
APPLICATION NO.	19/00048/FULLN
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
REGISTERED	10.01.2019
APPLICANT	Ms C O'Connell
SITE	100 Olympic Park Road, Andover, SP11 6RY, ENHAM ALAMEIN
PROPOSAL	First floor extension over garage to form ensuite and dressing room at first floor and loft conversion with two dormer windows to provide bedroom, bathroom and study.
AMENDMENTS	Amended plans were received on 6 March 2019
CASE OFFICER	Miss Katherine Dowle

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to Northern Area Planning Committee in accordance with the Member and Officer Interests Protocol.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site consists of a modern detached two storey house and garage. It is constructed of red brick with white UVPC windows and a tiled roof. There is a garage at the rear of the property with a parking space in front of it providing capacity for two cars to park.

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 It is proposed to extend above the garage to form an en-suite and dressing room in the first floor and a study in the second floor. Two front dormer windows are proposed to be installed in the front elevation of the property looking towards No.12 Woolwich Way. The application has been amended to remove a Juliet balcony which was proposed in the first floor of the north-east elevation of No.100 Olympic Park Road and replace it with a window.

4.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 4.1 None.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Highways: Objection:

The development fails to provide off-street parking in line with TVBC's adopted parking standards and fails to demonstrate any particular specific circumstances why a departure from standards is acceptable.

Whilst the applicant has provided some information with regard to the accessibility of the site to local public transport links I would not in any way class the site location as particularly accessible, certainly not enough to warrant a car free development.

The extremely high likelihood is that any occupier or future occupier would have access to a private car and as such that car would be required to park on-street.

Whilst I think it may be difficult to demonstrate a particular detrimental impact on highway safety to this occurring in this location, it is not your responsibility to demonstrate this.

It is for the applicant to demonstrate particular special circumstances why a car-free proposal would be acceptable. i.e.- an extremely accessible location.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 06.02.2019

6.1 **Enham Alamein Parish Council: No response received.**

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)

COM2: Settlement Hierarchy

E1: High Quality Development in the Borough

LHW4: Amenity

T1: Managing Movement

T2: Parking Standards

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Character of the area
- Amenity
- Impact on highway safety

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.

8.3 **Character of the area**

No.100 Olympic Park Road is a detached property located on a corner plot bordered by Woolwich Way to the south-west and Olympic Park Road to the south-east. The property is constructed of red brick and has a tiled roof. There are a number of similar house types surrounding No.100, with variations in roof height, materials and scale between these properties.

8.4 The proposed development would raise the ridge height of the garage in line with the existing ridge height and install two dormer windows in the front elevation. Two nearby properties, Nos.17 and 19 Woolwich Way, have dormers with a similar appearance to those proposed at No.100. The proposed dormers would be seen in the context of these existing dormers and are considered to integrate with the character of the area to an acceptable degree.

8.5 The proposed development raising the ridge height of the garage would have materials to match those in the existing property. The additional UPVC windows would be of a similar appearance to the existing windows and would integrate with the character of the host property and neighbouring properties. Overall the proposed development would integrate, respect and complement the character of the area, complying with policy E1.

8.6 **Amenity**

Privacy

98 Olympic Park Road

The proposed development is approximately 15m from the side elevation of No.98 Olympic Park Road. The proposal would have four first floor and second floor windows in the elevation facing No.98. The first floor windows would serve a bedroom and bathroom while the second floor would serve a bathroom and study. The addition of second floor windows as part of the application where there are no second floor windows currently would result in an additional angle of overlooking so it is recommended that a condition is added to obscure glazing in these windows. The additional window serving the first floor bathroom would be located in close proximity to the garden of No.98 and would overlook the garden of this neighbouring property and a condition securing obscure glazing in this window is recommended. The existing window in the first floor is proposed to be widened and would serve a bedroom. This window is some distance away from the garden of No.98 and so would not result in a significantly greater impact on overlooking as the other existing windows in this elevation. Therefore a condition securing obscure glazing in this window is not considered necessary. Taking into account the distance from the extension above the garage and the garden of No.98, the increase in height is not considered to result in a significant reduction in outlook from the garden of this neighbouring property.

