HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/74035

DESCRIPTION	Two storey front extension with integral garage & attached canopy porch & insertion of 1no. first floor window to side elevation
ADDRESS	Beacon Lodge Beacon Road West End Southampton SO30 3BR

SITE VISIT DATE	Various, as part of previous application and pre-app.
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Proposal is for a two storey front extension to provide two additional bedrooms at first floor level and an integral single garage at ground floor level. Application follows a previous approval for a two storey front and side extension. The current proposal effectively removes the side extension element, proposing just the front element.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level site
TREES	None to be affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Mix of wall/fencing panels at a height of approx. 1.8m with mature hedging also providing boundary screening.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Large, narrow rectangular property sat within a spacious plot. Large expanse of parking/garden to front with enclosed garden to side and rear. Previously extended. No defined architectural style or character.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area comprising a mix of properties types within a cul-de-sac. No uniformity to the street scene with a variety of styles, materials and both dwelling and plot size.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/25092/002/00	TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION	Permitted 1990 (built)
Z/25092/003/00	FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION	Permitted 1991 (built)
F/12/70507	Erection of detached garage at front with first floor gym/shower room	Permitted 2012m (not built)
F/13/72901	Two storey extension to side and front with integral garage & single storey porch	Permitted 2013 (not yet implemented but still extant)

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
One letter received objecting on grounds of scale and impact on residential amenities.	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	No response received

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) 25.NC, 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

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people" (para 56) and goes on to state that decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development (para 58).

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		

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Other … Comments noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		

Other …Comments noted. This amended proposal is actually significantly smaller in scale than the extension already approved.

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

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and emerging Policy DM1 of the Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough 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. 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.

History

This is an amended proposal following a previously approved scheme for a larger two storey extension that extended to the front *and* side. Prior to the approval, there was also a larger scheme (7m wide compared to the 3.5m width approved) that was withdrawn following officer advice. It was excessively large and would have resulted in material overlooking of neighbouring properties.

The current proposal removes the side extension completely and comprises just an extension to the front, which now occupies the same footprint as the front extension previously approved. Originally, this current application comprised a deeper extension (by 2m), with a ridge height significantly higher than that of the main dwelling. This raised several issues relating to the appearance of the resulting dwelling and its impact on the street scene. With an extant approval already in place, the case officer was also concerned that should both proposals be implemented, the resulting dwelling would be excessive in terms of its scale and very overbearing within the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

street scene. The applicant was not willing to enter into a UU to prevent the extant permission being implemented and instead reduced the scale of the extension to match that already approved.

The proposal also includes a porch canopy and the insertion of a new first floor window on the SE elevation.

Assessment

In terms of assessment, the extension has largely been assessed against current planning policies, as part of the previous application. The only change is the design and scale, with the extension now being smaller. This report will therefore focus on this issue as the impact on parking provision, overdevelopment & trees remains either unchanged or improved.

The design, scale and siting are all considered acceptable in the context of the original dwelling and will not lead to any detrimental impact on the street scene. The property itself has no features of architectural merit or particular characteristics. As per the previous application, the extension has been designed to blend with the existing, to give the appearance of it being part of the original, rather than an addition. This is considered to be an acceptable design solution in this instance. The extension is still relatively large but is significantly smaller than that already approved. With most of the bulk being set against the backdrop of the existing property and the materials & general style to match, any harm is difficult to demonstrate.

The amenities of neighbours are protected through the siting of the windows and the relationship between the dwelling and adjacent properties. There are no first floor windows on the front (north east) elevation. The new window on the side elevation, along with the side facing windows proposed as part of the extension, are a sufficient distance from adjacent properties to avoid any unacceptable overlooking. They are some 22m, at an oblique angle, from the nearest rear window, and garden area adjacent to the house, of the house to the SE, No60 Telegraph Road. This distance, particularly at this angle, is considered to be an acceptable relationship. This also accords with the Council's SPD. Due to the scale of the extension and its position against the existing dwelling, there will be no measurable impact on terms of overbearing impact or loss of light. Again, this is smaller than the extension already approved.

The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant planning policies and guidance.

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

Recommendation is to approve for the reasons stated above.

REF. NO. «AltRef»