HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/74477

ADDRESS	12 Ridgeway Close, Chandler's Ford, SO53 2LR
DESCRIPTION	First floor and two storey side extension and single storey rear extension

SITE VISIT DATE	4/6/2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes, certificate b has been served onto number 13

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS	
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	• The application is proposing the construction of a first floor and two storey side extension and single storey rear extension • The first floor extension and two storey side extension would be built on top of the garage and would extend 2.8 metres in width. It would project 8.3 metres in depth and would be 7.4 metres in height • The single storey rear extension would project 2.9 metres in depth, extend 8.3 metres in width and 2.6 metres in height to the mono pitched roof
TOPOGRAPHY	• Slight incline on approaching the dwelling
TREES	• There are no trees on site that would be affected by this proposal
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	• The boundary treatment consists of a fences which are approximately 1 and 1.8 metres in height
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	• The site contains a two storey semi- detached dwelling • At the front elevation there is hardstanding sufficient for two vehicles • There is a garage at the front elevation • The rear garden is small with predominately soft landscaped
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	• Ridgeway Close consists of identical property link semis which have not been subject to extensions

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
NA		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	
SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Highways transport policy	Objection to the proposal. 3 on site parking spaces required in accordance with EBC parking standards for a proposed 4 bed dwelling
Highways	As above

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
Saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) Policy DM1 of the Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

NA

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

Of particular relevance to this application is *Section 7: Requiring good design* which stipulates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning; that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment; and 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

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

These will be addressed in the report

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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."

Development Plan Policies

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, 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.

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable, with any formal planning approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of that proposed being considered appropriate and in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies and supplementary planning documents and guidance.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

The proposed single storey rear extension on balance is considered acceptable. Whilst the width is large owing to its relationship with the proposed first floor two storey side extensions, it is also acknowledged that the single storey rear extension could be

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

constructed without requiring consent from the local planning authority; this is therefore a material planning consideration.
From a recent site visit it was observed that the neighbouring properties appear to be un-extended with such proposals as first floor and two storey side extensions. It has been noted from a site history check that 3 and 11 Ridgeway Close have had refusals for such proposals as the bulk and proximity to the boundary, represented an unsympathetic extension to the existing properties and would be of visual detriment.

There is a prevailing character which is noticeable within the streetscene where the dwellings retain the link semi-detached feature. The existing flat roof garages allow for views across beyond the host dwelling thus maintaining an 'open character'. The space in between the dwellings is not overly generous, thus any form of first floor side extension would erode this character which would be further exacerbated as the host dwelling sits at an elevated position in relation to number 13, therefore on approaching the dwelling the first floor and two storey side extensions would clearly be visible.

The siting of the proposed first floor and two storey side extensions would erode the existing space in between the buildings, resulting in the loss of spatial characteristic of the streetscene, and would not reflect the predominant pattern of development in the surrounding area, contrary to saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, and the Quality Places SPD (2011).

Residential Amenity

The first floor and two storey side extensions would be sited away from number 11, therefore there would be no undue impact to these occupiers. The single storey rear extension would be sited adjacent to number 11, the proposed single storey rear extension would be proportionate in relation to the host dwelling, furthermore, the proposed single storey rear extension would not result in anymore harm than that would arise should the applicant extend the property under permitted development.

The proposal would be sited adjacent to number 13 which as already mentioned sits lower than the host dwelling, where there is a window on the flank elevation which appears to the serve the kitchen. The application of the 45 degree code illustrates that there would be an impact upon the outlook and level of daylight, which owing to the site levels could potentially appear to be worse. However it was also noted that there is a kitchen door which would still provide for as a source of light, furthermore, when taking into account the impact of the proposed single storey rear extension, it would not result in anymore harm than that would arise should the applicant extend the property under permitted development.

The first floor and two storey side extension and single storey rear extension would not have an adverse impact upon the amenity of nearby occupiers, in accordance to saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, and the Quality Places SPD (2011).

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised 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

The siting of the proposed first floor and two storey side extensions would erode the existing space in between the buildings, resulting in the loss of spatial characteristic of the streetscene, and would not reflect the predominant pattern of development in the surrounding area, contrary to saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, and the Quality Places SPD (2011).