HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/75820

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side and rear extension
ADDRESS	27 Walnut Close Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 5RQ

SITE VISIT DATE	27th January 2015
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Two storey side and rear extension to create two additional bedrooms, one on the ground floor and one on the first floor, following demolition of existing garage.
TOPOGRAPHY	Flat level site
TREES	TPO58/W2 – Wood – All tree species in area TPO242/T7 – Oak – on the eastern boundary towards the rear
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The rear is enclosed by a combination of 1.5-1.8m fencing some of which has trellis and 2m+ hedging. The front is open with no discernible boundary treatment
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi-detached two storey pitched roofed house set back from the road by a generous front garden area and a driveway leading up the eastern boundary to a detached flat roofed garage beyond which is a large private garden area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential street made up of pairs of semi-detached houses of similar appearance and design. Some are generously set with spacing between pairs others are closely set. Those properties that have sufficient space and have been extended to the side tend to have subservient extensions set significantly back from the frontage with reduced ridges.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	Various tree applications	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
21 Heathfield Road	Observed that the two storey extension will close the gap between two sets of semi-detached houses creating a terrace effect and leading to a sense of overcrowding and overdevelopment. Proposed rear windows visually windows

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Chandlers Ford Parish Council	No comments received.
Head of Transportation and Engineering	HOLDING OBJECTION - Lack of vehicle parking. In regard to the application, as a 4+ bed following development, a minimum of 3 on-site vehicle parking spaces will be required. Unfortunately no plans showing parking have been submitted, and so it is unclear as to whether 3 cars will remain able to fit onto the existing driveway. There is however space to convert part of the front garden to accommodate a third space if required (similar to the neighbouring property), and so if revised plans could be submitted demonstrating this, and onwards covered by Condition E04, then the application can be re-assessed accordingly. Alternatively, Condition E03 could be applied, stipulating a minimum of 3 on-site parking spaces.

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, policy DM1, DM24 (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'

Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places (2011)
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards (2009)

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, trees, street scene and

POLICY COMMENTARY

character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	x	
Noted and addressed below.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received		See below	x	
Noted and addressed below.				

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: The size and design of the proposed extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property. The extension has a generous set back and a reduced ridge height thus appearing subservient. The extension is similar in scale and form to that built next door at No.28 and demonstrates that it assimilates well to the host property.

Residential Amenity: Due to the parallel siting of the main proportion of the extension next to No. 28's extension there is not considered to be any detrimental loss of light, outlook, or overbearing impact. The proposed window in the eastern elevation does have potential to allow detrimental overlooking and thus loss of privacy. For this reason the window is conditioned to be obscured glazed and no more than a top hung opening top light, and for no additional or amended windows to be inserted into this elevation or the western elevation without the prior approval of the LPA. This should adequately protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Street Scene/Character Area: The street is made up of pairs of semi-detached houses of similar appearance and design. Some are generously set with spacing between pairs whilst others are closely set. The proposed development exhibits subservience both in its siting away from the principle elevation and the reduced ridge height. This subservience and particularly the generous depth of the set-back allows the property to maintain its character and appearance. Whilst two extensions adjacent to each other erode the space between pairs of semis, the deep set-back mitigates any detrimental harm. The spacing between properties will obviously be reduced but not entirely and will now replicate the separation and spacing between properties 18-25. On balance the proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the street scene or the wider character of the area.

Parking: The holding objection from engineers is noted however there appears to be sufficient space on the remaining driveway and frontage of the property to provide the required 3 parking spaces. A condition requiring the necessary parking provision is recommended to ensure adequate on-site parking.

Trees: The protected trees are considered to be a sufficient distance from the proposed development that they will not be at risk of harm.

Other Matters: It is acknowledged that there is a large structure in the rear garden of the neighbouring property No.28 that was assessed in 2008 under application F/08/63562 and was considered to not require planning consent. It is also acknowledged that No.28 has a similar extension however due to the size of the remaining garden both at the site and neighbouring property No.28, I do not consider that the combined impact of the shed and extensions would result in the overdevelopment of the plot and wider area.

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 comply with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE and emerging Policy DM1 and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.