8.7 *12 Woolwich Way*

The two dormer windows in the front elevation of No.100 would look towards the front elevation of 12 Woolwich Way. The properties are currently 12m apart from each other. Due to the separation distances between the properties the addition of two dormer windows looking towards the front elevation of No.12 Woolwich Way is considered to provide for the privacy of the occupants of this neighbouring property. These second floor windows would look towards the first floor bedroom windows at the front of the property.

8.8 *21 Woolwich Way*

There would be an additional first floor window serving the dressing room and an additional roof light serving the study which would face towards this neighbouring property. There are currently first floor windows looking towards this neighbour which are closer to the neighbouring building. The addition of the first floor window is not considered to result in an increase in overlooking of the neighbouring property. Raising the roof of the garage is not considered to significantly reduce the outlook from this property.

8.9 *14 Woolwich Way and 3 Eton Dorney Walk*

The north-west elevation of the proposed development would face towards these properties. There is a roof light proposed which would be visible from these properties but the opening is not considered to result in additional overlooking of the rear elevations of these properties. Raising the ridge height of the garage would not harm the outlook from these properties as it would be seen in the context of the existing building and would be the same height as the existing roof ridge.

8.10 Sunlight

Shadow diagrams have been created for this proposal and are attached to this report. The proposed development would result in a slight increase in the extent of shadows cast by No.100 Olympic Park Road. As a result of the proposal, the shadow between 10am and 11am would extend further into the garden of No.3 Eton Dorney Walk. By midday this would fall onto the lane between the properties and during the afternoon some additional shading would fall towards the rear garden of No.98 Olympic Park Road. The increase in shadowing to these properties would each be for a couple of hours during the day and is not considered to cause sunlight levels reaching these properties to fall below acceptable levels.

8.11 Daylight

The proposed development is a sufficient distance from neighbouring properties that it would not cause daylight levels to fall below acceptable levels.

8.12 Overall the proposal would provide for the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties, complying with Policy LHW4.

8.13 **Highway safety**

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms at the property from three to four. There are currently two parking spaces at the property formed of a garage and a space to the front of this garage. The parking standard set out in Annex G of the RLP requires three parking spaces for a four bedroom property. As the site would not be able to provide three parking spaces as required, the applicant has provided some information with regard to the accessibility of the site to local public transport links seeking to justify a departure from the Council's parking standards explaining that the house is 1.9 miles from Andover Railway Station and is accessed by a bus which takes approximately 20 minutes to Andover Town Centre. It is considered that the application property is not sufficiently well served by public transport nor is closely located to the services and facilities within the town centre to justify a departure from the Council's approved parking standards.

- 8.14 There are no restrictions to parking on streets near to the application site and the adjacent roads are frequently used for on-street parking. It is considered that the approval of the proposed extension would result in further demand for on-street parking in this location where there is already evidence of this taking place. Therefore the proposal fails to comply with Annex G and Policy T2.
- 8.15 The addition of extra cars on the highway network has the potential to affect a number of highway users including car drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. When a number of cars are parked on the road/footway this can obstruct views at junctions and reduce the efficiency of the network as users have to slow down and manoeuvre around parked cars. This in turn would result in additional on-street parking stress in this location and harm to the function, safety and efficiency of the highway network and therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies T1 and T2 of the RLP.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The proposed development would not comply with the parking standards set out in Annex G. The area in which it is located would not result in a low demand for parking. The additional on-street parking stress which would result from the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on on-street parking which would have a detrimental impact on the safety and efficiency of the local highway network. The proposal is contrary to Policy T1 and T2 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE for the reason:

- 1. The proposed development would conflict with the parking standards set out in Annex G of the RLP. The application site is divorced from the town centre and there are only limited services and public transport available within walking distance. As such there is inadequate justification to depart from the Council's parking standards in these circumstances. The proposed development would unacceptably add to the on-street parking demand within the locality which would contribute towards a detrimental impact on the function, safety and efficiency of the highway network. This would thereby conflict with policies T1 and T2 of the RLP.**

Note 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.**
-