HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/79182

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side & rear extension
ADDRESS	152 Church Road Bishopstoke Eastleigh SO50 6DS

SITE VISIT DATE	17 and 28th October 2016
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	The plans are sufficient to determine the application
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks to erect at two storey side and rear extension. The footprint of the front elevation is proposed to be extended by 2.17m. The footprint of the extension will extend 9.9m into the site. The rear elevation of the two storey extension will be 4.5m wide with a gabled pitched roof above. The ridge height of this roof will be 6 metres above the existing ground level.
TOPOGRAPHY	Ground levels remain constant within the vicinity
TREES	The site is protected by tree preservation order 660. The proposal will not be in conflict with any trees in the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Hedge Boundaries to rear
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application site contains a two storey, semi-detached, brick built residential dwelling. He external elevation are panted render and the property appears to have been previously extended at ground floor to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and made up of a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings of varying ages and designs.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	None relevant to this application	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None received	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BST	Concern about loss of light and proximity of development to 154
ENG	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
Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029: DM1
Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Character Area Appraisals – Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath (2008)
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards (2009)

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area -BIFOHH 6

- Retain the grass verges on St Margaret's Road and Stoke Park Road
- Retain/reinforce the mature broadleaved tree planting along Stoke Park Road
- Maintain the predominant shallow building setbacks and continuous building frontage in order to retain the sense of enclosure provided by existing development

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site is not located within a special policy area

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	
The issues raised are addressed in the material considerations below.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received	X	See below		
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 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 guidance. 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, 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. Also of relevance of Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

Layout & Design –

The application site forms part of a pair semi-detached dwellings located between a terrace of 8 houses and a large detached two storey property. Owing to the mix of property types and sizes, as well as the park and open space opposite, the verdant and semi-rural nature is clearly evident which has given Church Road its unique character.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Two storey side extensions should be setback to avoid a 'terracing' effect as it allows the main dwelling to maintain its dominance. No set back is proposed which is contrary to the Quality Places SPD but there is no cause for concern in this instance. The dwelling is set back significantly from the highway, and whilst the property will be extended towards number 154, side access will be maintained. The increased size of the resulting property remains in character with neighbouring properties within the vicinity. The proposal will maintain the hipped roof design of the property's front elevation when viewed in the street scene. The externals materials will match those used in the existing property further mitigating the impact of the proposal. In order to break up the side elevation of the two storey extension cedar cladding has been incorporated into the design to the rear of the extension. The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposal is not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot. Therefore in terms of the impact of the resultant form and scale, the site circumstances would sufficiently mitigate potential harm to the host dwelling and streetscene.

Residential Amenity:

Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) requires that development avoids unduly impacting upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, in particular by way of overbearing impact, loss of light or outlook, and overlooking.

It is considered that there is no conflict with this policy requirement in respect of the development and no neighbour representations have been received. There is mutual overlooking at the rear and whilst the extension is two storey, the design moves the two storey elements away from the shared boundaries with the neighbouring residential properties. The only part of the proposal which will be visible to the occupiers of number 150 is the two storey rear element, however as there is already a single storey rear extension, the first floor rear element would be the part which could potentially have an impact. A 1.5 metre separation distance will be maintained from the proposed two storey element and these occupiers, the orientation of the proposal will not result in undue harm to the level of daylight received.

The proposal will be sited adjacent to number 154 and it is not considered there would be undue harm to these occupiers privacy or outlook. The host dwelling sits much further back in the plot than 152, there is one small window at ground floor on the flank elevation, which appears to serve the kitchen and it is not known if this is a secondary window. The window will not be blocked in any way owing to the siting of the two storey side extension which will be significantly set back. At the rear the neighbours have a conservatory and one window at the rear of the first floor which is placed closer to the boundary of 156. Taking into account these site circumstances, it is considered these are sufficient to ensure there would be no undue harm to the amenity of these occupiers.

The existing rear elevation already contains windows at first floor level. A further window is

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

to be inserted into the existing rear elevation. This window could be inserted at any time under permitted development and does not require express planning consent. Further to which the level of overlooking would be the same as it currently is.

Highway Matters:

Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) requires that development provides a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles which includes an appropriate level of parking provision in accordance with the Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

There is room available on the site frontage to accommodate 2 vehicles which is the maximum number that is required under the SPD requirements, with this being for a 3 bedroom dwelling. Accordingly there is considered to be no conflict with the aforementioned policy requirements.

Trees and Landscaping:

Saved Policy 59.BE (i) of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011 requires that development takes full and proper account of the context of the site including natural features and trees worthy of retention. The site is offered protection by tree preservation order 660. However, the proposal will not be in conflict with any trees or landscape features of particular amenity to the area.

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.

CONCLUSION

The development complies with the requirements of saved policy 59.BE.