HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/71624

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side extension with entrance canopy
ADDRESS	24 Norbury Close Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 1PZ

SITE VISIT DATE	16/07/12
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Y
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Y

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	
TOPOGRAPHY	Flat site
TREES	None affected by this application
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.5m high fence / wall to rear, 1.5m hedge to side adjacent turning head/footpath. Open to main roadway.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached two storey dwelling with steeply pitched roof. At end of Norbury Close, adjacent to turning head and public footpath, orientated so the front door faces towards the footpath (south). Property stands alone in design terms, in this section of Norbury Close, and is located in a prominent corner position in the street scene. The use of a different brick to the nearby properties also contributes this this dwelling being very visible in the street scene. Small rear garden with small area of POS to the rear. Dwelling extends behind the neighbouring property, no. 25, and is angled towards it.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential close of detached and semi-detached dwellings with a bungalow directly opposite the site, but a general sense of conformity in design and limited materials palette. The original house design appears to have been used in prominent corner locations through Norbury Close. These other examples retain their original character.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/12/70999	Side porch, two storey side extension and room in roof	Ref 17/08/2012

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
25 Norbury Close	We wish to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	1. The new position of the front door will be very close and directly overlook our front garden. This distance between our front door and the new front door will create a thoroughfare through our front garden. If this proposal is accepted by the council to move the front door we intend to erect a fence along our boundary line to stop our front garden being used as a public thoroughfare. 2. The extension will be very close to the house as the prospective planner's garage is on the boundary of our land and is at angle to our property which gets closer to our house in the rear garden. The garage extends beyond our house by 3- 4 ft therefore we would like a site visit so that the Case Office can view the site from our rear garden. 3. Finally a health and safety matter. Mrs Myers took early medical retirement from work and is physically disabled. Therefore our side passage which leads from the front to the back garden must be kept clear at all times to allow obstruction free access around the house. Therefore we are unable to give permission for any workmen/building materials access to our property.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
CFD	Delegated decision - No objection
ENG	Objection on grounds of insufficient parking. In line with the EBC Parking Standards, a 4-bed dwelling requires a minimum of three vehicle parking spaces, and only two are proposed in the application. In this location, this standard must be adhered to due to the narrow make-up of the access road with no footways, which if vehicles were to be parked off plot, they would affect access and amenity for neighbours, refuse collection and emergency vehicles. It is noted that occupiers of the dwelling already park on grassed areas, which is assumed to be due to lack parking at present. Looking at the block plan, it does appear that the proposed driveway is approximately 12.1 metres in length. To accommodate a triple length drive (not ideal but an option) would require a driveway 3 x 4.8m in length - 14.4m in length. If it were possible for the rear garden to be 'eaten in to' by approximately 2.3m to accommodate this, then the situation may be able to be overcome. Plans showing this, with a condition TH26 would be required. Revised Plans received now show the availability of three vehicle parking spaces, accessed by a proposed new drop kerb / vehicle crossover. These spaces will need to be constructed to standard (2.4 x 4.8m each) and the crossover constructed to HCC standards. This will need to be conditioned by TH26 and TH08. With the above in place, I would raise no objection to the proposals. (MG 05.12.2012)

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	Objection, the plans show parking spaces which currently are accessed by driving over the grass highway verge. For these parking spaces to be formalised , the existing foot access over the verge needs to be replaced with a proper vehicular verge crossing construction to HCC requirements. The application plans and description of works therefore needs to be amended to include the construction of an vehicular access crossing over the highway service margin as there is no authorised access at present .

POLICY CONTEXT

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

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

n/a

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

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

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other … Amended plans have been received demonstrating three parking spaces can be accommodated on site. A dropped kerb has also been indicated. Given the road is not classified, planning permission is not required for the kerb itself, however as it is necessary in order for the proposed parking to be made available, it is appropriate to impose a condition relating to its construction.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		

Other …A site visit has been undertaken to visit the residents at no. 25 Norbury Close where their concerns were discussed. A number of the issues raised fall outside of the planning system and will need to be address with the applicant directly. A note to applicant can be included to remind the applicant that planning permission does not convey the right to encroach onto land outside of their ownership. The impact on residential amenity for no. 25 is discussed below.

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.

Given the site falls within the built area and an established residential area, the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the design being appropriate for the character of the dwelling and locality and there being no significant detrimental impact on neighbouring uses.

The existing dwelling is simple in design and orientated so the main roof slope is seen from the south. The site is a corner plot and in a prominent location when viewed from the southern end of the close and the footpaths. The space between this property and no. 25 is restricted due to no. 24 being angled towards no.25, with the garage to no.24 being built on the boundary.

The design of the proposed extension has been amended from an earlier application to create a subservient structure, reducing the mass of the extension and specifically the roof area. This allows greater space to be retained between nos. 24 and 25 and reduces the impact on light to no.25. Due to the orientation of the properties, and the position of the extension, it is possible there will be a slight impact on light through this gap. However, it is considered this is not significant given the existing roof will obscure the sunlight to no.25 for the majority of the morning, with light coming through this space only in the early morning. By early afternoon the gardens should receive good sunlight as they are orientated west. The design is now more in keeping with the general character of the locality and the alterations and extensions that have been carried out

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

on other properties in the vicinity.

The porch element to the front of this extension is relatively insignificant and would not have a great impact on the street scene alone.

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 Policy 59.BE.

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.

CONCLUSION

Recommend permission.