

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	19/02017/FULLN
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	07.10.2019
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr and Mrs Hodson
<b>SITE</b>	37 Cusden Drive, Andover, Hampshire, SP10 3TF, <b>ANDOVER (HARROWAY)</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Demolition of garage, erection of two storey side extension to provide utility/w.c/dining room with bedroom and bathroom over
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Alexandra Jeffery

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 37 Cusden Drive is a semi-detached two bedroom property within a residential area of Andover. 37 Cusden Drive is sited at an elevated position at the end of the residential cul-de-sac. The neighbouring pair of properties, 34 and 36 Cusden Drive, are set lower as the land gently slopes to the east. The attached property, 36 Cusden Drive is sited north-east of the site the subject of this application and has been extended in line with the front of the building with a matching ridge and eaves height. Four mature Rowan trees stand on land immediately to the south west of 37 Cusden Drive.

## 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 This application seeks to demolish the existing garage and erect a two-storey side extension. The proposed materials together with the height of the eaves and roof would match the existing property. Internally, the extension would host a bathroom and bedroom on the first floor and a W/C, utility room and extended living space on the ground floor. Two off road parking spaces are proposed on the driveway.

## 4.0 HISTORY

4.1 TVN.03927 – Erection of 48 houses and garages and construction of access road. Permission subject to conditions on 14.03.1984.

## 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Landscape – No objection.

5.2 Southern Gas – No response received.

5.3 Highways – No objection.

5.4 Trees – No objection.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 07.11.2019

6.1 Andover Town Council – No objection.

6.2 1 x Letter of Objection - 34 Cusden Drive (summarised)

- Contrary to Policy T2: proposed extension could reduce their current parking down to zero and would therefore result in parking both their vehicles on the highway which is already busy with cars and vans.
- Out of the character of the area: the proposal will see a full two storey extension from the front of the house to the back where a number of the two bedroom houses have extended above the garage but have still kept their garage and hence the step back from the front of the house. Proposal would create a huge flat fronted building of which there are not other properties of this type in the cul-de-sac.

6.3 1 x Letter of Objection - 35 Cusden Drive (summarised)

- Does not accord with policy T2: The proposed extension will prevent them parking outside their property, resulting in them parking both their vehicles on an already heavily used highway with other neighbour's vehicles.
- Out of character of the area: Some of the two bedroom houses have extended above their garage but have maintained the step back from the front of the house. If this application were to be approved it would create a large flat fronted building that will create/add to the neighbourhoods ability to park safely.

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
- E2: Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough
- LHW4: Amenity
- T2: Parking Standards

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Trees
- Amenity
- Parking

## 8.2 **Principle of development**

37 Cusden Drive is within the Andover settlement boundary as defined within the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016). The proposal would be acceptable in regard to policy COM2 subject to being appropriate to the other policies of the Revised Local Plan.

## **The impact on the character and appearance of the area**

8.3 Policies E1 and E2 of the RLP seek to protect the landscape of the Borough through the provision of high quality development that integrates with, respects and complements the character of the area, and through the provision and/or retention of appropriate landscaping and landscape features. Accompanying paragraph 7.12 explains that when considering policy E1 :

“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.”

8.4 In order to achieve a subsidiary design within proposed extensions, applicants are often requested to set extensions back from the front wall of the building which in turn reduces the ridge height of the extension, visually emphasising the size and form of the host property.

8.5 Near to the application property, 41 Cusden Drive was granted permission for a two storey side extension over the garage in 1992 and, 24 Cusden Drive was granted permission for a single storey front and two-storey side extension in 1998. These properties incorporate set backs and are subsidiary in form.

8.6 The proposed extension would be readily visible within the street scene. The proposed two storey side extension at 37 Cusden Drive would be in line with the principal elevation and the ridge and eaves height the same as that on the host property. The neighbouring property, 36 Cusden Drive, has been extended in line with the principal elevation of the property therefore it would not appear out of place with the immediate surroundings for no.37 to be extended in the same manner.

8.7 Although the proposed extension would not incorporate a set back or appear subsidiary, in mirroring the extension at 36 it would re-balance the two semi-detached properties, and as such, the proposal would not appear overly dominant or harmful in these particular circumstances. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene or surrounding area.

8.8 The Landscape Officer considers that the plot sits within a residential close where other neighbouring properties have been extended. As such, from a landscape perspective it is considered that the impact of the development would have a neutral impact on the immediate and wider landscape. It is considered that the scale of the proposed two storey side extension would be in keeping with the host property and that its appearance, design and

materials would complement the surrounding area. As such the proposal complies with policies E1 and E2 of the RLP.

### **Trees**

- 8.9 The Trees Officer comments that four mature, modestly sized Rowan trees, stand on land immediately to the south west of the application site. The proposed extension extends the footprint of the building 400mm closer to the northern most Rowan tree. The Tree Officer considers that ground works (for footings or drain laying) would be within the tree's root protection area and could be expected to result in some root loss and damage to the tree.
- 8.10 Although the proposed development is likely to have an adverse impact on the closest tree, the tree is not of a condition worthy of inclusion within a Tree Protection Order.
- 8.11 It is considered that the development would have an acceptable impact on the immediate and wider landscape given the existing condition of the Rowan tree nearest to the application site and as such the proposal complies with Policy E2 of the RLP in regards to Trees.

### **Impact on amenity of the host property and neighbouring properties.**

- 8.12 The siting of the proposed two storey extension on the east elevation of 37 Cusden Drive and by virtue of the size and design of the proposal it is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring or nearby property. No objections have been received in this regard. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would comply with policy LHW4 of the RLP which seeks to protect the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers.

### **Parking**

- 8.13 Annex G of the RLP states that three bedroom properties must demonstrate space for the off-road parking of two vehicles. It has been demonstrated that off road parking for two vehicles can be achieved within the curtilage of the property. Further to this, the Case Officer has visited the site to measure the proposed parking spaces which are found to be in accordance with Policy T2 of the RLP; each measures 2.4 metres (width) by 4.8 metres (depth).
- 8.14 The Highways Officer confirms that the proposed plans for 2 driveway parking spaces are of satisfactory size and layout for their safe and efficient access and egress.
- 8.15 As such the proposal complies with policy T2 of the RLP.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The proposal would integrate, respect and complement the character of the area and as such complies with Policy E1. It would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the immediate area in accordance with Policy E2 and provides for the privacy and amenity of its occupants and those of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy LHW4. The parking proposed meets the requirements of Policy T2. The proposal would therefore accord with the relevant policies of the RLP.

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:  
Drawing no.2 (Composite plan – proposed)  
Site Location Plan  
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.
3. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use except in complete accordance with the parking plan on the approved plan, Site Location Plan. The parking spaces hereby approved shall be provided before the development hereby is occupied and thereafter retained for as long as the development remains in existence.  
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.

**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.
-