

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	18/01955/FULLS
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	23.07.2018
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mrs B Hayes
<b>SITE</b>	162B Botley Road, Romsey, Hampshire, SO51 5SW, <b>ROMSEY EXTRA</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Extension to provide sitting room, bedroom, kitchen and bathroom
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	Tracking Diagram 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2018 and Amended Site Plan 8 October 2018.
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Mrs Sacha Coen

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Ward Member.

## 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site 162B consists of a two bedroom bungalow with detached double garage. The property 162B was back land development to properties 158, 160, 162 and 162A Botley Road granted permission by appeal on 2 December 2009 and it is accessed via a gravel track along the south-eastern side of 162A.

## 3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Front extension to provide annex accommodation consisting of a sitting room, bedroom, kitchen and bathroom.

## 4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 TVS.01640 - Change of use of two rooms for play school - Eastward, Botley Road, Romsey - Temporary Permission valid until 30.04.1978 - Granted on 20.04.1977.
- 4.2 TVS.01640/1 – Renewal of use of two rooms for children's play school - Estward, Botley Road, Romsey - Temporary Permission valid until 31.05.1981 - Granted on 05.06.1978.
- 4.3 TVS.1640/2 - Replacement of garage and erection of dwelling - Estward, Botley Road, Romsey - Outline Permission 07.06.1979.
- 4.4 TVS.1640/3 - Erection of two dwellings - Estward, Botley Road, Romsey. Refused 25.01.1980.

- 4.5 TVS.1640/4 - Resiting of vehicular access and garage to existing house and erection of new dwelling - Estward, Botley Road, Romsey - Permission 15.05.1980.
- 4.6 TVS.1640/5 - Continuation of Play Group - Estward, Botley Road, Romsey - Permission 30.06.1981.
- 4.7 TVS.1640/6 - Use of part of new house as playschool - adjoining Estward, Botley Road, Romsey - Temporary Permission subject to conditions valid until 31.03.1989 - Granted on 24.03.1986.
- 4.8 TVS.1640/7 - Renewal: Use of part of house as playschool - Springfield, Botley Road, Romsey Extra. Temporary Permission subject to conditions valid until - 31/03/91, Granted – 18.05.1989.
- 4.9 TVS.16740/8- Renewal of Permission to continue to use part of dwelling as playschool - Temporary Permission subject to conditions valid until – Granted 23.08.1991
- 4.10 09/00476/FULLS - To erect a single storey dwelling with detached garage to the rear of 162a Botley Road – Refused 05.06.2009 – Allowed on Appeal 02.12.2009.
- 4.11 11/00832/CLPS - Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use for retention of carport to serve 162A Botley Road – Issued 22.06.2011.

## 5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Ecology:** No concerns subject to note.

5.2 **Trees:** No objection.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 17.08.2018

6.1 **Romsey Extra Parish Council:** No objection.

6.2 **3<sup>rd</sup> Party Correspondence:** Objections from 162, 162A Botley Road:

In the Design and Access statement the property is referred to as a 2 bedroomed bungalow. However this bungalow was accepted as a 3 bedroomed bungalow in 2009, the planning reference being:

- 09/00476/FULLS. The 2nd bedroom has yet to be split into 2 rooms. The reason for building the extension is for the daughter and son-in-law to also live in the property in order to care for their elderly parent. However this is already a large 3 bedroom property so the need to extend it to a property with 4 bedrooms, 2 kitchens, 2 sitting rooms and 3 bathrooms seems excessive and overdevelopment and not in keeping with other properties in the area as required by the Test Valley Local Plan. I would suggest this is more of an "annex" than a mere extension.
- Impact upon trees and hedgerows mature hedgerows.
- Impact upon the pedestrian and vehicular access.

- Impact on parking and turning.
- Increase in traffic movement.
- Overdevelopment.
- Overlooking.
- Permitted development rights were removed under the appeal under 09/00476/FULLS.
- Loss of amenities during and after the works.
- Fears regarding vehicle access, manoeuvrability and parking by works vehicles.
- There will be no area for grab/7.5T or 3.5T vehicles to turn unless use of land belonging to 162A is permitted. The residents of 162A are unlikely will not give any permissions to allow their land to be used to facilitate the works.
- The plans submitted highlight the area of interest to include the boundary of 164 Botley Road. Can you confirm if this boundary is being moved? If not, I would ask that that a reapplication is made with a more accurate set of drawings.
- Covenant over the access drive and damage to the track caused by increase in traffic.
- Detriment to health and safety as fire and ambulance services can not drive up the access track.

## 7.0 **POLICY**

### 7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

### 7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP)

Policy SD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy COM2 – Settlement Hierarchy

Policy E1- High Quality Development in the Borough

Policy E2 – Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough

Policy E5 – Biodiversity

Policy LHW4 – Amenity

Policy T1 – Managing Movement

Policy T2 – Parking Standards

### 7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Look at Romsey – Area 2 Halterworth: Romsey Town Design Guidance

Supplementary Planning Document (January 2008)

## 8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### 8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Impact on amenity of neighbouring property

- Impact on ecology
- Impact on trees
- Impact on parking provision

## 8.2 **Principle of development**

The sites lies within the settlement boundary as defined on the Inset Maps of the TVBRLP. In accordance with Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP development is permitted provided the proposal is appropriate to other policies of the Revised Local Plan. The proposal is assessed against relevant policies below.

