
APPLICATION NO.	23/03062/FULLN
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
REGISTERED	30.11.2023
APPLICANT	Mr and Mrs Uddin
SITE	37 Bishops Way, Andover, Hampshire, SP10 3EH, ANDOVER TOWN (MILLWAY)
PROPOSAL	Two storey side and rear extension to provide bedroom with ensuite and family bathroom on the first floor and garage, gym and family room on ground floor and single storey rear extension to provide enlarged kitchen/diner
AMENDMENTS	
CASE OFFICER	Claudia Hurlock

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)
[Click here to view application](#)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Northern Area Planning Committee at the request of a member, for the reason "it raises issues of more than local public interest".

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

2.1 37 Bishops Way is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse of brick, tile and render construction. The dwelling benefits from off-road parking at the front of the property. The dwelling is sited in close proximity to Bishops Way and is accompanied by a long rear garden. The property also has an existing single-storey rear extension of brick construction with a flat roof. The surrounding area is characterised by residential dwellings, with trees lining the road. The dwellings are generally detached on both sides of the road and the area has an attractive, spacious and green quality to it which is reflected in its designation within the Andover Residential Area of Special Character (sub-area 1C).

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 The application seeks full planning permission for two storey side extensions to provide bedroom with en-suite and family bathroom on the first floor and garage, gym and family room on ground floor and a single storey rear extension to provide enlarged kitchen/diner using materials predominantly to match the main dwelling such as a tiled roof, cream painted render and face brickwork.

4.0 HISTORY

4.1 None relevant.

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 None.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 25.12.2023

6.1 **Andover Town Council:** No objection.

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)(TVBRLP)

Policy SD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy COM2 – Settlement Hierarchy

Policy E1- High Quality Development in the Borough

Policy E4 – Residential Areas of Special Character

Policy E5 - Biodiversity

Policy LHW4 – Amenity

Policy T2 – Parking Standards

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Areas of Special Character (RASC) Appraisals – Andover – January 2018

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 parking provision

Principle of development

8.2 The site 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.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

8.3 The existing dwelling is a modest, 3 bedroom, 2 storey detached property. The existing principal elevation of the dwelling has a large distinctive singular two storey gable feature with a smaller, recessed gable also visible within the front elevation of the building. This provides the property with much of its distinctive character and interest.

8.4 The site is located within sub-area 1C of the Andover Residential Area of Special Character (RASC). The RASC is characterised by tree lined street with grass verges and footpaths. Many of the houses are of the same era and display a unifying similarity of style and features.

- 8.5 In addition to the assessment of the RASC, Policy E1 of the TVBRLP states that “Extensions or alterations can have a cumulative impact on the character of the area and can overwhelm an existing building to the extent that its original character and symmetry is significantly eroded. To minimise this the proposal would need to be subsidiary to the original building and not dominate in scale.”
- 8.6 One of the common features within the RASC is the distinct dominant gable feature which is prominent and can be seen on a number of other dwellings within the street scene and therefore contributes positively to the character of the RASC. The application proposes to enlarge the dwelling by adding a larger, taller gable feature to the front of the property. The proposed addition of the larger gable feature would diminish the dominant appearance of the existing gable feature, fail to respect the existing proportions of the building and would due to its large, extended form appear an unduly dominant addition to the existing building. The proposal would draw the eye and draw attention from what is generally an area of dwellings with modest proportions and appearance.
- 8.7 To conclude, the proposal would unbalance the existing appearance and character of dwelling. Furthermore the proposal would form an unduly dominant feature within the street scene and harm the RASC where dwellings in this area are generally of modest appearance and proportions. The proposal would also not retain the distinctive local character of the existing building and is therefore contrary to policies E1 and E4 of the TVBRLP.

