HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/71320

DESCRIPTION	Demolition of existing garage and construction of new garage
ADDRESS	11 Tuscan Walk Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 2AL

SITE VISIT DATE	17.10.12
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Demolition of existing garage (due to subsidance) and construction of a slightly larger garage measuring 6.9m(d) by 3.6m(w) by 3.8m(h) with a fully hipped roof and side door.
TOPOGRAPHY	The road slopes downward in a northerly direction and the site slopes up away from the road in a north westerly direction
TREES	TPO379/G7 – 1 Ash (felled) and 13 Oak along rear boundaries of properties in Tuscan Walk and Vespasian Way
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front boundary is relatively open with only a low level wall and landscaping.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached bungalow with a pitched roof containing a large front box dormer set back from the road by a landscaped front garden area. A driveway leads up the SW boundary to a detached hipped roofed garage and modest rear garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Tuscan Walk consists of similar detached bungalows with detached bungalows set at the back of the driveway within the rear gardens. The garages all have a similar appearance and are a visible feature of the street scene.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Chandlers Ford Parish Council	No objection

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Countryside & Trees	No formal consultation took place however the application was discussed with Tim Holman who raised no objection to the proposals.

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
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area - Scantabout Avenue & Peverells Wood

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a Special Policy Area

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	
None				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received	x	See below		
None				

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Planning Obligations are not applicable to the scale or form of development proposed.

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

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and emerging Policy DM1 of the Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan both require 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.

Principle: The application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable, as set out below.

Layout/Design: The size and design of the proposed garage is very similar to the existing garage. It is slightly longer allowing for some additional storage space however this is to the rear where it has no impact on the street. The garage, given its similar layout and design to the existing is considered to be appropriate, sympathetic to, and in keeping with the host property.

Residential Amenity: The proposed garage has a similar appearance to the existing garage & is set no further forward than the existing. It is therefore not considered to have any detrimental impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking over and above that of the existing garage.

Due to its increased depth the garage does take up additional garden space, within a garden that is already very modest in size, however this area is unusable and is therefore not considered to result in any detrimental loss of usable private amenity space.

Street Scene/Character Area: The proposed garage retains an almost identical appearance to and is sited in almost exactly the same footprint as the existing garage. It is therefore not considered to have a detrimental impact on the street scene or the wider character of the area.

Trees: Tim Holman was of the opinion that the felled Ash tree caused the subsidance to the existing garage and that the remaining Oak trees are a sufficient distance from the proposed garage. Although the new foundations may damage some roots any harm, and the type of foundations used will mean that there will not be any significant damage to the TPO Oak Trees.

Parking: The proposed garage exceeds the minimum size requirements for a garage, as outlined within the Residential Parking Standards SPD and there is sufficient parking on the driveway for at least 2 cars. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of the SPD.

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

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.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above this application is considered to comply with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE and emerging Policy DM1 and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.