HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/77866

DESCRIPTION	Two storey rear extension & rear conservatory
ADDRESS	32 Yardley Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 0HQ

SITE VISIT DATE	12/02/16
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	It is considered that sufficient information has been provided to allow for the assessment of the development proposed.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application proposes the erection of a two storey extension to the rear of the property and a conservatory to the rear of the site. A single storey garage, previously approved under application F/06/57914, has also been shown the submitted plans.
TOPOGRAPHY	Land slopes from northwest to south east
TREES	None that will be affected by the application
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Low wall to front of site, close boarded fencing to side boundaries adjoining neighbouring properties
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application site contains a chalet bungalow with dormer windows to the front and rear elevation. There is parking to the front of the property and a swimming pool and garden to the rear of the site.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The street consists of a mix of bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey properties.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/06/57914	First floor rear extension and dormer windows, addition of dormer windows to front extension and construction of attached double garage, front porch entrance and new pitched roof over existing side extension, following demolition of existing car port	Granted 06/10/2006 Part implemented
F/05/55758	Single and first floor front extensions and addition of front facing dormer windows. First floor rear extensions and addition of rear facing dormer windows (amended scheme)	Withdrawn 01/02/2006
F/05/54419	2 storey front extension, first floor rear and side extensions	Refused 05/09/2005
Z/16097/000/00	Erection of extension to kitchen	Granted 12/05/1975

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
32 Coniston Gardens	No objection

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Head of transportation and engineering	No objection – as a 4 bed dwelling, a minimum of 3 onsite parking spaces will be required, and these can be provided for on the existing driveway that is unaffected by the proposals. No engineering or drainage issues anticipated as a result of this scheme.

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, (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 policy 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

The site is not located within a Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out twelve core principles that underpin the planning system, one of which is that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings". It goes on to say in paragraph 56 that "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."

Paragraph 64 that "Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions."

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	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	x	
Other …					

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."

Principle

The site is located within the urban edge where the principle of development is considered to be acceptable subject to the design and impact of the proposal in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies and supplementary planning documents.

Saved 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, a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclists and neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, and noise and fumes. Also of relevance is Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

Also of relevance of the sites planning history. Permission was granted under application F/06/57914 for a first floor rear extension, dormer windows to the front and rear, an attached double garage, porch and pitch roof over existing side extension. The dormer windows to the front and rear of the property have been implemented and therefore the permission is currently extant.

Layout, design and impact on the character of the area

A single storey conservatory is proposed to the rear of the property. The conservatory is considered to be modest in depth and would infill between the existing single storey rear extensions. It is considered that the proposed conservatory is acceptable in size and scale.

Application F/06/57914 approved a first floor extension to the rear of the property. The current application proposes a similar design, however, the extension would be deeper and higher than

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

previously approved. The proposed two storey extension would extend to the rear of the existing rear extension by 3.8m. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed extension would be relatively deep, on balance, it is not considered to result in a disproportionate addition to the existing dwelling. The proposed extension would be set down from the roof of the existing dwelling and is considered to be acceptable in terms of form and design.

The proposed two storey and single storey extensions would be located to the rear of the property and would not be viewed within the street scene, however, due to the acceptable form and design of the proposed extensions, they are not considered to cause material harm to the wider character of the area.

The submitted plans show a garage to the front of the dwelling, the garage was permitted under application F/06/57914. The approved application showed the roof of the garage linking to the roof of the single storey extension at the side of the property. The submitted plans show a roof over the proposed garage, not linking to the single storey extension. The size, form and design of the garage is the same as previously approved and is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of form and design and would not impact on the street scene or wider character of the area. It is therefore considered for the avoidance of doubt, due to the changes to the roof of the garage, the garage has been included in the description of the proposed application.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The proposed conservatory would be located between two existing single storey extensions and would therefore not impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

The neighbouring property 34 Yardley Road has two dormer windows facing towards the application site. One of these dormers serves a bathroom and the other serves an upstairs room. This is the only window serving this room and the window is condition to be obscurely glazed with only a top opening section. It is acknowledged that the proposed two storey extension would extend in front of the neighbouring properties dormer window, however, it is considered that due to the separation between the proposed extension and the dormer window with the roof hipping away from the neighbouring property, the proposal would not cause material harm in terms of loss of light. The dormer window on the neighbouring property currently looks over the application sites garden, it is considered that as the window is condition to be obscurely glazed and is a side facing window the proposed extension is not considered to cause harm to the neighbouring property in terms of loss of outlook. No objection has been received from the neighbouring property no.34 Yardley. It is therefore considered on balance that the proposed two storey extension would not cause material harm to the amenities of the neighbouring property.

The proposal is considered to comply with policy 59.BE of the Local Plan.

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

The application is recommended for approval.