HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/77425

DESCRIPTION	Single storey rear extension following removal of existing conservatory, single storey side extension and replacement garage
ADDRESS	23 Sharon Road West End Southampton SO30 3AR

SITE VISIT DATE	11/11/2015
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Single storey rear extension which is to replace an existing conservatory once removed. The extension would measure 2.4m in depth, 5.4m in width and have a flat roof to the height of 3m. The extension to the side is also single storey and flat roofed and would measure 1.5m by 4m. The replacement garage is to be located in the same position as the existing and have a very similar footprint; it will measure 5.6m x 3m and have an overall height of 3.7m.
TOPOGRAPHY	Slight rise in ground level from road towards site, and land slopes downwards from east to west.
TREES	No trees are affected by the proposals.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Low garden wall to the boundaries at the front of the site. 1.8m fencing along boundary with no. 25 Sharon Road to the rear garden area (and garage this side), and shed along rear boundary. Lower fencing along the boundary with no. 21 Sharon Road (which is also on lower ground).
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached bungalow with an existing detached single garage to the eastern side of the site, in line with the current building line. The front garden has a small lawn, and an area of block paving in front of the garage. The rear garden is of a good size, mainly lawned, enclosed and well screened.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Established residential area within the urban edge. The bungalow is within a row of similar bungalows, some within the locality have been altered with dormer extensions.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
No relevant history.		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
No representations received.	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Council	West End Parish Council raised an objection to the application on the grounds of overdevelopment.
Head of Transportation & Engineering	No objection. As a 2 / 3-bed dwelling, a minimum of 2 on-site vehicle parking spaces are required. These are provided for on the existing driveway, with the proposed garage therefore being appropriate for storage. One point of note: The proposed garage is not of sufficient size to be considered suitable for parking, with a minimum internal dimension of 3.0 x 6.0m required. As such, if the applicants were ever minded to convert their loft and make the dwelling 4-bed, then they would need 3 parking spaces, but the garage could not be considered. As such, if this is a potential future option, then it would be recommended that the garage be increased in size accordingly. Engineer Comments: 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), saved policies 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014 Policy DM1, (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
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area – HEWEB 4

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

Parish Response – The amount of amenity space following development would still be adequate and would not constitute overdevelopment of the plot.

Transportation & Engineering – Comments noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received				

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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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.

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 and guidance.

Layout/Design:

The proposed single storey extension to the rear is to replace an existing conservatory and would enlarge the space of the rear bedroom, and create an additional dining area to the rear of the kitchen. It is considered that this would be an acceptable addition to the property in terms of its layout and design. It will be in keeping with the existing appearance and character of the dwelling and is not excessive in its scale or size as it will be much to the same dimensions as the existing conservatory.

Likewise the single storey side extension, which is to create a larger bathroom and hall/entrance area, is set back from the front of the dwelling by 2.8m, and is considered to be appropriate in its size, scale and design, and still in keeping with the character of the dwelling.

The proposed garage would be replacing the existing which is in quite a poor state of repair; it would be located in the same location and be of a similar footprint. The garage would have a pitched roof compared to the flat roof of the existing but is still considered to be of an acceptable scale and design, and would not detract from the character of the dwellinghouse.

The property will also retain an adequate area of rear amenity space following the construction of the extensions and the garage, such that the proposals will not result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

In addition the brick and roof tiles are proposed to match those used on the existing dwelling, and will also be conditioned to adhere to this.

Residential Amenity:

The proposed extensions by virtue of their nature and siting will not have a significant impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by way of overlooking, overbearing impact or through any loss of light or outlook. The garden is enclosed and well screened to the rear and the rear extension set away from the boundary line with no side facing windows.

The proposed garage is close to the boundary with the adjacent property No.25 Sharon Road, and is replacing one in the same location. There will be some impact as the design of the roof will be changing from flat to pitched; however there are no side facing windows on this side elevation of the bungalow, and it is felt that the impact on amenity is not significant.

Street Scene:

There would not be a significant impact upon the street scene, the garage is a replacement rather than newly proposed and although having a pitched roof compared with the original flat roofed version, is of a similar size, built of matching materials and coming no further forward than the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

existing building line and therefore retaining the existing setback.

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 development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

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

Recommend permission.