HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/71352

DESCRIPTION	Single storey rear extension, rear dormer windows & front roof lights (amended description)
ADDRESS	25 Lime Gardens West End Southampton SO30 3RG

SITE VISIT DATE	04/12/2012
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Proposed single storey rear extension will replace the existing conservatory and will measure 4.5m in depth, 4.5m in width, 2.5m to the eaves and 4.6m to the ridge. On the rear wall of the extension a chimney is proposed, approximately matching to extension ridge in height. Two dormers are proposed on the rear roof slope with roof lights to the front.
TOPOGRAPHY	Land levels vary with an overall slope down to the south. The site sits some 1m higher than the property immediately to the west, No26 and the land to the east of the site is higher still.
TREES	None to be affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Rear garden is enclosed with a 1.8m boundary wall where it adjoins the public highway with 1.8m fencing enclosing the remainder.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached modern dwelling with parking to front and enclosed garden to rear. Property occupies a plot on a T-junction with a residential area and is at right angles to the adjacent property, No24.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area comprising dwellings that not uniform but are clearly linked in design and materials. Many have been extended with single storey extensions/conservatories.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/29910/025/00	ERECTION OF 18 HOUSES	Permitted 1991 (No PD restrictions)

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Two letters received objecting on the following grounds: • Overlooking/loss of privacy	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	• Loss of property value • Visually intrusive design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	No objection

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 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

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, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other … Comments noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

The issues raised of the impact on property values is not a material consideration in determining the application. The issues raised regarding privacy and design are material and are 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 and DM1 of the Pre-Submission 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. They also require 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.

The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies for the following reasons:

- The rear dormers are positioned to sit below the ridge of the dwelling and are not deemed to be excessive in scale. They line up with the windows on the rear elevation and will not result in any adverse impact on the character of the area. In terms of residential amenity, the dormers windows are not considered to result in a material increase in overlooking above that already afforded from the existing first floor windows. There is a distance of around 14m between the dormer windows and the boundary shared with No24. This exceeds the 12m relationship generally considered to be acceptable between rear windows and gardens.
- The rear dormers, due to their scale and siting, also fall within current permitted development regulations and could therefore be built without the need for express planning consent. The same applies to the proposed roof lights.
- The extension replaces an existing conservatory, albeit on a slightly larger footprint. The land is set higher for the site when compared to the immediate neighbour to the west but the proposal still complies with the light tests set out in the SPD: Quality Places. The eaves are fairy low which will minimise any visual impact and the design is appropriate for the dwelling. At a depth of 4.5m, the extension is only 500mm larger than what could be built under permitted development.
- The chimney flue is not considered to be detrimental to the character or appearance of the area.
- No impact on parking standards required.

Amended plans were submitted on 11th December to show all the existing & proposed elevations on

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

a single drawing. The plans did not comprise any amendments to the scheme itself.

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

Recommendation is to permit for the reasons stated above.