REF. NO. F/12/71576

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Single storey side and rear extension, partial garage conversion, pitched roof over existing garage and porch canopy. 1 Doric Close, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 2PF.

SITE VISIT DATE – 30/10/2012

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above to provide an enlarged kitchen/dining/family space at the rear and a utility room, as well as a simple canopy to the front porch.
SITE AREA	Approx 510 sqm.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	Generally flat and level.
TREES	None on or surrounding the site will be affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Fairly open to the front with a low brick wall. Rear garden is marked by 1.8 – 2.0 metre timber fences.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Early 1970s two storey detached dwelling on a good size plot. Detached garage and store to the side with driveway in front. Garden to the front with good size garden to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area is residential in nature and made up of mainly detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings of a similar age and style to the application dwelling. There are also terrace and chalet style properties within the estate.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
13526	House and garage.	Approved 1972

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
36 Scantabout Avenue	No objection to the proposed extension but asks that the boundary wall shown on the drawings is amended to allow better access down the side of the dwellings for maintenance.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Transportation &	No objection provided three off-road parking spaces can be provided on

REF. NO. F/12/71576

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Engineering	site to meet the 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD.
Chandler's Ford Parish Council	No objection.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within Special Character Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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: Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Areas – Scantabout and Peverells Wood
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

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

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

An amended plan has been received showing the suggested revision to the side boundary between No.36 Scantabout Avenue and the application property. This should now overcome the concern raised. However, it should also be noted that the construction of the boundary wall proposed does not require planning approval and could be constructed under permitted development provided it is no more than two metres in height.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

n/a

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

REF. NO. F/12/71576

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 proposal essentially joins the existing detached garage to the side of the dwelling, together with a fairly shallow single storey rear extension. This will provide a large kitchen/dining/family room space, together with a new utility room and a garage, although this will be slightly undersized. The form, scale and design of this proposed side/rear extension follows the style of the current dwelling and remains subservient to it. This is also the case for the proposed porch canopy. Overall the resulting dwelling is considered to be acceptable and will accord with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the current local plan and 'Quality Places' SPD.

Residential Amenity – Due to the position, proximity and orientation of the application dwelling in relation to its immediate neighbours, the proposed single storey addition and porch canopy will have no adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring dwelling in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in this respect.

Parking – The Head of Transportation and Engineering has highlighted that the dwelling, having four bedrooms, is required by the Council's 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD to provide at least three off-road parking spaces. Presently the dwelling has room for two cars on the driveway and one in the garage. However, the proposed extension will result in a garage which is slightly shorter than standard, meaning that it cannot be considered as a parking space in terms of the SPD.

The frontage of the application site is more than sufficient to provide three off-road spaces in a satisfactory way if required. The Head of Transportation and Engineering has requested that a condition requiring these spaces to be provided is included as part of any planning approval. However, in this instance such a condition could be considered a little onerous, given that the resulting garage will be just large enough to park a small car and that should additional parking be required, this can be provided on the site frontage by the applicants under permitted development. If the proposal was likely to result in highway issues, then such a condition would be fully justified but in this instance it is felt to be a little onerous.

Street Scene & Area Character – In terms of the street scene the only noticeable difference

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

will be a pitched roof to the present garage and the small gap between the garage and house being filled in. As has been mentioned above, the resulting design is considered to be sympathetic and subservient to the main house and appropriate in terms of its design. It is also considered to meet the requirements of the 'Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Areas' SPD, which states for new development within Scantabout that "the style and design of any new building work, including extensions, is compatible with the character of good quality adjacent properties". That being the case, there the proposed extension and alterations are considered to be acceptable.

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.

CONCLUSIONS

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