**HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/75070**

| | |
|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION | Two storey side extension |
| ADDRESS | 34 Crusader Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 0PE |

| | |
|---|---|
| SITE VISIT DATE | 16 September 2014 |
| ARE PLANS ACCURATE? | Yes |
| HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? | Yes |

**THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

| | |
|---|---|
| DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION | The application seeks approval for the erection of a two-storey side extension to the western elevation of the dwelling. The extension measures 2.3m in width and will span the full depth of the property. The development is to allow for the increase in the property from a 3 to a 4 bedroom dwelling. |
| TOPOGRAPHY | The site slopes up from front to back. There is also a drop down in levels between the western side elevation of the existing dwelling and the highway which runs parallel. |
| TREES | Whilst there are a number of mature trees on the open space to the northern side of the site it is not considered that these will be unduly impacted upon by the development proposed. |
| BOUNDARY TREATMENT | The site has a fairly open frontage with only a low-level timber picket fence demarcating the boundary with the adjoining property. To the rear, the private amenity area of the property is bordered by a brick wall to its western and southern sides, with there being a 2m high timber fence marking the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling. |
| SITE CHARACTERISTICS | The application property is an end-of-terrace, three-bedroom dwelling of red brick construction. The property has a flat roof porch to the front with an area of private amenity space to the rear. There is no on-site parking available to serve the property with there being only pedestrian access to its frontage from Crusader Road. Unallocated parking is instead provided on-road as well as within a garage court to the rear of the site. |
| CHARACTER OF LOCALITY | The site falls within an established residential area formed predominantly of terraced properties set on relatively small sized plots. Parking for the dwellings in this vicinity is either on-road or within garage court areas. |

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

| REFERENCE | DESCRIPTION | DECISION |
|---|---|---|
| None | | |

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| None | |

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Botley Parish Council | *Requested confirmation that the parking provision will be adequate for a four bedroom property.* |
| Southern Electric | *No comments received.* |
| Head of Transportation and Engineering | *The development proposals result in the property becoming a 4-bed dwelling, and in an area such as Crusader Road where unallocated parking is provided, this could have an impact on the availability of parking to local residents. In terms of the unallocated parking, the difference in requirements between a 3 and 4-bed dwelling is an additional 0.5 space requirement. Clearly this cannot be added to the existing development, and as such a review of reported parking issues has been undertaken. This shows no new complaints have been received for several years and therefore parking appears to be at an acceptable level at present. Additional to this, it is noted that at the time of writing this response no neighbour objections have been lodged. For this reason, whilst there will be additional impact on parking needs, this is at this time negligible and as such is not a valid reason for a highway objection.* |

**POLICY CONTEXT**

| DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE |
|---|
| Within Built-up Area Boundary<br>Within Established Residential Area |

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S**

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Saved Policy 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'), Policies DM1, DM24.
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

**CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA**

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area – HEWEB 76 (Summary Description Only):

*"1970s/1980s terraced development on a loop/cul-de-sacs on the south eastern edge of Hedge End, in the parish of Botley".*

**SPECIAL POLICY AREA**

The site does not fall within a designated special policy area.

**NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE**

National Planning Policy Framework:

**NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE**

Of particular relevance to this application are both paragraph 17 which *inter alia* states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, as well as *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**

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the principle of the development proposed, its layout and design, highway matters, and the impact of the proposals upon neighbouring residential amenity as well as the Crusader Road street scene and wider area character.

**COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| None received | | See below | | |
| Other – the comments made are noted and are responded to where necessary in the below assessment of the proposals. | | | | |

**COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| None received | X | See below | | |
| Other … | | | | |

**PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS**

There are no planning obligation requirements associated with this application.

**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 Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 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

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL**

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND**

unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

**MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Principle:

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.

Layout, design and the impact of the proposals upon the character of the area:

The development is considered to be acceptable in this respect and in compliance with the requirements of Saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011. The extension is of a modest width at 2.3m and in this regard represents a proportionate addition to the main property. It is also of a sympathetic design and will match the host building in both materials and fenestration. Whilst the proposals will result in the blank side elevation of the dwelling being bought closer to the road and the development will, owing to the open nature of the site, be eminently visible within the street scene, it is considered that an appropriate degree of set in will be maintained from the highway footpath such that it will not appear either unduly prominent or visually obtrusive. As such the proposals will not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area. The property will also maintain an adequate area of private rear amenity space such that the proposals will not result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

Residential amenity:

Owing to their scale, nature and positioning, it is not considered that the proposals will have any undue impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. The extension for which permission is sought is sited alongside the highway with no windows being proposed in its side elevation facing towards the neighbouring properties on the opposing site of the road. In addition, the development will be fully screened from the adjoining neighbouring dwelling by the application property. As such the proposals are considered to be in compliance with the requirements of Saved policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan in respect of the matter of residential amenity.

Highway matters:

The main highway related consideration in respect of the proposals concerns the provision of adequate parking to serve the development. In line with the Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards, the increase in the number of bedrooms within the property technically generates an associated increased parking requirement. The requirement in this case is for 0.5 unallocated spaces which in line with the comments of the Council's Head of Transportation and Engineering is not deliverable in practical terms as part of this development. On the basis, therefore, that the Head of Transportation and Engineering has as a result raised no highway objection to the proposals and there are no known parking issues in this area, it is not considered that the application could reasonably be refused on the basis of insufficient parking provision and as such the development is therefore deemed to be acceptable in this regard.

Overall, for the reasons as outlined above, the application is considered to comply with the requirements of the relevant development plan policies, associated supplementary planning

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL**

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND**

guidance, and national planning policy.

**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.