Impact on amenity of neighbouring property

- 8.8 35 Bishops Way
Due to the limited projections along the shared boundary, together with the limited impact of the proposed rear windows on the rear extensions of this application proposal, the proposal is considered not to have a significant or harmful impact on the amenity of this neighbouring property. The occupants of No. 35 have also not objected to this proposal.
- 8.9 39 Bishops Way
Privacy
There would not be any direct overlooking opportunities that would arise from the proposal which would affect No. 39. The proposed rear windows on the rear elevation of the extension would have views of the outbuilding at the rear of the garden of No. 39, however the separation distance is considered sufficient to ensure that the proposal would not have a significant impact in respect of privacy to this area.
- 8.10 No. 39 Bishops Way has an existing garden room at the rear boundary of the property which is used for leisure and as an occasional tattoo studio for the owners. This building however is sited approximately 27.5m away from the proposed rear extensions, and therefore this separation distance would ensure that the privacy levels for both dwellings are maintained.

Loss of daylight/sunlight

- 8.11 A shadow diagram has been undertaken which shows that the proposed works would cause additional shadowing onto the neighbouring property, No. 39 across the south-eastern side elevation which is used as the primary external amenity space, but also has windows serving the kitchen extension, from 9am until 11am. From 1pm however, the extensions would not cause any loss of sunlight to the neighbouring properties and therefore the time of shadowing during the day would be limited. It is considered therefore, that the proposal would not result in sunlight levels falling below acceptable levels.

Outlook/Overbearing

- 8.12 The proposed 2 storey rear extension would have a height of 4.9m to the eaves and 7.7m to the ridge. This would extend approximately 7.0m from the rear of the original dwelling including the existing single storey rear extension. It would extend by a further 7.8m further to the rear than the existing rear elevation of No. 39. The single storey element of the extension would be 3.0m in height and the entire length of the proposed extension, including the single storey element, would protrude over the existing boundary hedge. The protrusion at two storey level would impose itself on the outlook from the rear of No. 39, and from the garden, as a considerably more dominant and overbearing presence than existing and visually dominate the amenity areas (internal and external) of No. 39 but especially the outside seating area which would be located adjacent to the two-storey side wall of the property. This proposed extension would also only have a separation distance of 2m from both properties which further adds to the overbearing impact. The occupants of No. 39 would suffer an unreasonable sense of enclosure and loss of outlook between the existing single storey rear extension of the property and the proposed works to No. 37.
- 8.13 Whilst the proposal would not have a significant impact on either sunlight or privacy levels, the extensions would dominate the primary amenity space of No. 39 Bishops Way and as such, would fail to provide an acceptable level of amenity for the occupants of the neighbouring property, and the proposal would be contrary to Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

Impact on ecology

- 8.14 A bat survey and mitigation report was undertaken by Aluco Ecology Ltd (November 2023) which assessed impact that the proposal may have on bats. The house was initially evaluated as moderate potential based on evidence of bats in the loft void between insulation layers. The bat survey recorded no current roosting or activity within the house. Common Pipistrelles were recorded foraging and commuting over the site during survey. Mitigation measures have however been recommended such as a Schwegler Bat Roost Uni and a swift box. The proposal therefore is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

Impact on parking provision

- 8.15 The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling from 3 to 4, however it has been demonstrated within the submitted block plan that there is sufficient space in front of the dwelling for the parking of 3 cars which comply with the standards as set out in policies T2 and Annex G.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposed rear extensions would, by virtue of their bulk and mass and proximity to the neighbouring property, dominate the primary amenity space of No. 39 Bishops Way and cause a harmful sense of enclosure to the primary outside amenity space of this property and the addition of the larger gable feature would diminish the dominant appearance of the existing gable feature, fail to respect the existing proportions of the building and would, due to its large extended form appear an unduly dominant addition to the existing building. The proposal therefore is contrary to Policies E1, E4 and LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE for the reasons:

1. **The proposed two storey gable extension at the front of the property would unbalance the existing proportions and distinctiveness of the front elevation of the house. Furthermore the proposal would form an unduly dominant feature within the street scene and harm the character of the Andover Residential Area of Special Character where dwellings in this area are generally of modest appearance and proportions. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies E1 and E4 of the TVBRLP.**
2. **The proposed development would by reason of its bulk and mass and proximity to the neighbouring property, visually dominate and result in an unacceptable loss of outlook to the primary outside amenity space of No. 39 Bishops Way. The proposal therefore is contrary to Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.**

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.**
-