HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/76479

DESCRIPTION	Front porch, single storey rear extension, addition of pitched roof over garage/store room & part conversion into habitable accommodation
ADDRESS	3 Gatcombe Gardens West End Southampton SO18 3NA

SITE VISIT	Yes
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. The single storey extension measures 6.2m(w) by 4m(d) by 4m(h) and has a pitched roof which extends over the existing garage. The rear section of the garage will be converted into a playroom. The proposal also includes a front porch with a pitch roof that measures 2.6m(w) by 1.5m(d) by 3.4m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	The land slopes upwards from north to south, with the dwelling at no.2 on a lower level and no.4 on a higher level. The site is relatively flat with steps down to the garage that is located at the side of the house.
TREES	None affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	2m high close boarded fencing around rear garden. Open at front.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached house with single garage at side that projects 6m to the rear of the house.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Mixed residential area consisting of two storey detached and semi detached houses of varying designs.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/05/54222	Construction of single storey front extension (not constructed)	Permit (June 05)

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	Objection on grounds of: Proximity to neighbouring property;

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	Overdevelopment of site; Access for Maintenance

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), saved policies: 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014: DM1 (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising:

- Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, published February 2014; and
- Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014'

Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places & Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not Within Hedge End, West End and Botley Detailed Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

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	X	
The amount of development and impact on neighbouring residents will be discussed within the assessment section. Planning policy does not require a dwelling to provide access for maintenance.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	None received		See below		
Other …					

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.

The size and design of the single storey rear extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing house and ties in with all of the proposed work. The porch would be the only element visible from the public realm and this is a small addition that fits in with the character of the house and wider locality.

The single storey rear extension is 4m deep and has been pulled in 1.2m from its boundary with no4. As such the proposed extension will not materially affect the outlook from no.4. It is noted that the house at no.2 is on lower ground than the application site. However, the garage is already present on the site. While the proposal will slightly increase the garages bulk by changing its roof from flat to pitched, this is a relatively modest change that will not materially harm the outlook of no.4. The proposal passes the daylighting tests outlined in Quality Places SPD. The only side windows are high level roof lights, which will not overlook the neighbouring dwellings. Overall, the proposal is not considered to unacceptably harm the amenity of adjoining dwellings (by way of overlooking, loss of outlook or loss of light).

The site will retain a good sized garden and therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot. At the front of the property is a driveway able to accommodate two cars and there is space for a third car on the properties frontage if required. A plan has been provided demonstrating that three car parking spaces can be accommodated on site, meeting the council residential parking standards.

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

The development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014. 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

Recommend Permit