HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/74442

DESCRIPTION	Erection of single storey side & rear extension & erection of two storey & first flo
ADDRESS	rear extension 8 Pound Road Bursledon Southampton SO31 8FE

SITE VISIT DATE	1/5/2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application has four elements as follows: A single storey front extension to form a porch. Single storey side extension A first floor rear extension Two storey rear extension (adjacent to the first floor rea extension) The rear extension (both single and two storey) have two ful hipped roofs with central valley. Eaves match existing. Ridg 20cm below ridge of main roof. Single storey side extension – lean to hipped roof with eaves 2.6m and ridge of 3.9m. Single storey front extension eaves to match existing. Ridg 3.9m
TOPOGRAPHY	The site is level at point where extension proposed. Applicatio site rises from road level very gradually to point where house located. No. 10 on marginally higher ground level tha application site.
TREES	None
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	2m high fence on rear boundary. Front boundary 1.2m hedg 1.2m cbf on side boundary at front to no. 6. 2m cbf and 4 dense hedge to side boundary of no. 10a at front.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site comprises a semi detached property which is locate to the rear of the application site. To the front of the house the property's amenity area which is fenced off (1.2m) fro hard standing area that sits between this garden area and th road and provides a large parking area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is located in a residential area characterised principal by two storey semi detached dwellings although there are a fe detached houses in the immediate locality.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
6 Pound Road		
F/10/67888	Two storey side extension	Permit 04/11/2010
Rose Cottage Portsmouth Road		
Z/25906/00A/00	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extensio	Permit 06/05/1983
F/04/50695	Construction of pitched roof over existing single storey sid and rear extension and construction of detached garage	Permit 21/05/2004

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
HND	No objection.
ENG	No objection. Request that hedge on front boundary cut back to increase footway width and lowered to improve visibility.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Special Protection Area-recreational disturbance zone

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) saved 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

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area 29. Strength of character : Moderate. Guidance –
Maintain the predominant plot widths.
Ensure that new development relates effectively with the building features and materials prominent in existing development.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

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

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
No comment				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
No comment					

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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Saved policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and policy DM1 of the revised draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 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.

Impact upon character of the area.

In terms of the impact of the proposed extensions to the dwelling upon the character of the area, only the single storey front and side extension will be clearly visible as viewed from the road. These extensions are subservient to the main house and relate well to its design and form and are therefore considered acceptable in the street scene.

The two storey rear extension will also be visible noting the gap between the application building and no. 10 however at the distance from the road (29m) and noting that it will remain sympathetic in its form and design to the host building, the impact of the two storey extension will not be harmful in terms of its impact upon the street scene.

Impact upon residential amenities

The proposed two storey extension will be located between 2m to 3m from the side boundary of no.10 Pound Road and at a point where it would be adjacent to the rear garden of no. 10. The extension will tie in and be flush with the side elevation of the main house. Whilst there is an encroachment to this side boundary of no. 10 it is considered that the impact upon the residential amenities of no. 10 will not be unacceptably affected noting the distance involved and the existing relationship to the property. There would no harmful loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking or harm to the outlook of occupants at no. 10 and in this respect the application is considered acceptable.

In terms of no. 6 Pound Road, which is the other half of the semi detached property, the proposed first floor rear extension would be visible from their rear garden and from their first floor rear windows. In respect of their garden no. 6 have single storey conservatory in the rear garden immediately adjacent to the side boundary of no. 8 pound road. As viewed from usable garden area the extension would be approx. 3.5m distance which, it is considered, would be a sufficient distance to ensure that the extension would not appear overly dominant or harmful as viewed from that property's garden. In terms of the first floor bedroom window, closest to the proposed first floor extension, a 45 degree line is drawn from the approximated position of the window at no. 6 across the proposed extension. The line cuts the rear most third of the proposed extension and would be clearly visible from the neighbouring property. During the site visit the neighbour made clear that he had no objections to the application including this aspect of the application. No letter has been submitted by the occupants of no. 6 Pound Road. It is considered however that the extension would result in an unacceptable impact upon the outlook of no. 6, representing poor design harmful to neighbouring residential amenity. In this respect the application would set a harmful precedent which would be unlikely to be equally appreciated by neighbours in similar context. The application is considered to be unacceptable in this respect.

Finally the proposed first floor rear extension will be located between 80cm to 1m approximately from the rear boundary where currently the first floor is located approximately 4.3m from the rear boundary. Furthermore the existing first floor rear windows comprise two obscure glazed windows to a hall and bathroom and one clear window to a bedroom. The proposed extension will create two large bedroom windows. These windows will look directly onto the rear garden of Mignonette

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Cottage. The rear garden at Mignonette Cottage has been subdivided by what appears to be metal grill fencing. In addition a large tree sits within the rear garden of that property that goes someway in alleviating the degree to which the first floor of the proposed extension will overlook the garden of that property. The portion of this garden closest to the application site partially accommodates a large kennel structure. Nevertheless the proposed first floor windows will directly overlook this part of the garden and will again create a harmful precedent which represents poor design harmful to the residential amenities of occupants of Mignonette Cottage. This part of the application is therefore also considered to be unacceptable in this respect. It is noted that making the rear windows obscure glazed would not fully address the issue and a perception of overlooking would remain which is a material consideration and would equally harmful affect the residential amenities of neighbouring occupants. Amendments are not therefore invited in this respect.

Nature conservation

The proposal is not considered to result in a likely significant impact on a European Protected sit (SPA,SAC or Ramsar). HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening was not required for th development as it falls outside the designated zone of impact.

The development does not comply with the requirements of saved policy 59.BE of the Local Plan policy DM1 of the revised draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not y adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. Wi regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are n considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSION

The recommendation is to refuse.