HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/79610

DESCRIPTION	Single storey rear extension
ADDRESS	6 Stag Drive Hedge End Southampton SO30 2QN

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

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Single storey rear extension with a mono-pitched roof measuring 3.9m(w) by 3.4m(d) by 3.4m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat
TREES	None affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	2m high close boarded fence around rear garden.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey mid terraced house with rear conservatory followed by rear garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is part of the 149 unit housing estate at land to the North of Botleigh Grange Hotel and contains a mixture of house types.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/37905/001	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR 149 UNITS, DENTAL SURGERY UNIT, LIVE-WORK UNITS, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, FOOTWAYS, CYCLEWAYS, CAR PARKING AND NEW ROADS WITH VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM LOCKE ROAD	Permit (20/06/2003)
F/04/50053	CONSTRUCTION OF CONSERVATORIES ON PLOTS 86, 87, 91, 92, 138, 157, 158 AND 159. *(the application site is plot 87 and the permission includes a conservatory for 4 stag close (plot 86) which has not been constructed)*	Permit (13/04/2004)

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	No objection

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Outside Built-up Area Boundary - Countryside Within an existing residential area Within HRA Screening Area

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies: 1.CO, 9.CO & 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 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	
Noted				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	None received		See below		
Other …					

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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

Since the adoption of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2001-2011) the site has been developed as part of the 149 unit housing estate at land North of Botleigh Grange Hotel. Therefore, while the site is shown within designated countryside it actually has the characteristics of an urban area and as such it is considered more appropriate to use Policy 59.BE, rather than the more restrictive 9.CO that is designed for residential development within the countryside.

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.

Assessment

The development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE, in that:

- The size and design of the rear extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing house and will fit in with the residential character of the housing estate. It is noted that some of the neighbouring houses already have rear extensions/ conservatories of comparable proportions.
- The extension is single storey structure of just 3.4m deep and the site has good boundary screening. As such the extension is not considered to be visually obtrusive and will not result in an increase in overlooking into the neighbouring dwellings.
- The house is mid terraced and the properties within the row are tightly packed, this means that the single storey rear extension will have an impact on the daylight received through the patio doors in the rear of the two adjoining dwellings. The extent of the proposal is just on the line of the daylighting test outlined in Quality Place SPD. However, the site already has a rear conservatory of very similar proportions and so the proposed single storey extension is not considered to have significantly more of an impact than the existing structure. The garden faces South West and so the neighbouring properties should continue to still receive a reasonable amount of sunlight.
- The site retains a useable sized garden and the proposal is not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.
- The proposed householder extension 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 even though it falls inside the designated zone of impact.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011-2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard 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