SITE: 29 Kingsway, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 2FG

Ref. F/16/79640 Received: 25/11/2016 (20/01/2017)

APPLICANT: Mr and Mrs Beasley

PROPOSAL: First floor rear extension including enlarged dormers to

side elevations

AMENDMENTS:

**RECOMMENDATION:** 

**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION** 

#### **CONDITIONS AND REASONS:**

- (1) The proposed development due to the size, scale, mass and design of the dormer windows would create an unsympathetic alteration to the roof of the dwelling. The proposal would be visually prominent in the street scene and from the wider public realm, detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. As such the proposed development is contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011, Policy DM1 of the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- (2) The proposed development due to the increase in size, scale and mass of the dormer windows and roof, in close proximity to the boundaries with the neighbouring properties would be over dominant, detrimental to the amenities of 27 Kingsway and 11 Purkess Close. As such the proposed development is contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011, Policy DM1 of the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

Note to Applicant: The application was refused following the assessment of the following plans: A, B, C, D, E.

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Eastleigh Borough Council takes a positive approach to the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome and to ensure all proposals are dealt with in a timely manner.

### Report:

This application has been referred to Committee because a member of the committee lives in close proximity to the application site.

# **Description of Application**

- 1. The application proposes a first floor rear extension to the roof of the dwelling. The roof of the extension would have a half hip at the rear.
- 2. The side dormer windows are proposed to be enlarged and the roof of the dormer windows would be altered to a sloping roof.
- 3. A front porch is also proposed.

#### **Site Characteristics**

- 4. The site consists of a detached bungalow with flat roof dormer windows in the side roof elevations. The site is located on Kingsway and is accessed via a footpath to the front of the dwelling. Vehicular access and parking is provided at the rear of the site from Purkess Close.
- 5. The surrounding properties in this part of Kingsway generally consist of detached bungalows and chalet bungalows.

## **Relevant Planning History**

6. F/08/63024 - Single storey rear extension and addition of pitched roof to existing rear extension – Permit 29/07/2008

#### **Representations Received**

7. None received

#### **Consultation Responses**

8. Chandlers Ford Parish Council: None received

### **Policy Context: Designation Applicable to Site**

- Within Built-up Area Boundary
- Within Established Residential Area

#### **Development Plan Saved Policies and Emerging Local Plan Policies**

9. Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 saved Policies 59.BE, 104.T

- 10. Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 Policies DM1, DM24
- 11. The Submitted Local Plan comprises: the Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 2029, published February 2014; and the Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014.

# **Supplementary Planning Documents**

- Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places (November 2011)
- Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards (January 2009)

# 12. National Planning Policy Framework

- 13. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 14. Para 14 sets out a general presumption in favour of sustainable development and states that development proposals which accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out-of-date planning permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of the development would outweigh the benefits; or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted (paragraph 14). Local plan policies that do not accord with the NPPF are now deemed to be "out-of-date". The NPPF requires that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. In other words the closer the policies in the plan accord to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given.

## **Policy Commentary**

15. The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, trees, street scene and character of the area.

#### **Comment on Consultation Responses and Representations Received**

16. None received

# Assessment of Proposal: Development Plan and / or Legislative Background

- 17. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-
- 18. "If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

19. In this case policy issues for consideration include;

# **Principle**

- 20. The site lies within the urban edge, as part of an established residential area. The principle of development is considered to be acceptable subject to the proposed scheme being appropriate in nature, design and siting, in accordance with the relevant local planning policies and guidance.
- 21. In this case the relevant saved local plan policies are 59.BE and 104.T
- 22. Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes. Policy 104.T requires adequate off-highway parking to be provided

### **Character and appearance**

- 23. The existing property is a detached bungalow with flat roof dormer windows and a single storey extension at the rear of the property with a double pitched roof. A single bay garage and parking is located to the rear of the site. The dwelling is elevated from the footpath and is positioned at a lower level when viewed from Purkess Close.
- 24. The application proposes a first floor rear extension to alter the roof from a hipped roof to a gabled roof with a half hip. Dormer windows are proposed in the side elevation with a sloping roof. A front porch is also proposed.
- 25. The proposed extension to the rear of the dwelling would extend the existing roof form and would be similar in form and design to the neighbouring property no.27. It is considered that the change from a hip to gable would not be disproportionate and would not be overly dominant in the street scene.
- 26. The existing dwelling has flat roof dormer windows, the application proposes to alter the dormer windows by extending the size of the dormers and altering the roof of the dormer windows. The proposed dormer windows are considered to be significant in size and mass and due to the roof form of the dormers they are not considered to sit well within the roof of the dwelling and would dominant the roof of the dwelling.
- 27. Due to the layout of the dwelling access to the site is gained at the front and rear of the site. The rear elevation is therefore visible from Purkess Close and due to the dwelling being positioned at a lower level than the road the roof is highly visible from the street. It is therefore considered that the proposed roof

- alterations and dormer windows would be visible from the street and due to the unacceptable size, scale and mass of the dormers they would not be in keeping with the character of the area.
- 28. In addition a footpath is positioned along the side boundary of 11 Purkess Close providing access between Kingsway and Purkess Close. The side dormer window would be visible across the garden area of 11 Purkess Close. It is therefore considered that the proposed dormer windows are clearly visible from the wider public views.
- 29. It is therefore considered that due to the concerns regarding the size, scale and mass of the dormer windows and the visibility of the dormer windows within the street and from the wider views of the site the proposal is considered to cause material harm to the street scene and wider character of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan.

#### **Trees**

30. TPO trees are located to the front of the site. Due to the proposed changes being positioned at the rear of the dwelling and no ground disturbance, the proposal is not considered to impact on the protected trees. If permission were to be granted conditions would be recommended for protection of the trees during construction works.

## Flooding

31. The site is located within 25m of the river, due to the proposed extensions being at first floor level and the proposal not increasing the size of the existing porch no flood risk assessment is required in this case.

#### Residential amenity

- 32. The neighbouring property 11 Purkess Close is a detached bungalow positioned further towards the southeast of the plot than the application site. Due to the layout of the site the garden area to this dwelling is located to the north east of the property. Whilst the dwelling on the application site is visible from this existing garden, concerns are raised regarding the increased roof mass of the dwelling and the size and scale of the dormer windows in close proximity to the private amenity area of this property. The proposal is therefore considered to cause material harm in terms of over dominance to this neighbouring property.
- 33. The dwelling is also positioned in close proximity to the boundary with number 27 Kingsway. Concerns are raised that the increased roof mass including the large size, scale and mass of the dormer windows in close proximity to the boundary of the neighbouring property would cause material harm to the amenities of this neighbouring property in terms of over dominance.

- 34. A number of side facing windows are proposed in the dormer windows, if permission were to be granted conditions would be recommended to obscure glaze these windows.
- 35. The proposal is therefore considered to be materially more harmful to the neighbouring property than the existing on site situation due to the increase in the size of the dormer windows and resulting roof mass and therefore the proposal is considered to conflict with Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan.

## Access and parking

- 36. No alterations are proposed to the existing access on the site.
- 37. The property with the proposed extension would have 4 bedrooms. The Council's Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document requires that dwellings of this size provide three on site spaces. No plan has been submitted with the application showing parking on the site, however, there is an existing garage and drive at the rear of the site which would allow for parking of three cars and therefore no objection is raised on these grounds.

#### Other material considerations

38. Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011- 2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

#### Conclusion

39. The application is recommended for refusal.

