REF. NO. F/11/69223

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Single storey rear extension. 92 Bournemouth Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 3DL.

SITE VISIT DATE – 22/07/2011

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above to provide a large kitchen to allow a kitchen/dining space.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	The area immediately adjacent to the house is relatively flat and level with the rest of the rear garden sloping down away from the house.
TREES	There are no trees on or adjacent to the site which would be affected by the proposal.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Both side boundaries are marked by 1.2 metre high timber fences.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The property is a small two storey Victorian terrace house with off-road parking to the front and a long narrow garden to the rear. To the rear of the house is a small single storey projection which forms the kitchen and was part of the original house. It is this that is to be widened to make the kitchen bigger.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The immediate surrounding area is generally residential in nature but is close to industrial and commercial premises behind and opposite the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	No record of any previous planning history.	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Owner of No.90 Bournemouth Road	Objection. Loss of light and outlook to No.90.

REF. NO. F/11/69223

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Chandler's Ford Parish Council	No objection.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) : 59.BE
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPS 1 - Delivering Sustainable Development

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the principle of that proposed, its layout and design, impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, as well as its impact upon the character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

See below.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal is considered to conflict with relevant Development Plan policies.

In this case policy issues for consideration include:

Principle – The application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the basic principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of that proposed being considered acceptable and accordance with the relevant policies within the adopted local plan and supplementary

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

planning guidance. In this instance the most relevant policy is saved Policy 59.BE (i) & (vii) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) which states that proposals should take full and proper account of the context of the site and be appropriate in terms of design and siting both in themselves and in relation to neighbouring properties and avoid unduly disturbing neighbouring uses, especially in terms of loss of privacy, light and outlook.

Layout & Design – The proposed extension is relatively modest in scale, extending no further into the garden than the existing original single storey projection but increasing in width to take up the full width of the plot. This would result in a 4.0 metre deep single storey extension which would double the size of the current kitchen and allow for a kitchen/dining space overlooking the rear garden.

In terms of its general form, scale and design there are no concerns, the resulting extension being similar to a number of others to the rear of neighbouring terraced properties and having no real impact on the size or usability of the rear garden. However, while this is the case it does raise concerns with regards to its resulting impact upon the amenity of No.90 Bournemouth Road.

Residential Amenity – The main concern in this instance is the impact of the proposed extension upon the outlook from the rear of No.90, the immediate neighbouring property to the north of the application dwelling. This is also a mid terrace dwelling with a similar single storey original projection to the rear, although it is handed in floor plan. Presently the outlook from the main rear room of No.90 is reasonably open to the left (towards the boundary with No.92) but constrained to the right by the rear projection. The concern is that the proposed extension to the rear of No.92, together with the existing projection to the rear of No.90 would result in the outlook being restricted to a narrow tunnel 4.0 metres in length. Given that this is the main outlook from the rear of the property, it is felt that this resulting situation would not be acceptable and would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of No.90 Bournemouth Road.

There were also originally concerns with regards to loss of light, resulting from the roof design of the proposed extension, as well as its depth, however, this concern was addressed via an amended roof design which now meets the required lighting tests.

While the applicants could build a very similar extension, albeit only 3.0 metres deep under permitted development, the additional metre depth in this instance is felt to result in an unacceptable impact upon the outlook of No.90, contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the local plan.

Area Character – In terms of the general character of the area, the proposed extension raises no issues and is a fairly standard extension to this type of house. It is just unfortunate in this instance that the circumstances of the case mean that the proposal would result in an adverse impact to neighbouring occupiers, contrary to the local plan.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

For the reason given above, the application is recommended for refusal.