HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/76488

DESCRIPTION	Single storey side & rear extension, following removal of existing conservatory & utility room
ADDRESS	92 Chapel Road West End Southampton SO30 3GN

SITE VISIT DATE	09/06/15
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Single storey side & rear extension, following removal of existing conservatory & utility room Proposed extension will wrap around the existing bungalow extending out 4.0m to side and 3.0m to rear with a pitched roof.
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat. The neighbouring bungalow to the rear (no. 94) is in an elevated position.
TREES	No trees affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Relatively open site with low brick walls to side and front. Rear garden area surrounded by close board fencing 1.80m high. Also 1.80m high fence between no's 92 & 94.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached bungalow set within a large corner plot. Previously extended to side with a lean-to conservatory. Existing detached garage and vehicular access to the rear of the site.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area, predominantly bungalows.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
WIR5130	The erection of 11 bungalows and 2 garages	PERMIT – 02/08/1957
Z/15948/0	Conservatory	Permit 04/04/1975
F/09/65260	Raising of roof to provide first floor accommodation with side facing dormer window, single storey side & rear extensions and provision of new hard standing, following demolition of existing conservatory & garage	Withdrawn 31/07/09
F/09/65611	Single storey side & rear extension, re-positioning of side fence, provision of access ramp to front door and provision of new hard standing, following demolition of existing conservatory (amended scheme)	Permit 21/09/09
F/15/75892	Single storey side & rear extension, following removal of conservatory & utility room & construction of detached	Withdrawn 24/03/15

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	single garage, following demolition of existing garage	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
none	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	No objection
Head of Transportation and Engineering	No objection. A condition should be applied however to ensure that no future works to enclose the garden are undertaken, which could onwards affect highway visibility. A variant of E10 should cover it. No objection to extension in position proposed. Before approving application, please see me about marking on plan as with previous proposals for this property the areas to be left open and not enclosed by fences to maintain sight lines and forward vision across bend in Chapel Road .

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: DM1

- 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 11

• Maintain the predominant open/hedge plot boundaries.
• Maintain a uniformity in building heights within each street.
• Ensure that the materials applied in new development are similar or complementary to those prominent in existing development.

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

With regards to the comments of the Council's Head of Transportation and Engineering in respect of the matter of restricting the enclosing of the property's garden such as to not impede sight lines or highway visibility. Whilst these are noted and it is acknowledged that there is a need to limit the height of any means of enclosure on or in the proximity of the highway boundary for these reasons, such a condition was imposed upon the original planning consent for the construction of the dwelling (WIR5130) and this continues to have effect. It is not therefore considered that it is necessary or reasonable to impose a condition in the instance of the current application, particularly given that there is no indication that any such boundary treatments or means of enclosure are proposed as part of the development for which permission is sought. A note will however be added to the decision notice to bring the matter of the restrictions imposed by the condition on the original planning consent to the attention of the applicant.

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 previous application to this, F/15/75892, also included a detached pitched roof garage, located closer to the road. This application proposes the same extension to the bungalow but omits the proposed garage.

The size and design of the proposed wrap around side/rear extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality. The extension will maintain the single storey design and nature of the building and is considered to be subservient to the main building being set back and with a lower roof ridge line. The bungalow is situated on a corner plot, as such the design will fit well into the existing street scene. The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot. There remains adequate parking on site. The layout of the development would maintain the existing building lines of neighbouring development.

There would not be an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking. The existing bungalow would extend 3.0m further towards the rear boundary, however the site is considered to retain an adequate garden area with good screening. The property to the rear (94 Chapel Road) is in a slightly elevated position to the application site.

Currently the bungalow is rented and the tenant is aware of the planning application.

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 as it falls outside/inside 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 permission