REF. NO. F/16/79576

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Two storey side & single storey rear extension, front porch & raised patio area to rear. 18 Spring Close, Fair Oak, Eastleigh, SO50 7BB

SITE VISIT DATE – 21/12/2016

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above to provide a replacement garage, utility room and kitchen/diner at ground floor, and a total of four bedrooms at first floor.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site appears level from the front but eth rear garden drops away relatively steeply.
TREES	None on or adjacent to the application site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open to the front with 1.8 – 2.0 metre fences to the side and rear boundaries.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	1960s two storey semi-detached dwelling with parking to the front and driveway to the side leading to a detached single garage at the rear and a modest rear garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area is residential in nature and made up of 1960s semi-detached dwellings similar to the application property.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	No record of any previous planning history.	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Deadman – 39 Spring Close	“Spring Close is a cul de sac consisting of pairs of semi detached 1960's built family homes. Built on comparatively high ground, each pair benefits from views of the surrounding countryside between the gaps of these pairs. My house is situated directly opposite the proposed extension so will obstruct the views that I have enjoyed for the past 25 years and one of the main reasons for buying this property in the first place. In addition the proposed extension is totally not in keeping with the style of properties in Spring Close. The proposed extension will have a detrimental effect on the look of the house in

REF. NO. F/16/79576

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	Spring Close. If permitted, I believe this will set a precedent and could lead to the houses looking more like terraces, joining together and/or in close proximity with neighbours. In conclusion, I strongly object to the proposed extension."

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Head of Transportation & Engineering	Holding objection. The proposals will increase the dwelling size to a 4-bed, and as such in accordance to the EBC Parking Standards a minimum of 3 on-site vehicle parking spaces are required to ensure roadside parking is kept to a minimum. This is particularly key in a location such as this where roadside parking would likely obstruct neighbouring driveways, and likely result in parking on the footways. At present the existing driveway is only sufficient for one car, and as such revised plans are requested demonstrating how 3 spaces will be provided (partial front garden conversion?). Once received, if acceptable there would be no objection, however Condition E04 would need to be applied.
Fair Oak Parish Council	No Objection – Members had trepidations on the size of the extension, especially to side, and raised concerns of overdevelopment.

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 Policies 25.NC, 59.BE & 104.T

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, DM9 & DM24

Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Character Area Appraisals – Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports and encourages sustainable development which is considered to have three roles, economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that "These roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities. Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions."

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 that proposed, its layout, design and impact upon the street scene and wider character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, parking and highway issues, as well as nature conservation.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

See below.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

A response to those matters which can be taken into consideration is given below. With regards to loss of the view between properties, while the outlook from a property is protected this is different to loss of a private view, which cannot be taken into consideration when determining any planning application. On the matter of setting a precedent, again this is not a material consideration and cannot be used to determine any planning application which must be considered on the merits or otherwise of each case. However, it should be noted that the precedent for two storey side extensions has already been set with at least two dwellings further down the street having been extended in this way.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

n/a

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."*

In this case policy issues for consideration include:

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. The most relevant policy in this case is saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan 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, a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, to make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, and noise and fumes. Also of relevance is Policy DM1 of the Submitted

REF. NO. F/16/79576

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

Layout, Design, Street Scene & Area Character – The form, scale and design of that proposed is considered to be appropriate and suitably subservient to the main dwelling, and with the removal of the existing detached garage to the rear, will leave adequate private amenity space for the enlarged dwelling.

The comments made with regards to the potential for a terracing effect to occur if more properties along the street were to undertake the same form of extension are noted. However, as has been set out above the issue of precedent cannot be taken into consideration and each application must be judged on its own merits. In this instance, given that No.20 does not have a two storey side extension it would be hard to argue that any terracing effect would occur or that there would be any detrimental impact upon the appearance of the street or the wider character of the surrounding area.

As such it is considered that the application proposals accord with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the current Local Plan, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Local Plan and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Residential Amenity – Due to the orientation, proximity and relationship of the application property to its neighbours, as well as the nature of the development proposed, it is not considered that there would be any adverse or unacceptable impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook. There are some windows within the flank elevation of the neighbouring property (No.20 Spring Close) but it would appear that these serve a landing and bathroom/WC. These, not being habitable rooms, means that there would be no unacceptable loss of outlook or light in planning terms. As such the application is considered to accord with the amenity requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the current Local Plan, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Local Plan and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Parking & Highway Issues – The Head of Transportation and Engineering's comments were given without the benefit of being able to visit the site, where it would be noted that a gravelled parking area has been provided to the dwelling which is easily capable of accommodating the three off-road spaces required by the Council's 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD and should not therefore lead to any on-street parking issues. The application is therefore considered to comply with this element of saved Policy 59.BE of the current Local Plan and Policy DM24 of the Submitted Local Plan.

Nature Conservation – The proposal is not considered to result in a likely significant impact on a European Protected site (SPA, SAC or Ramsar). HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening was not required for this development as it falls outside the designated zone of impact.

The site falls outside the 5.6km buffer zone for the Solent SPA meaning that a contribution is not required to mitigate the increased recreational pressure resulting from the development.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011-2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons given above the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

REF. NO. F/16/79576