HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/12/71804

DESCRIPTION	First floor rear extension, alterations to bay at front and detached garage/workshop at rear
ADDRESS	117 Cranbury Road Eastleigh SO50 5HE

SITE VISIT DATE	10.1.13
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposed development consists of the following elements: • First floor rear extension measuring 4.1m(d) by 3.9m wide with a gable end, picthed roof, and rear facing window over the existing flat roofed extension • Alterations to front bay from a flat roof to mono pitched roof and bricking up of the front elevation to create a more domestic scale window • Construction of a detached garage/workshop with a hipped roof at rear measuring 4.9m(w) by 8.2m(d) by 4m(h) and accessed via garage doors directly onto blemheim Road.
TOPOGRAPHY	Flat level site.
TREES	There are no trees on or adjacent to the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The boundary consists of a mixture of 1.8m fencing and 1.8-2 wall.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The property is a typical Eastleigh end of terrace two storey house on a corner plot between Cranbury Road and the rear service road. The front of the property appears to be a converted shop front. The front door is on Blemheim Road as is access to the rear parking area. To the rear within what was previously the garden is a large detached workshop structure and a concrete parking area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area of typical Eastleigh terraced two storey houses. Many have been extended however these tend to be single storey. Many also have large detached garages that back onto the service road. These vary in scale and design however tend to be fairly low level or less prominent positions where scale is not soo much of an issue.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/09/66044	60 Chamberlayne Road - Erection of detached	Refused

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	garage/workshop at rear	
Q/09/66341	60 Chamberlayne Road - PD Enquiry – Detached garage/workshop to the rear	Planning approval not required

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
115 Cranbury Road	Objected to the proposal on the basis of: • Loss of light • Overbearing structure

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
None	

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

Eastleigh Character Area – ELAC 12

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people" (para 56) and goes on to state that decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development (para 58).

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, street scene, and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received	x	See below		

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received		See below	x	

The neighbour objections have been noted and are addressed within the main considerations section of this report.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Planning Obligations are not applicable to the scale or form of development proposed.

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

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and emerging Policy DM1 of the Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan both require 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.

Principle: The application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable, as set out below.

Layout/Design: The layout and design of the proposed alterations to the front are considered acceptable. However as a result of the proposed first floor extension the host property will have a very long two storey projection which due to its gable end combined with the close knit, grid layout, and orientation of buildings of this part of Eastleigh this would result in significant overshadowing and loss of outlook to the immediate neighbour No.115 Cranbury Road (see residential amenity below).

While the principle of providing a garage/workshop to the rear of the application dwelling is acceptable, that proposed is considered to be excessive in its size and scale. Detached garages within rear gardens that back onto a rear service road are common place in this area. The proposed garage however is far larger in terms of its depth and width than other garages in the area and would in my opinion be out of keeping with the character of the area (see street scene below) and would also represent an over development of the plot (see residential amenity below). The applicant had confirmed the existing workshop would be demolished however I am still concerned that there is insufficient private amenity space that meets the requirements as set out within our Quality Places SPD.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

A further concern is that the proposed garage door would open directly onto the pavement along Blenheim Road, raising some concerns for pedestrian safety. However, this garage door would be in the same position as a pair gates so it would be very difficult to refuse the application on these grounds, and even more so given that it would be allowed under Permitted Development.

The scale and form of a proposed garage is very similar to that proposed at 60 Chamberlayne Road which was refused permission. The garage in situe at No.60 whilst still not ideal in scale or design was constructed under permitted development.

Residential Amenity: The proposed alterations to the front bay will have no impacts on residential amenity. Having carried out the lighting tests, as set out within the Quality Places SPD, the proposed two storey rear extension however, due to its depth, height, bulk, and built form, combined with the orientation of the building, would result in a loss of light to ground and first floor widows within the south and west elevation of No.115. The proposal would also have a detrimental impact on the outlook from No.115, which would be dominated by the extension to the south or by the particularly large and high garage to the rear. The first floor extension so therefore considered to conflict with the requirements of saved policy 59.BE, emerging policy DM1 and the Quality Places SPD.

In terms of amenity space for the extended property, the Quality Places SPD sets out that amenity space should be no less than 60% of the floor space. In this instance the increased floor space to 144.92sqm requires a garden of not less than 86.94sqm. The applicant has confirmed that the existing workshop will be demolished and therefore the proposed resultant garden would be 55sqm which equates to 38%. The SPD indicates that any reduction in amenity space should only be considered where an area of public open space is less than 100m away. The property is more than 100m from any open space and whilst the garden is orientated to allow maximum use of the garden 38% garden in relation to the house is not considered sufficient to meet the requirements of the enlarged dwelling. On this basis the proposal fails to comply saved policy 59.BE, emerging policy DM1 and the requirements of the Quality Places SPD.

Street Scene/Character Area: The alterations to the bay will convert the commercial appearance to a residential appearance with the use of a smaller window. The proposed addition of a mono pitch roof will further improve the front elevation and make it assimilate better to its neighbouring properties.

The proposed first floor extension will have a similar appearance to that of No.119 on the opposite corner. This demonstrates that end of terrace houses can be extended without having a detrimental impact on the street scene or wider character of the area.

With regard to the garage, the prominent almost corner position of the intended garage site, being at the entrance to the rear alleyway from Blenheim Road, will only help to emphasize the very large scale. Currently the boundary treatment to the north of the site are 1.8m walls and fencing with no significant structures behind these. This gives this particular section of the street a quite open and low aspect when looking north, for what is a relatively built up urban area. The construction of such a large structure right on the back edge of the pavement and in comparison to other detached structures found along these rear alleyways, would be at odds with this open low level nature, to the detriment of the appearance and character of the street scene and surrounding area. It is therefore considered to be contrary to saved and emerging policies, the Quality Places SPD and the Character Area Appraisal for Eastleigh. This is the same justification used for refusing a very similar garage at

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

No.60 Chamberlayne Road. It should be noted that the garage constructed to the rear of No.60, although still not ideal in scale form or design was constructed using permitted development rights and was therefore outside the control of requiring formal planning consent.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above this application is considered to conflict with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE and emerging Policy DM1 and is therefore recommended for refusal.