HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/72795

DESCRIPTION	One and two storey side extension
ADDRESS	9 Burnetts Fields Horton Heath Eastleigh SO50 7DH

SITE VISIT DATE	29/07/13
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Two storey side extension projecting forward of the existing side extension by 1.8m. First floor side/rear extension extending the length and width of the existing ground floor extension. The ridge of this extension in set well below the main ridge of the dwelling, approximately 1.5m above ground level and the roof is half hipped front and rear. A small dormer window is added in the existing rear roof slope and the front door is replaced with a new window and relocated to the front elevation of the proposed extension. The extension is set m from the flank wall of number 10 which sits on the boundary.
TOPOGRAPHY	Dwelling is sat down in the plot, at a slightly lower level to number 10 to the east. The garden steps up to the rear.
TREES	None affected by this application.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Hedging along front boundary, low level wire fence to the east. 1.8m fencing panels on concrete plinth along side/rear boundaries.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	End of terrace, two storey, former Council, inter-war dwelling with large front garden and side driveway and long rear garden. Existing single storey side extension.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Mix of dwelling style, generally set back well from the highway with good sized plots. Mix of semi-detached and terrace properties of differing design with a range of alterations and additions.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
10 Burnetts Fields	After having received your letter dated 2 July I am writing to you to express my concerns and opposition over the 2 storey side extension

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	proposed by number 9 Burnetts Field, application number F/13/72795. I live at no.10 Burnetts Field on the ground floor that neighbours no. 9 Burnetts Field. On the side of my property at the front, is a side window at an elevation of almost 1.6 metres to the bottom of the window itself. This window was only really designed to allow light in rather than to view out of. With a 2 storey side extension, the sunlight or any light, would be 'severely' reduced entering into the side of my flat. I would say that during winter daytime in this particular room, the light can be an issue, with me having to turn a light switch on while reading. This is likely to mean an increase of my electricity bill. I have other concerns too. My poor garden would receive much less sunlight on that side where the build would go ahead, more difficult for me to sunbath, but while these might not seem to be of importance, sunlight and neutrino flux are extremely important for health and the immune system in moderation. My last concern is the onset of months of building work right by the side where I sleep. As I have just started a contract of work during nights, it means that I go to sleep by around 5am. So any inevitable building work that commences will certainly ruin any sleep I will need. Lastly, while I have found this situation worrisome, I do hope this letter is not late at being received. I've been away for 10 days and returned a couple of days ago to find your letter.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
OAK	No objection.

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) 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

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area 28

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

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	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below		
Other …The proposed extension has been reviewed using the guidance contained within the Council's Quality Places SPD and is assessed 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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle: The development site falls within the built urban edge in an established residential area, therefore the principle of development is accepted, subject to the proposed works being appropriate in nature, scale and design, in compliance with the relevant local plan policies and guidance. The relevant local plan policy in this case is 59.BE which 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.

Also relevant is the guidance contained within the Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area Appraisals SPD, which states:

- 'Maintain the predominant deep building setbacks in order to retain/ reinforce the existing levels of on-plot planting.
- Maintain the predominant open/ hedge plot boundaries.
- Ensure that the form of new development relates effectively with the gable end frontages prominent in existing development to the north of Burnetts Fields.'

Design and Character: The extension has been designed to both minimise its impact on the neighbouring property, number 10, and its impact on the street scene. The extension is set well back from the front of the dwelling, with the ridge 1.5m below the ridge of the house. The roof is hipped and pitched at the same angle as the main roof to both complement the existing property and minimise the visual impact. The extension is subservient to the main body of the building and does not disturb the gable end frontage. The replacement of the front door with a window can be carried out under permitted development and does not require formal planning permission.

Residential Amenity: The resident at number 10 Burnetts Fields has raised concerns regarding the impact on light to an unidentified room in the ground floor flat he occupies and the rear garden. Due to the orientation of the buildings and the reduced height of the extension, there would not be an increase in overshadowing on the rear garden or side of the property. In assessing the impact on daylight, the existing relationship between the two properties must also be considered. Using the 45 degree rule and vertical sky component test set out in the Quality Places SPD, the available daylight to the window mentioned is already compromised. The addition of the extension does not significantly impact the degree of daylight available to this window and therefore does not warrant a reason or refusal. The extension is set back from the front of the dwelling and the window at no. 10, therefore there is no impact on outlook, nor is there an issue with overlooking due to the design of the extension and the position of windows.

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

Whilst disturbance during the construction period is not a material planning consideration, due to the proximity of the extension and the concerns raised by the resident at no. 10, it is considered appropriate to impose a condition regarding hours of work.

On balance, the development is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. 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, subject to standard conditions.