HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/77103

DESCRIPTION	Single storey side and rear extension
ADDRESS	8 Clanfield Close Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 2HL

SITE VISIT DATE	6.10.15
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposed rear and side extensions will have flat roofs and are single storey. The proposed rear extension will be 3.5 metres high from the ground level and 3.3. metres to a depth of 5.4 metres. The extension spans the full width of the dwellinghouse. The roof of the extension has an overhang of a metre on the north and western side. The roof will overhang the south side elevation of the extension to a lesser extent at 0.3 metres. A new raised terrace is proposed which will wrap around the rear extension. The terrace will project to a full depth of 7.2 metres from the rear elevation of the original dwellinghouse either side of the proposed extension. The terrace will project from the rear doors of the extension to a depth of 2 metres. Due to raised terrace extending further into the rear where the land slopes downwards, it will be 1 metre above ground level at the furthest point from the dwellinghouse. The proposed side extension will measure 2.9 metres high from ground level at the front and 3.3. metres at the rear. The extension is recessed back from the front of the dwellinghouse by 1.6 metres. The extension projects form the side elevation to a depth of 4 metres. The rear extension will provide a large living space which will replace the living room on the existing ground floor which is to be converted into a bedroom. The side extension will provide an additional bedroom on the ground floor. Thus, there will be an overall increase of 2 bedrooms to the property.
TOPOGRAPHY	The ground within the site gradually slopes downwards from the road frontage to the rear boundary.
TREES	Woodland to the NW of the site – TPO 311/W1. A group of 5 oak trees are located to NW of the dwelling which are partially within the site - TPO311/G31. A single oak tree is also positioned near the NW site boundary – TPO 311/T34.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open frontage with a trellis fence between along the boundary with no.7. Planting and low hedging is positioned along the side boundary which is at an angle with no.9.

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	Mature planting and trees along the rear northern side boundary. Rear boundary and southern rear side boundary with no.8 comprised of a fence which steps down. A trellis fence is also positioned above the raised terrace up against the boundary fence.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached 2 storey dwelling house on large triangular shaped plot situated at head of cul de sac. There is accommodation in the roof space with a dormer which projects from the majority of the rear roof slope and a single Velux in the front roof slope. There is raised decking which extends from the rear wall of the dwelling house and attached garage to a depth of 5 metres. This is shown on the existing elevations and measures 0.7 metres above the ground level at the furthest point. At this height above the ground, the raised decking is not permitted development and would require planning permission. There are steps leading down from the decking to a large sloped lawn area that forms the remainder of the rear garden. A large outbuilding is positioned on raised ground within the rearmost part of the garden. To the front of the dwelling is a large paved driveway area and a large low gate leads round to the rear garden. There is an attached single storey garage to the side which link to the equivalent garage at no.7.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area of mixed styles of two storey dwellings set within cul-de-sacs.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Nos. 2,3,4,5,7,9,10 and 11 Clanfield Close	• Improve boundary treatment between application site and no.9. • Increased demand for parking from 2 additional bedrooms resulting in on street parking within an already congested cul de sac. • On street parking will restrict access to other properties, further limit manoeuvring space within the close and be detrimental to highway safety. • Loss of privacy to residents at no.7 due to overlooking into rear garden from raised platform. • Disruption during construction period. • Impact of proposed extensions on surface water drainage. • Impact on TPOs during construction of extensions. • Potential to change use of property to B&B or flats. • Recent development of single storey structure on site in conjunction with the proposed extensions raises questions over future use.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Chandlers Ford Parish Council	No comments received.
Head of Transportation and Engineering	Transport Policy Officer: No objection. As a 4+ bed dwelling, there is a requirement for a minimum of 3 on-site vehicle parking spaces to be provided. The development accords with this, via the existing driveway which appears to actually be capable of holding at least 4 vehicles comfortably. Due to the proposed size of the property (5-bed), it is requested that a condition is put in place to retain the full extent of existing driveway in future years, not to be reconverted to grass or built upon with any structure - i.e. no additional development under PD or sheds.

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 B.E, 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, DM24

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, trees, street scene and

POLICY COMMENTARY

character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	X	
The comments raised by the Transport Policy Officer are considered below.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	X	
With regards to concerns raised regarding the impact on surface water drainage, it is considered that there will not be a significant impact on the basis that the proposed development is for relatively small scale. It is acknowledged that there are concerns regarding the potential use of the site when taking into account the outbuilding in conjunction with the formation of 2 ground floor bedrooms. However, the outbuilding does not form part of this application. Furthermore, the outbuilding is permitted development.					

