REF. NO. F/13/72020

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Single storey side and rear extension. 408 Fair Oak Road, Fair Oak, Eastleigh, SO50 7AD.

SITE VISIT DATE – 11/03/2013

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal is to provide a new bedroom, bathroom and additional living space in a flat roof single storey side addition, which will be used as annex accommodation for the applicant's father.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	Generally flat and level.
TREES	There are no trees on or near the site which would be affected by the proposed works.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The boundary adjacent to the proposed extension is marked by a 2.0 metre high brick wall, which will be replaced by the side wall of the proposed extension.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The main property is a late Victorian two storey detached dwelling on a large plot. The dwelling has been previously extended at ground floor level to the front and rear. To the front is a parking area with a driveway down the side of the dwelling leading to a large outbuilding which was originally used as a barn and stables for the house when it was part of the local land owner's estate in the late 19th Century. Between this and the house is the rear private garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and made up of mainly 1920s-50s single and two storey detached dwellings along Fair Oak Road and later 1960s/70s detached, semi-detached and terraced two storey dwellings to the rear of the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/11762/006/00	First floor rear extension.	Approved Feb 2003
Z/11762/005/00	Single storey front and rear extensions .	Approved Oct 2002

REF. NO. F/13/72020

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received.	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Head of Transportation & Engineering	No objection. Sufficient off-road parking can be provided but would request that a condition is applied to ensure that the annex is not used as an independent dwelling unit.
Head of Environmental Health	No objection but note that the site is near to a former landfill site and may be subject to ground contamination. A condition requiring a detailed ground investigation to be completed and submitted to the LPA prior to commencement is requested, as are conditions controlling working hours and burning.
Fair Oak Parish Council	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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011): 59.BE
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029: DM1
Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Character Area Appraisals – Bishopstoke, Fair Oak & Horton Heath (BIFOHH 21)
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

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 the principle of that proposed, its layout and design, impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, as well as upon the street scene and character of the surrounding area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

The comments from the Head of Transportation and Engineering are noted and a condition ensuring that the annex remains incidental to the main dwellinghouse is recommended.

With regards to the condition requesting a land contamination survey to be undertaken, while it is noted that the site is in close proximity to a former landfill site, to insist upon such a detailed and expensive survey to be undertaken is considered disproportionate to the small scale of the development proposed. However, a note advising the applicant of the need to deal with this issue when considering the construction of the extension is included on the decision notice.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

n/a

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

n/a

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."

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant Development Plan policies.

In this case policy issues for consideration include:

Principle – The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable, with any formal planning approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of that proposed being considered appropriate and in accordance with the relevant local plan policies and supplementary guidance. The most relevant policy in this case is saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan 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. Also of relevance of Policy DM1 of the Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

Layout & Design – The proposed extension is a simple flat roof structure to be built down the western side of the existing dwelling. Towards the front will be a modest bedroom with separate bathroom and to the rear will be a living area with glazed lantern above. The extension is intended as an annex for the applicant's father and will be directly connected to the main house via a doorway into the kitchen, allowing the other facilities of the house to be shared. It has also bee designed in such a way that will allow the additional accommodation to be incorporated into the main house should the space no longer be required as an annex.

In terms of its design, the proposal is a simple low key design. While not necessarily very sympathetic to the existing attractive Victorian dwelling and its architectural details, the proposed extension is nonetheless considered to be acceptable. The applicant has discussed a revised roof design to try and make it more in keeping with the dwelling but after consideration it has been decided that this would only make the extension more obvious and have more impact upon neighbouring properties.

Overall therefore in terms of its form, scale and design the proposed extension is considered to be acceptable and to meet the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the current local plan and the Council's relevant supplementary planning documents.

Residential Amenity – Due to the position of the proposed extension and its low key flat roof single storey design, there will be no adverse impact on any neighbouring property in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook. While it will be visible at the end of the neighbouring Allington

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Lane properties, the view is obscured by the garage of No.1 and other garden buildings of No.3.

Street Scene & Area Character – With regards to the street scene, again the proposed extension will not really be very visible due to its set back position and its single storey flat roof design. In terms of the general character of the area, again there are no concerns although a condition ensuring that the annex accommodation is only used as incidental accommodation to the main dwelling is recommended as the site is not considered suitable for subdivision.

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.

CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons given above, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.