HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/71896

DESCRIPTION	First floor side extension
ADDRESS	22 Thornbury Wood Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 5DQ

SITE VISIT DATE	29/01/2013
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	First floor extension above existing breakfast room and utility, 8.2m deep, 3.4m wide with pitched roof to match the existing in form and height.
TOPOGRAPHY	Site slopes up relatively gently towards the dwelling, rear garden is flat. Properties on the opposite side of the road are set at a higher level.
TREES	Blanket TPO covers site. No trees are likely to be affected by the proposed works.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open frontage, with some planting along sides, 1.8m fencing to rear with mature and substantial tree screening.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey, detached 1960/70s property with double garage projecting forwards of the front elevation at 90 degrees. Driveway and parking area on frontage with front garden/landscaping forward of the garage. Small, enclosed rear garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Wide, attractive, open street with properties of generally similar sizes and design. Typically well-spaced, with a regular rhythm. Some properties have been constructed closer together, with a variation in the design. Parking is generally on-curtilage with open frontage that are landscaped and well-tended.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/28214/000/00	Single storey side extension	15/05/1985 Per
T/28214/001/00	FELLING OF 5 TREES	04/05/1988 PART CONSENT PART REFUSE TREES
Z/28215/000/00	Single storey side extension	15/05/1985 Per

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
20 Thornbury Wood	Comment and request from next door. The building works will be quite close to the boundary line and I would ask if the builders can erect a screen or similar to the scaffolding (and/or as needed elsewhere) to help negate any dirt and dust being blown into our back garden and front driveway so as to protect drying washing, parked car and various paved areas from dirt and/or grit contamination please. It would also be useful to have scaffolding screens for privacy.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
CFD	Delegated decision - No objection

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Garden Within Flood Zones 2 and 3 Blanket TPO

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

n/a

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, trees, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	x	

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Other …

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		

Other …Whilst the comment received from the neighbours adjoining this site is not a material consideration in planning terms, should permission be granted, the request can be passed to the agent for the applicant's attention.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle – The development site falls within the built urban edge and an established residential area. The principle is therefore acceptable, subject to the nature, scale, and design of the proposed works being in conformity with the local planning guidance and policy.

In this case, the relevant local plan policy is 59.BE which requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

Residential Amenity – The proposed extension is unlikely to have a significant impact on the nearby residents at no. 20 as the flank wall to their property does not have windows, the proposed extension does not project forward of the rear elevation and the orientation of the properties means overshadowing would not be an issue. There would be no impact on the neighbours to the northeast. The rear boundary is heavily screened by mature, protected trees and any development would not be visible to the property at the rear.

Character of the Property – The proposed extension has been designed to accord with the design of the existing dwelling, matching the materials, fenestration and ridge height to tie the extension in. Whilst it would create a wide building occupying the full width of the plot, this would not necessarily be inappropriate in another plot in the street (see below). The extension would not impinge on the small garden and so would not be considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Impact on Street Scene and Character of the Area – The extension is intended to sit above an existing side extension which is positioned behind the double garage. Whilst the design of the extension in relation to the dwelling itself could be appropriate, the impact on the spacing between the property and no. 20, which has an impact on the street scene, is not acceptable.

From the public realm, Thornbury Wood has an attractive and open suburban character. This is contributed to by the wide road and footways, the open frontages which are well landscaped and maintained and the considerable set back from the road. The properties tend to reflect a similar design premise which results in a sense of cohension along the street, with some variation in property type to provide interest. Whilst there is some variation in the spacing between the different property types, this spacing is constant within those types and reinforces the feeling of openness, balance and rhythm, supported by a back drop of mature trees.

By building above the side extension between nos. 22 and 20, the space between these two properties is reduced from approx. 6m to 1.5m. This loss of space would be detrimental to the attractive character identified above. Whilst there are other examples of the reduced spacing between properties, this applies to the different property types and further serves to positively reinforce the spacing where it is seen.

As such, the proposed extension is considered to be contrary to local plan policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSION

Recommend refuse in relation to loss of space around the property having a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the locality and the visual amenity of the street scene.