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 Submitted 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 neighboring 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 dependent on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable, as set out below. There were concerns raised by residents that the increase in bedrooms could allow for a change of use to HMO. A change of use from C3 (dwelling house) to C4 (Houses in multiple Occupation – occupied by between 3-6 unrelated individuals) is permitted under the 2015 Use Classes Amendment Order. However, it is considered that this location would not be suitable for HMO development and could set a precedent within this small residential close. This would be on the basis that the intensification of use would have an impact on both residential amenity and highway safety. A restrictive condition could be applied which would remove this permitted change of use and thus, any change of use to HMO would require an application for planning permission. Concerns were

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

also raised that the dwelling house could be converted into a B&B. However, this is not a permitted change of use and would require an application for planning permission irrespective of any restrictive condition.

Layout/Design and its impacts upon the Street Scene: The extensions are fairly modest and in proportion with the host dwelling and plot. The proposed facing materials will match the existing dwelling creating a sympathetic and visually cohesive appearance. The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

The rear extension is single storey under a flat roof, 5.6 metres deep, and spans the entire width of the dwelling house. At this scale there is a large expanse of roof however only parts of it will be visible above the neighbouring fence lines and being located to the rear it will not be visible from the street. Overall its design, siting, and scale are considered acceptable.

The side extension is also a single storey under a flat roof and is also recessed back from the front edge of the dwelling. Due to the height and siting of the extension, it is considered that it will not appear particularly noticeable from the road and will not have a detrimental impact on the street scene or the wider character of the area. Furthermore, a slightly narrower side extension could be constructed under permitted development.

Residential Amenity: The proposed rear extension is of a single storey height and is set away from the boundary with no.7. Given this size and siting of the extension, it is not considered to have a significant overbearing impact on no.7. Furthermore, the low height and profile of the extension which is to the north of no.7 will not result in a significant loss of light.

The occupiers at no.7 objected on the grounds of loss of privacy as a result of overlooking from the raised terrace into their rear garden. The submitted plans show that there is an existing raised terrace which was confirmed on site. This was erected without planning permission. It was noted on site that a trellis fence had been erected on the applicant's side of the boundary fence along the depth of the existing raised terrace. This fence ceased at the point where the steps lead down to the lower ground level. The existing plans appear to show a boundary fence which measures 2 metres above the raised deck.

The existing raised terrace that is nearest to the boundary with no.7 extends to a depth of approx. 2.5 metres with steps. In comparison, the proposed raised terrace has a depth of 7.2 metres including where it abuts the boundary with no.7.

The originally proposed plans showed a boundary fence which measured 1.6 metres high above the raised deck. This was not considered to provide a sufficient level of screening and as such would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking from both the side window in the extension and the raised deck/terrace particularly where it abuts the boundary with no.7.

Therefore, amended plans were requested showing a 2 metre high fence from the raised deck which would extend the full depth of the terrace. A condition is recommended that requires the fence is erected prior to the proposed extension and terrace coming into use and being retained as such thereafter. Thus, subject to this screening fence being erected, it is considered that there will not be any unacceptable overlooking.

The proposed side extension whilst close to the boundary with no.9 is also of a single storey height and is slightly narrow could be constructed under permitted development. For these reasons, it is considered that the extension will not have an overbearing impact on their side garden. Due to the orientation, there is already an element of overlooking into the side of no.9. A slightly smaller extension could be built with a front window viewing this element of the site. On the basis of the above, it is considered that there would not be a harmful level of overlooking to warrant refusal. In light of the fact that a smaller extension could be built without requiring an application for planning

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

permission, it would be unreasonable to require an improved boundary treatment with no.9.

It is also acknowledged that there are concerns as to the level of disruption particularly in relation to construction vehicles parking within the road. The LPA would not normally seek to limit the impact the development has on the amenity of the locality for a development of this scale and nature given the temporary nature of the construction period and the associated disruption it may have. Taking into consideration, the constrained nature of the site and its difficult access arrangements, it is considered that a pre commencement condition could be applied requiring the submission of a method statement detailing the arrangements for the duration of the construction period.

Parking & Highway Safety: It is acknowledged that there are number of concerns from neighbours that the potential parking demand from 2 additional bedrooms could lead to an increase in on-street parking and the impact that this will have on highway safety. A minimum of three off-road parking spaces are required by the Council's 'Residential, Parking Standards' SPD for a dwelling house with four or more bedrooms. I refer to the comments made by the transport policy officer who has no objection to the proposal. They consider that the existing driveway to the front appears capable of holding 4 vehicles comfortably. The application therefore complies with this element of saved Policy 59.BE of the current Local Plan and Policy DM24 of the Submitted Local Plan. It is recommended that a condition be added to any decision requiring a minimum of three car parking spaces be provided within the curtilage of the site prior to the proposed development coming into use and being maintained as such thereafter.

Trees: There are a total of 6 oak trees covered by a TPO some of which are within the site. However, being located a considerable distance from the proposed extensions it was considered that the protected trees would not be at risk of harm. A condition can be applied to ensure that no parking of vehicles or storage of construction materials shall take place near any trees covered by a TPO.

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.