HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/75619

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side extension and single storey front extension
ADDRESS	35 Westmorland Way Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 2NA

SITE VISIT DATE	31.12.14
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Two storey side extension with a pitched roof and single storey front extension with mono-pitched roof.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site is set within the highpoint of the road, in an elevated position with the road sloping downwards in a SW and SE direction with neighbouring properties on lower ground. Properties to the north are on rising ground but due to the road junction are separated.
TREES	None
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front of the property is open. The side and rear garden is enclosed by 1.8m fencing and 2m+ hedging.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	End of terrace two storey house with a pitched roof set on a large corner plot in an elevated position with driveway parking and garden to the front and a side garden wrapping round to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area with rows of semi-detached and terraced properties with similar appearances/characteristics that follow the topography of the area with properties stepped into the hills.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/30622/000/00	Two storey side extension	Permitted Nov' 1988
F/14/74757	Two storey attached 2 bed dwelling	Withdrawn
Z/24988/001/00	Ground floor front and rear extensions and first floor side extension @ 33 Westmorland Way (behind site)	Permitted Oct' 1998

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Chandlers Ford Parish Council	No comments received.

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), saved policy 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising of the 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' Policy DM1

Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not within a Character Area

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 and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received	x	See below		
N/A				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received	x	See below		
N/A				

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

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and emerging Policy DM1 of the Amended Draft 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 and its impacts upon the Street Scene/Character of the Area: The area has a strong and cohesive appearance to it with rows of semi-detached and terraced properties with similar appearances/characteristics that follow the topography stepping with the rise and fall of the land.

Basic design principles direct that extensions should be subservient in scale, form, and design to the host dwelling. Whist it is noted that the extension has a small set back and slightly reduced ridge height these are not sufficient to create subservience and are completely negated by the width of the extension which as almost the same width as the host property essentially doubling the foot print and internal accommodation. Such a wide extension results in the property appearing unbalanced and out of proportion.

Being in an elevated position and on the brow of a hill the site is already prominent. It is considered that such a wide extension will unacceptable erode the current open nature of this corner plot and will result in a visually prominent and overbearing built form that dominance the street scene, particularly when approaching this section of road from the east.

It is noted that the applicant submitted an application described as “Two storey attached 2 bed dwelling” however this application was never validated. The current plans are almost identical to the invalid application and show that conversion would be achievable after the build is complete. Whilst there is no indication within this application that the extension would be converted to a separate unit of accommodation and indeed conditions could be applied to prevent such conversion, this does however highlights the scale of the extension in contrast to host dwelling and that it is unsympathetic in size and form to the host property.

Residential Amenity: The property being an end of terrace and the extension being located on the open side of the property will not have any unacceptable impacts on to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light.

It is however noted that being located at the brow of the hill and in an elevated position to its neighbour No.33 there is potential for additional overlooking over and above that existing at

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

present and being such a large extension has potential to appear overbearing and reducing the outlook from No.33 however these acknowledged impacts are not considered to be soo detrimental as to warrant using it as an additional reason for refusal.

Parking: The existing house has a requirement under our Residential Parking standards to provide a minimum of 2 parking spaces for a 2/3 bed property. This was comfortably achievable on the site. The extension will build over the existing parking arrangements and will provide an additional 2 bedrooms increasing the total bedrooms on the site to 5. For a property of this size Parking Standards require a minimum of 3 parking spaces however only 2 are shown and it does not appear possible to provide any further parking on the frontage. The proposals therefore fails to provide adequate provision for on-site car parking which would encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway and so interrupt the free flow of traffic and cause a hazard to road users

Other Matters: The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

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

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.