P/14/0142/FP

HILL HEAD

MR & MRS BAGLEY

AGENT: ROSENTHAL DESIGN SERVICES LTD

ERECTION OF EXTENSION AND SUB-DIVISION OF EXISTING DWELLING TO CREATE AN ADDITIONAL SEMI-DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING PROVISION & DETACHED GARAGE FOR EXISTING DWELLING

5 COTTES WAY EAST FAREHAM PO14 3NG

Report By

Graham Pretty (Ext.2526)

Introduction

This application is brought before committee under the adopted scheme of delegation following the receipt of letters of objection.

Site Description

This application relates to a site within the urban area of Hill Head on the corner of Cottes Way East and Cottes Way. The site is occupied by a detached chalet bungalow. The dwelling has an attached garage to the eastern side which has a flat roof.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for extensions to the dwelling and conversion to form a pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposed extensions would be to the eastern side of the existing dwelling bringing the front elevation of this part of the building forwards in line with the western side. A new roof would be provided to the eastern side of the dwelling to increase the amount of first floor accommodation. The new roof would extend over the position of the current flat roofed garage which would rebuilt to become habitable accommodation.

Two car parking spaces would be provided on the frontage of Cottes Way East for the resultant new dwelling. A detached garage is proposed to the west side of the existing dwelling with two car parking spaces on a new driveway with access on to Cottes Way.

The existing garden would be divided to provide each dwelling with an amenity space.

Policies

The following policies apply to this application:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Planning Practice Guidance

Approved Fareham Borough Core Strategy

- CS17 High Quality Design
- CS11 Development in Portchester, Stubbington and Hill Head
- CS2 Housing Provision
- CS6 The Development Strategy
- CS5 Transport Strategy and Infrastructure

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review

RCCPS - Residential Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document,

Development Sites and Policies

DSP2 - Design

DSP4 - Impact on Living Conditions

DSP15 - Recreational Disturbance on the Solent Special Protection Areas

Fareham Borough Local Plan Review

DG4 - Site Characteristics

Relevant Planning History

The following planning history is relevant:

P/13/0182/FP ERECTION OF EXTENSION AND SUB-DIVISION OF EXISTING DWELLING TO CREATE AN ADDITIONAL SEMI-DETACHED DWELLING REFUSE 22/05/2013

Representations

Two letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- Semi-detached properties are out of keeping with the prevailing character of development

- The modern design is not in keeping with the established character of dwellings in the area

- Overdevelopment of the site

- The proposed tandem car parking spaces accessing Cottes Way will as a result of the tandem spaces proposed, result in parking on street which will make access to existing properties, opposite, difficult

Consultations

Director of Community (Environmental Health) - No objection

Director of Planning and Development (Transport) - No objection subject to conditions

Planning Considerations - Key Issues

The key issues in this case are:

- The Planning History of the site
- The Principle of the Development
- The Impact on the Character of the Area/Visual Menity of the Streetscene
- Impact on Neighbouring Properties
- Residential Amenity
- Highways
- Ecology

Planning History

Planning application P/13/0182/FP for the same development as currently proposed was refused under delegated powers on 22nd May 2013. The refusal was solely on the grounds

of the proximity of the revised car parking and access for the existing dwelling being too close to the junction of Cottes Way and Cottes Way East where reversing on to the highway would be considered hazardous. The reason for refusal was as follows:

"The proposed development would be contrary to Policies CS5 and CS17 of the Fareham Borough Core Strategy and is unacceptable in that; the proposal would not make adequate provision within the site to enable a vehicle to turn and so enter and leave the site in a forward gear. In the absence of a turning facility on site vehicles would either enter or leave the site in reverse gear. Given the proximity of the proposed vehicular crossover to the road junction of Cottes Way East and Cottes Way it is considered that this would be detrimental to highway safety."

Principle of Development

The site is located within the urban area where residential infilling, redevelopment and development on neglected and underused land may be permitted, providing it does not adversely affect the character of the surrounding area or amenity of existing residents.

