HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/74634

ADDRESS	18 Forest Road, Chandler's Ford, Chandler's Ford, SO53 1LZ
DESCRIPTION	Single storey rear extension and detached timber car port

SITE VISIT DATE	1 July 2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS	
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	• The application is proposing the construction of a single rear extension and detached timber car port • The single storey rear extension would project 3.6 metres in depth, extend 6.5 metres in width and 2.9 metres in height • The carport would project 5 metres in depth, extend 4.5 metres in width and 3.4 metres in height
TOPOGRAPHY	• Upon entering the driveway the land dips downwards, no site changes in site level were observed from the rear
TREES	• There are no trees on site that would be affected by this proposal
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	• The boundary treatment consists of a fence which are approximately 1.8 metres in height and dense hedges
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	• The site contains a unique two storey detached dwelling • The dwelling has a deep cat slide roof at the rear which has been extended with a full width dormer • At the front elevation there is hardstanding sufficient for three vehicles • There are two dormers at the front elevation • At the rear there is a single storey side and rear extension which is of a very small scale that does not extend the full width of the host dwelling • The rear garden has decking and well maintained mature landscaping

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY		
REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/04/51558	Alterations and extensions to provide two storey dwelling	Granted 1/10/2004
Z/04673/007/00	Alterations and extensions to create two storey dwelling with front and rear facing dormer windows	Granted 13/5/2003
Z/04673/002/00	Side extension to provide cloakroom and lounge	Granted 10/9/1979

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	
SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Occupier of 5 Common Road	Querying whether trees along the southern boundary will be removed and whether the access to the site will be altered

CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Tpol	No objection, there should be a condition applied that the car port must remain open, and not have doors added to it as this would result in the unit being too small for a viable vehicle space.
Highways	No objection. The extension is shown close to the critical ordinary water course flowing through property but does not appear to affect it. Any changes to the water course would need HCC approval as Lead Local Flood Authority .
Trees	No objection
Environment Agency	No comments received

POLICY CONTEXT
DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area 25m river buffer Flood zone 2 and 3 All tree designated with a TPO

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S
Saved policy 43.ES, 44.ES, 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) Policy DM1, DM4 of the Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029) Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011)

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

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

These will be addressed in the report.

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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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 would in effect create an infill extension which would extend from the flank wall of the kitchen to the full width of the house. The proposed roof would be of a mono pitch style and when comparing this to the roof of the existing extension it would have been better if the roof of the proposed single storey rear extension to have matched. However, on balance the proposed single storey rear extension is a proportionate addition which respects the host dwelling and is of appropriate scale and mass.

Any form of development which would be clearly visible from the street should be well designed and not cause undue harm to existing character of the street.

The proposed car port would be open at two sides; one of which would be from the front elevation and therefore the roof would be clearly visible. The proposed materials are considered to respect the host dwelling and the appearance of the proposed carport would be in scale and proportion.

Transport policy and highways have raised no objection and have commented that a condition requiring the car port to be kept open to allow ease of access. This is not considered necessary as the onus is on the applicant to ensure they can access the car port viably.

The occupier of 5 Common Road has enquired whether the trees along the boundary of the host dwelling and 5 Common Road will be removed and whether the access would change. The trees along the boundary have no ‘value’ and are therefore not designated with a TPO, therefore should the applicant wish to remove them they may do so, furthermore the Councils tree department have raised no objections. With regards to the access this is to remain as it is.

Flood Risk

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The application site is within a flood risk 2 and 3 zone. Highways have stated that a critical ordinary water course flows through the property but does not appear to affect it. A flood risk assessment was requested and the Environment Agency have been consulted on this matter but no comments have been received. The Councils highways do not consider this to be an issue but have said that any changes to the water course would need HCC approval as Lead Local Flood Authority.

Single storey rear extension and detached timber car port would not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or indeed the surrounding area in accordance with saved policy 43.ES, 44.ES, 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011). policy DM1, DM4 of the Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029) and Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011).

Residential Amenity

The proposed car port is not considered to cause undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be sited away from 5 Common Road and would be masked from view from the existing extension, therefore it is considered that there would be no undue harm to these occupiers amenity.

Number 20 sits higher than the host dwelling and has been considerably extended, the proposed single storey rear extension would be sited more than five metres away from the boundary. There is a window on the flank elevation of number 20's single storey side extension which serves a playroom. The playroom is not considered to be a habitable room and therefore the impact in terms of loss of outlook and privacy is not considered to be as detrimental as it would be say to bedroom.

Single storey rear extension and detached timber car port would not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or indeed the surrounding area in accordance with 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 Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (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

Single storey rear extension and detached timber car port represent a suitably designed householder extension would not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the

CONCLUSION
host dwelling or indeed the surrounding area in accordance with saved policy 43.ES, 44.ES, 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011). policy DM1, DM4 of the Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029) and Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011).