HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/72255

DESCRIPTION	Rear conservatory
ADDRESS	Woodlands Beacon Road West End Southampton SO30 3BQ

SITE VISIT DATE	03/04/2013
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks approval for the erection of a rear conservatory measuring 4.5m in width, 4.5m in depth and 3.7m in height. The conservatory will be accessed from the property's kitchen / breakfast room and will be situated in close proximity to the shared boundary with the neighbouring dwelling to the south-east, Sleepy Hollow.
TOPOGRAPHY	The property's rear garden slopes relatively gently north-eastwards down to the rear boundary of the site.
TREES	There is one tree in the vicinity of the proposed conservatory which has already been substantively removed.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The boundary treatment surrounding the property's rear garden is as follows: Rear (North-Eastern) – 1.8m high close-boarded fencing; South-Eastern Side – 0.3m high brick wall with 1.8m high close-boarded fencing above; North-Western Side – Substantial hedging, which due to the difference in ground levels with the neighbouring property (The Firs), is at its highest point approximately 3m above the level of the rear garden of Woodlands.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application dwelling is a detached chalet-bungalow set in the centre of a relatively sizeable plot.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is situated within an established residential area, with this part of Beacon Road being characterised by a mixture of one and two storey detached dwellinghouses of varying periods and designs. The property falls within the Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area HEWEB 7.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/39259/000/00	Addition of pitched roofs to front dormer and existing side extension	PERMIT – 15/11/2002
F/10/68085	Addition of front facing dormer	PERMIT – 30/11/2010

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	(03/04/2013): 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) – Saved Policy 59.BE
Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 – Policy DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area – *HEWEB 7*

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

N/A

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework:

Of particular relevance to this application is *Section 7: Requiring good design* which stipulates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning; that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment; and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

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		
Other – The comments of West End Parish Council are noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received	X	See below		

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Other …

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Planning obligations are not applicable to this application.

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."

Development Plan Policies:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011):

Saved 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.

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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.

Appearance, Layout and Impact on the Streetscene and Character of the Area:

In terms of appearance and layout, the proposals are considered to be acceptable. Whilst at 4.5m, the conservatory will be fairly sizeable in terms of its depth, it is not considered that this is overly excessive or out of proportion with the host property. The site will also retain a good sized garden and therefore the proposals will not result in the overdevelopment of the plot. As the conservatory will be situated to the rear of the dwellinghouse, it will not have any impact on the Beacon Road streetscene and is otherwise considered to be in-keeping with the character of the area.

Impact on Residential Amenity:

In terms of the impact of the proposals on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, the main consideration is in respect of the property immediately to the south-east, Sleepy Hollow, due to the depth of the conservatory and its proximity to the shared side boundary. Whilst it is not considered that the conservatory will result in any loss of outlook for the occupiers of this dwelling and the only windows in the facing side elevation are high-level (1.7m above floor level) such that there is little or no potential for overlooking, particular consideration has been given to the matter of whether the conservatory will cause an unacceptable loss of light to, or have an overbearing impact upon, the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

occupiers of this property. Having visited the site, it is apparent that any impact would be relatively minimal and would certainly not be sufficiently detrimental to justify the refusal of the application on such grounds. The conservatory is not excessive in height and has a fully hipped roof, minimizing any potential for the development to be either visually dominant or overbearing. In terms of loss of light, whilst the neighbouring dwelling is sited in fairly close proximity to the application property, the only window that would potentially be affected by the proposal is that in the rear of the attached garage, and thus no primary habitable rooms are considered to be overtly affected. Accordingly, the proposals are considered to comply with the requirements of Saved Policy 59.BE in respect of their impact upon neighbouring amenity.

Overall, the development is considered to comply with the aforementioned development plan policies and associated supplementary planning documents and guidance.

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 relevant policy is DM1 (General criteria for new development) which essentially echoes the requirements of the Saved Policy 59.BE of the current Plan and is not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSION

The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.