HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/72211

DESCRIPTION	First floor rear extension
ADDRESS	26 Eastleigh Road Fair Oak Eastleigh SO50 7JB

SITE VISIT DATE	05/04/13
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above, across the full width and depth of the existing single storey extension, 3.7m deep, 7.5m wide, with hipped roof.
TOPOGRAPHY	Gentle slope down from south to north and a steeper slope from west to east.
TREES	None affected by this application.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.8m high fence to the side boundary with the POS to the west.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached, two-storey dwelling with existing single storey rear extension. Frontage parking area, gated side access between no. 26 and 24. Relatively small rear garden, backing onto the rear garden of the property behind, no. 28 Eastleigh Road. To the west is a triangular shaped piece of public open space/visual amenity land, at the junction with Fair Oak Road and Eastleigh Road.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Primarily residential two storey dwellings in the immediate vicinity with a range of alterations and extensions, from conservatories and porches through to two storey extensions. Typically some frontage area, originally as gardens but converted to parking in a number of cases; and relatively small rear gardens. Some garage courts. A number of these properties face onto the busy Bishopstoke Road, the remainder are generally in closes accessed immediately of this road.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Q/37991/000/00	TOWN PLANNING CORRESPONDENCE-PROPOSED BRICK WALL AT FRONT OF PROPERTY ADJACENT TO COUNCIL OWNED LAND	PNR 2001
Z/37991/001/00	SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION	PNR 22/11/2001

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
24 Eastleigh Rd	Having looked at the plans on line I would like to formally request that planning permission is not granted for the following reasons. The increased height of the building will significantly reduce the day light to my kitchen and hallway. It will also reduce the amount of sun to my garden. In addition there is limited parking available and turning the property into a 5 bedroom house will Increase the amount of vehicles (potentially) residing at the property.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
OAK	Delegated, No Objection

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) 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

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area

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

None received		See below	x	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	x	
Other …					

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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle: The development site is located within the built urban edge and an established residential area. The principle of development is therefore accepted, subject to the proposed works being appropriate in terms of nature, scale and design, in compliance with the relevant local planning guidance and policies. In this case, the relevant local plan policy is 59.BE which 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.

Design and Layout: The roof of the existing dwelling is orientated along a north-south axis, with gables facing north and south. This roof form is the same along the three properties that are read together in the street scene and is quite noticeable due to the area of public open space to the west. The proposed design provides for a hipped roof, which has been done to reduce the impact of development on the adjoining property; it does not however reflect the character of the existing property. The single storey extension that is to be extended at first floor level already projects from the side of the property which has created an awkward relationship with the original building This has been exacerbated by the poor choice of bricks which do not match the original property. The first floor addition would increase the prominence of this side element which could be argued to be out-of-character and unsympathetic. The proposed extension is therefore considered to be out-of-character with the original dwelling and would result in a prominence and intrusive built form to the detriment of the street scene and character of the area.

The proposed extension increases the accommodation from a modest 3-bed dwelling to a 5-bed property. This has implications for the space requirements of the ground floor living accommodation and the private amenity space. It could therefore be argued that the proposal constitutes overdevelopment, although this is not considered to be an overwhelming reason for refusal in this case. The proposal does result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining property as discussed below.

Residential Amenity: The addition of a first floor extension, 3.7m deep, has the potential to affect light and overshadowing of the kitchen and private amenity space of the neighbouring property

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

and have an overbearing impact, to the detriment of the residential amenity of this property. This is exacerbated by the orientation of the properties and the change in level between the two sites which sets no. 24 at a slightly lower level than no. 26. Further, due to the short garden length (approx. 10m) and the proximity of the property to the rear, there may be an issue with regards to increased overlooking of amenity space.

Parking: The Council's Residential Parking Standards SPD requires 3 parking spaces for a 4+ bedroom property. The property currents has sufficient space to park 2 cars on the frontage and the plans indicate the ownership of one of the garages within the block located in Hawthorn Close. The site therefore has the capacity to accommodate the necessary parking spaces on site.

The development is therefore considered not to comply with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the 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

Recommend refusal on the grounds of impact on the character of the property and the area, to the detriment of the street scene; and a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.