## 8.3 **Impact on the character and appearance of the area**

Concern was raised that the development to extend the property would result in overdevelopment. The size of the dwelling house with the proposed extension and the existing garage has a total foot print measuring approximately 179.93 m<sup>2</sup>. The size of this residential plot measures at approximately 922.63 m<sup>2</sup> and therefore the resulting amenity garden space, turning space and driveway measures at approximately 742.70 m<sup>2</sup>. The resultant dwelling will remain single storey in nature and therefore the proposed extension is not considered to result in overdevelopment.

8.4 The development is located in a position such that limited public views would be possible. Any glimpsed views of the proposal would be seen in the context of the existing dwelling and in this respect the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area, in compliance with Policies COM2 and E1 of the TVBRLP.

## 8.5 **Impact on amenity of neighbouring property**

Concern was raised that the extension would overlook the school from a new bedroom window and new bathroom window. Given the single storey nature of the property and the presence of the existing boundary treatment consisting of a mixture of close boarded fencing, ship lap fencing and established trees along the northern boundary the proposal would not give rise to an adverse impact on the living conditions of the host property or the Halterworth School by virtue of reduced levels of privacy. The proposal is in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

8.6 Concern was raised about noise generated by the work and the disruption this may cause. Construction traffic and noise from the works on site would be expected to be temporary in nature. It would be unreasonable to refuse development for a single storey extension on the prospect that the surrounding properties would be adversely impacted during the construction period.

8.7 By virtue of the size (bulk and mass) and design of the proposal, it's position relative to neighbouring properties, and the nature of the intervening boundary treatment the proposal would not give rise to an adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties by virtue of loss of daylight, sun light, or privacy. The proposal is in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

#### 8.8 **Impact on trees and hedgerows**

The proposal is not considered to give rise to any adverse impacts on existing trees, in accordance with Policy E2 of the TVBRLP.

#### 8.9 **Impact on ecology**

Given the very modern age of the property, it is considered there to be no reasonable likelihood that bats would be present and affected and therefore the Ecology Officers has raised no specific concerns over this proposal. However an informative note has been attached this permission to stop works immediately if bats, or evidence of bat presence (e.g. droppings, bat carcasses or insect remains), are encountered at any point during this development, in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

#### 8.10 **Impact on parking provision**

The proposal does not give rise to an additional demand for car parking or result in the loss of existing car parking spaces to serve the dwelling, in accordance with the parking standards as set out in Annex G and Policy T2 of the TVBRLP.

#### 8.11 **Other Issues**

Concerns were expressed that the Design and Access statement submitted with the planning application referred to the property as a 2 bedroom bungalow, although planning permission was granted as a 3 bedroom in 2009 under the planning reference 09/00476/FULLS. The objector states the 2nd bedroom has yet to be split into 2 rooms. Unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, an application should be dealt with on the basis of its description and the information actually provided rather than supposition.

8.12 Concern was raised that permitted development rights were removed under the appeal under 09/00476/FULLS and the submitted planning application is to enlarge the property including additions to the roof and other roof alterations. Permitted development has been removed from the bungalow under 09/00476/FULLS, which is a procedure the local planning authority will often do in order to have an element of control how a property can further be extended. The purposes of removing permitted development mean the applicant is required to apply to the local planning authority for further development rather than carrying out works within permitted development, it doesn't mean that no further works can ever be carried out.

8.13 Concern was raised that there will be no area for grab/7.5T or 3.5T vehicles to turn unless they use land belonging to 162A is permitted. Construction traffic for a modest extension would be expected to be temporary in nature. The building works and associated construction traffic is not a consideration of the Planning Authority but a civil matter between parties.

8.14 Concern was raised that the plans submitted highlight the area of interest to include the boundary of 164 Botley Road. The red edge on the original site plan registered on 23 July 2018 was askew and appears to include land belonging to 164 Botley Road. It has been confirmed that land belonging to 164 Botley Road is not part of this application and an amended site plan was received on the 8 October 2018 to address this error.

8.15 The Objector has concerns that the access track that they have a covenant over, will be damaged by the increase in traffic movements. The proposed extension to increase the bungalow to a 3 bedroom bungalow would not create a level of increased traffic that would warrant refusal of this planning application. Any damage to the track would be a civil matter between parties as covenants are not a planning consideration.

8.16 Concerns were raised that fire and ambulance services can not drive up the access track. As the extension does not have an impact upon highway safety and the driveway track already exists, the use of the track can not be considered as part of this application.

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal is considered acceptable and in accordance with the policies of the TVBRLP.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

### **PERMISSION subject to:**

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.**  
**Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**
2. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:**  
**Amended Site Plan**  
**Drawing Number 1052/01 - Existing Elevations/Floor Plans**  
**Drawing Number 1052/02 A - Amended Proposed Floor Plan**  
**Drawing Number 1052/03 - Proposed Elevations**  
**Drawing Number 1052/04 - Site/Roof Plan/Section**  
**Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**
3. **The external materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match in type, colour and texture those used in the existing building.**  
**Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship of the new development with the existing in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.**

### **Notes to applicant:**

1. **In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. TVBC work with applicants and their agents in a positive and proactive manner offering a pre-application advice service and updating applicants/agents of issues that may arise in dealing with the application and where possible suggesting solutions.**

- 2. Bats and their roosts receive strict legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. All work must stop immediately if bats, or evidence of bat presence (e.g. droppings, bat carcasses or insect remains), are encountered at any point during this development. Should this occur, further advice should be sought from Natural England and/or a professional ecologist.**
-