HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/72794

DESCRIPTION	Single storey side extension
ADDRESS	27 Epsom Close Horton Heath Eastleigh SO50 7NZ

SITE VISIT DATE	29/07/13
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Single storey rear extension, on west elevation, front section with monopitch roof and stepped footprint, with rear section dual pitched roof extending to the rear of the property, approximately level with the rear of the existing conservatory.
TOPOGRAPHY	Generally flat site, with the front driveway area sloping very gently towards the adjoining property, no. 26.
TREES	None affected by this application
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open frontage and side and rear fencing.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Modern, detached, two storey dwelling in corner location, set back from the highway and accessed by means of a shared driveway to double garage in dual ownership. Small garden area to front of dwelling, with access to the rear of the property to the side of the house, between the house and garage. Rear garden extends from along the side of the house, then diagonally to the west and straight out from the rear elevation to form an irregularly shaped garden screened at the rear by mature trees.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Range of two storey detached, semi-detached and terrace dwellings of differing size, in a range of plot sizes and shapes developed around the same time in an organic layout which has resulted in some unusual relationships between properties. The development site shares a fairly narrow driveway with the two neighbouring properties, no. 26 and 28.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
26 Epsom Close	I refer to our telephone conversation earlier today regarding the above

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	planning application which is proposed to take place at the property next to my own; my property being 26 Epsom Close. As mentioned, Ruth Harding at Paris Smith suggested I contact you about this matter. As discussed, I do not object to the proposal itself. However, as I indicated, I do have some concerns based, unfortunately, on historic experience, given I have shared access to my property. My understanding is that I own the land in front of my garage, albeit that the access to that driveway from the road has common access for numbers 26, 27 and 28. I will send following this email a photograph of the driveway, my property and red car, being on the left and the proposed development property on the right. I have experienced some problems in the past, (but would point out not from the present occupiers of number 27), whereby contractors carrying out work not related to my property have parked their vehicles on my drive resulting in spillages and damage to the driveway and also on occasion to my front lawn, resulting in me having a small fence erected. There is also a potential issue, due to the natural camber of the drive, that any surface water/liquid tends to run off towards my property's external wall. Where this is caused by normal domestic use ie car cleaning etc I tend not to be so concerned. However, run-off of any building related products and related debris would be a different matter. With this in mind I would be grateful if any relevant conditions or guidance could be noted on the building consent, if approved, to ensure no encroachment of building materials, debris or vehicles onto my side of the driveway and related accessways.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
OAK	No objection.

POLICY CONTEXT

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

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

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

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area 58

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

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

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	x	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
Other …Disruption during the construction phase of development is not typically a material planning consideration. However, due to the constrained nature of the shared access, there is the potential for encroachment onto the property of number 26 Epsom Close. Whilst planning permission does not give the right to encroach onto land outside of the applicant's ownership, and a note to this effect can be included on the decision notice should permission be granted, a condition restricting hours of operation should limit the potential conflict with regards to access. A note to applicant can be included to identify this area of possible conflict and advise thought be given to how and where materials will be stored and contractors will manage parking, etc.					

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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 of development is therefore accepted, subject to the proposed works being appropriate in nature, scale and design, in compliance with the relevant local planning policies and guidance. 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.

Design and Street Scene: The different roof forms of the proposed extension is a little awkward, however the majority of the extension will not be visible from the public realm and that which is, will only be visible from a limited area. The extension occupies an area of limited practical use as amenity space due to its location between the house and garage and is a nature space to be developed. The extension is single storey, therefore has little impact on the character of the dwelling and materials can be conditioned to match the existing house.

Residential Amenity: There would not be an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking due to the location of the extension, the relationship between this property and the adjoining dwellings, and the design of the extension. Where there is the potential for conflict, as discussed above, is during the construction period and for this reason it is considered appropriate to impose a condition restricting hours of work. The small scale of the development should limit the extent of the possible conflict.

The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

The development complies with the requirements of 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 permission, subject to conditions and notes to applicant.