HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/73843

DESCRIPTION	First floor side extension
ADDRESS	30 Gatcombe Netley Abbey Southampton SO31 5PX

SITE VISIT DATE	17/1/2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application is for the erection of a first floor side extension above an existing single storey element of the house located to the side. The first floor element will not project beyond the existing front elevation at first floor level and will be flush with the rear elevation. The new roof will tie into the main roof in terms of pitch, eaves and ridge height. The proposal will change the three bedroom dwelling into a four bedroom property.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site is level
TREES	No trees affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	None to front. 2m close boarded fence along side and rear boundary.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site comprises a semi detached two storey dwelling with parking within the front garden area and a small rear garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is located within a residential estate characterised by a mixture of detached, semi detached and terraced two storey dwellings. The estate has limited front boundary treatment and therefore an open plan character. As listed in the history section below both no. 31 and 63 Gatcombe, which are located adjacent and opposite the site respectively, have constructed two storey side extensions with the benefit of planning permission.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
31 Gatcombe Netley Abbey		
Z/35591/000/00	Two storey side extension	Permit 27/11/1998
F/13/73836	Rear conservatory	Under consideration
63 Gatcombe		
Z/33628/000/00	Construction of two storey side extension.	Permit 05/07/1995

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
HND	No objection
ENG	No objection subject to conditions

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Special Protection Area-recreational disturbance zone

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

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

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area 44: 1970's/1980's terraced/semi-detached/ detached development on loops/ multi-headed cul-de-sacs on the north eastern edge of Netley.

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, highway matters, trees, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
No comments				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
No comments					

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 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.

The size and design of the extension follows that of the host building in terms of eaves and ridge height, roof pitch, window detailing and front and rear building lines. As such the extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property. Looking at the distance between the house as extended and the property at no. 29, there will be a distance of approximately 3.3m when measured from front elevations. Although this spacing decreases towards the rear of the house noting the orientations of nos. 29 and 30, the distance to the front provides a sense space between the buildings. For these reasons and noting planning permissions for other similar side extensions within the immediate locality the proposed extension is considered acceptable in terms of its impact upon the character of the area.

There are no dwellings to the rear of the site and the extension being located to one of the property will not therefore affect the residential amenities of no. 31 Gatcombe. The rear building line of no. 29 Gatcombe, to the other side, is slightly set in from that of no. 31 and as such the first floor extension will project beyond the rear elevation of no. 29 by approximately 1.5m. Although no. 29 has no side elevation windows, an daylight assessment has been carried out in respect of its rear elevation windows closest to the side boundary of no. 31. The level of daylight received into no. 29 has been calculated using guidance contained with the SPD Quality Places 2011. This shows that the level of daylight received into habitable rooms at no. 29 will not be harmfully affected by the proposed first floor extension. The extension will only slightly project beyond the rear elevation of no. 29 and is not therefore considered to harmfully affect the outlook of occupants at no. 29 or cause unacceptable levels of overshadowing. The proposed extension will have no side windows. As such the proposed extension would not unacceptably impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking.

In terms of parking, the property as extended would change the three bedroom property into a four bedroom property. The property is served by a parking space located within the front garden

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

area and street parking is available. A small parking area is also located adjacent to no. 31 Gatcombe.

The proposals involve the provision of an additional bedroom, which brings the property up to a 4-bed dwelling. In line with the EBC Parking Standards, this quantum of development requires a minimum of 3 on-site vehicle parking spaces. This is required to ensure adequate parking is provided on site and to avoid on street parking which may cause highway danger. The frontage of the site allows for the addition of parking spaces to make a total of three and a condition is attached to ensure this additional parking is provided. The loss of the garden area to the front to accommodate this hard standing is considered acceptable noting the level of soft landscaping as a whole in the estate and permitted development rights which allow conversion of front garden areas to hardstanding without planning permission. The addition hardstanding and any widening of the vehicular access point may have implications for a street lighting column and an informative is added advising the applicant that contact should be made to HCC and SEB should the column need to be repositioned.

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 saved Policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft 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

The recommendation is to permit