The proposal would result in the intensification in use of a single residential plot and thereby results in the development of garden land. Whilst this would not be identified as previously developed land this in itself is not reason to resist development. Proposals on residential garden sites must be considered, in the context of the character of the area as required under paragraph 53 of the NPPF and against Policy CS17 of the Fareham Borough Core Strategy. This policy requires that all development responds positively to and is respectful of the key characteristics of the area including scale, form and spaciousness. Subject to these considerations the principle of the development is considered acceptable.

Impact on Character of the Area/ Visual Amenity of the Streetscene

The existing dwelling sits on a corner plot which is relatively wide in comparison to those within the surrounding area.

Cottes Way East consists largely of bungalows a number of which have first floor accommodation within the roof space. There are however chalet bungalows with dormer windows visible to the east of the application site closer to Crofton Lane and full two storey height properties immediately to the west along Cottes Way. The proposal would not actually raise the height of the roof of the existing dwelling but it would introduce further first floor accommodation and increase the bulk of the roof whilst retaining a chalet style appearance. The proposal would result in the formation of a second gable end to the front elevation to mirror an existing feature. Glazing panels would be used on the gable end at both ground and first floor level giving a more modern appearance. Whilst this design approach may be different to the more traditional appearance of neighbouring properties this does not make it unacceptable and in paragraph 65 the NPPF warns Planning Authorities away from rejecting development simply because it differs from the existing if it is not in fact harmful to the prevailing character. Officers consider that the proposal with its single storey scale and gabled design would be sympathetic to the character of Cottes Way East and would not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the streetscene. No reason relating to the character of the area was put forward against the previous application.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

The neighbouring property to the east has a secondary lounge window within the side

elevation sited towards the rear of the dwelling. There is currently approx 3.5m between the two dwellings with the neighbour's window facing towards the flat roofed garage of the application property. Whilst this separation distance would not be reduced the new extension would replace the garage in the same position. There is some vegetation on the boundary which is within the control of the neighbouring property. At the time of the officers site inspection this vegetation obscured any outlook from the lounge window and had a direct impact on the light available to this room. In this respect officers do not consider that the proposal would have any detrimental impact in terms of further loss of light or outlook than the existing vegetation which the objector has chosen to retain and in any event a 2m high means of enclosing the boundary could be constructed without the need for express planning permission. Again, no reason relating to the impact upon neighbours was put forward on the previous application.

Residential Amenity

It is considered that the subdivision of the plot would provide adequate amenity space to serve both the proposed dwellings, providing a 12m by 7m rear garden for the new plot and a 10m by 21m rear garden for the existing. This would not be detrimental to the character of the area.

Highways

The eastern dwelling would utilise the existing access on to Cottes Way East with two car parking spaces provided side by side on the property frontage. These arrangements are considered acceptable as the existing dwelling currently has no on-site turning available.

The current application addresses the previous reason for refusal by separating the accesses for the two dwellings and providing the existing dwelling with an access on to Cottes Way. Although representation has been received on the grounds that tandem spaces would result in manoeuvring on the highway and/or parking on street, causing issue for existing residents on the opposite side of Cottes Way, the use of tandem car parking spaces is not unusual within residential areas and there is no highways objection to the proposals.

Ecology

Recently gathered evidence demonstrates that new development can reduce the quality of the important bird habitat in the Solent Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Any development that would result in an increase in the local population may have an impact either alone or in combination with other developments upon the SPAs. Development can increase the population at the coast and thus increase the level of disturbance and the resultant effect on the SPA's conservation objectives.

A legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project interim strategy, represents an agreed approach to mitigation.

Conclusion

The application is for a new dwelling within the urban area. The principle of such development is acceptable in policy terms and a previous application was refused only on highway grounds. The application remains the same as previously submitted with the exception of the provision of a garage and rearranged car parking and access which now

overcome the previous objection.

PERMISSION

Subject to the completion of a Planning Obligation under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to the satisfaction of the Head of the Southampton and Fareham Legal Services Partnership to secure a financial contribution towards off site ecological mitigation measures by 31 July 2014 and to conditions and notes as follows:

Matching materials; Access and car parking as on approved plans; removal of permitted development rights; hours of work; mud on road; no burning.

Background Papers

P/13/0182/FP; P/14/0142/FP

