HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/75543

DESCRIPTION	Single storey rear extension & partial conversion of garage into habitable room
ADDRESS	52 Watkin Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 2TD

SITE VISIT DATE	02/12/14
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Single storey pitched roof rear extension to form family room, 3.20m deep x 7.10m wide x 4.20m high with 3 no. roof lights. Also partial conversion of existing garage/workshop into habitable room.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level site
TREES	No trees affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.80m high close board fence all around rear garden. Open plan front garden with small tree.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	1980's detached house with attached garage to side
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area of detached houses, part of a large housing development.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/28343/009/00	RESERVED MATTERS: CONSTRUCTION OF 108 DWELLINGS and GARAGES WITH ROADS and SEWERS TO SERVE. Area 8B	ARM 15/09/1989
Z/28343/000/00	RESIDENTIAL, OPEN SPACE, ROADS AND FOOTPATHS WITH COMMUNITY CENTRE AND SCHOOL (AMENDED PROPOSALS)	GRANT OUTLINE PERMISSION 14/04/1987

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	No objection

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Engineers	**Transport Policy Officer:** Matt Grantham Holding objection. As a 4-bed dwelling, a minimum of 3 on-site parking spaces is required in accordance to the EBC Parking Standards. Whilst 3 are shown on plans, unfortunately one of this is to be in the reduced size garage. Due to garages also being utilised for storage, the minimum internal garage dimension acceptable for consideration as a parking space is 3.0 x 6.0m accordingly, and the proposed garage falls below this. There is however, adequate frontage space to widen the existing driveway to allow for the parking of 3 vehicles, and if this could be shown on revised plans and covered by Condition E04, then a re-assessment of the application can be undertaken accordingly. No DC's are required for this domestic extension. **DC Engineer:** Eric Reed As Matt comment, request plan with longer garage or alternate separate shed storage for cycles etc.
HSE PADHI	Do not advise against (DAA)

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

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (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 Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area 64

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

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

Engineers Objection				

There are 2 no. parking spaces on the drive at the front of the property, with room to create additional parking if required. The existing tandem garage will remain the same with the back part becoming a playroom. The front of the garage remains as it was built, therefore the situation for car parking will not be affected by the proposal. The rear garden is large enough to accommodate a shed if the owners need extra storage.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received				

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

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 rear extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality.

There would not be an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking. The bulk of the extension will be screened by the rear of the existing garage/workshop.

The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

Nature conservation
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.

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 permission