HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/71467

DESCRIPTION	Two storey rear extension
ADDRESS	70 St Johns Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 4AG

SITE VISIT DATE	07/11/12
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Extension will project 1.5m out from the existing side elevation of the dwelling and extend back as far as the existing single storey extension on the rear. The extension will provide a large kitchen/family room, wc and entrance hall at ground floor level and an additional bedroom with ensuite and dressing area along with a family bathroom at first floor level. This will result in the property changing from a 3-bed to a 4-bed property.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level site which is approx 0.5m higher than the site immediately to the north east.
TREES	None
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.8m fencing/gates to the side of the property enclose the garden from the front with approx. 1.3m fencing extending down the boundary between the property and No68. The boundary then comprises a higher hedge garden which wraps around the rear boundary changing again into 1.8m fencing.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi-detached property forming a single pair of properties within this section of St Johns Road. Large gravel parking area to front with double gates to the side of the property allowing vehicle access into the rear garden. The property appears to have previously been extended at single storey and two storey level to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area comprising a real of mix of property styles and sizes. No uniformity at all to the street scene with variety itself being the main characteristic.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town 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
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area

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, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other … Comments noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	None received		See below		
Other …					

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

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and policy DM of the Pre-submission 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. They also require development to have 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.

The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant local plan policy for the following reasons:

Character & design - The size and design of the extension is considered to be acceptable in the context of the existing property and the character of the locality. Whilst it is quite large in terms of footprint, the property sits within a sizeable plot and has adequate spacing between itself and its neighbour, No68. The extension has been designed to minimise the visual impact both in terms of the street scene and the impact on the adjacent property, and will appear as subservient to the main dwelling. The drop in eaves height also helps to bridge the visual change in levels between the application property and No68. Whilst a flat roof is not ideal in design terms, it won't be seen from any vantage point and enables a more sympathetic relationship between the house and the extension.

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 existing relationship between adjacent properties and the size, siting and design of the extension. The side elevation could give rise to overlooking of No68 and a condition is therefore recommended to ensure the proposed windows are obscurely glazed with only high-level opening sections. To avoid the perception of being overlooked it is also recommended that a condition is imposed to restrict the insertion of further windows on this side elevation. Due to the drop in ground levels between No70 and No68, the side facing ground floor windows will be afforded views into the conservatory, living area and garden of No68. The boundary treatment could be raised a little which would overcome this issue. A condition to this effect is recommended.

With regard to overbearing impact and loss of light, No68 has once side facing window that could

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

be affected. This, however, is a secondary window, with light also coming through the rear elevation through the glazed conservatory. The conservatory itself will not be materially affected as the structure is primarily glazed with light able to come in through all elevations. Due to the distance between No68 and the extension, along with the existing development that is present for No70, the proposal is not considered to result in a material increase in visual impact.

Parking – The property has adequate space for parking to the front, with the 3 spaces required in accordance with the Council's adopted standards easily accommodated. No objection on grounds of highway impact.

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

Recommendation is to permit for the reasons stated above.