HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/79718

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side extension, single storey front extension & single storey rear extension
ADDRESS	30 Chichester Close Hedge End Southampton SO30 2GQ

SITE VISIT	Yes
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	The plans are sufficient to assess the planning application.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal seeks permission for: - Two storey side extension with a double pitched roof measuring 2.5m(w) by 6.8m(d) by 5.8m(h). - Single storey front extension with a cropped pitched roof measuring 4.9m(w) by 3m(d) by 3.5m(h). - Single storey rear extension with a cropped pitched roof measuring 5.2m(w) by 3m(d) by 3.5m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat
TREES	There is an ornamental tree in the front garden and a large conifer tree behind the existing garage. The trees are not covered by a TPO and not of high amenity value.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	2m high panel fencing with some vegetation around rear garden.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached house with flat roof garage attached to the side. There is a single parking space at the front of the house and a compact rear garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The house is at the end of a row of four similar style detached houses, some of which have front and rear extensions of varying styles. The property is located within a residential area, consisting of 1970s/1980s terraced/semi-detached/detached dwellings on loops/cul-de-sacs in central Wildern.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
2 Chichester Close (observation letter)	Our main concern arising from this proposed extension is the provision for parking. The proposal includes demolishing the existing garage and building an extension at the front of the property, thus reducing the already limited space

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	available for parking. The application states that there will be room to park two vehicles within the boundary of the property but this is questionable and needs to be investigated further, otherwise the existing difficulties with on street parking will only be exasperated.
1 Navigators Way (observation letter)	I note that my garage is involved as they are taking down their garage, which shares a boundary wall with mine. I see no mention of making what is an internal dividing wall into an external weatherproof wall or making good the remaining existing asbestos roof. I am not sure whether these points should come under planning or building regulations. Please note that on drawing 06 the elevation for the neighbour's house is wrong as the drawing shows two storeys coming out to the extent of their front ground floor extension, whereas it is only the garage that comes that far.
2 Navigators Way (observation letter)	<u>General</u> • There is no indication of the future parking arrangements for the property on any of the drawings, parking at the junction between Chichester Close and Navigator's Way has become a hazard due to parking on the street. As the garage and part of the driveway will be lost due to the proposed development the cars are likely be parked on the road adding to this existing problem. • Has a demolition survey been carried out for the removal of the existing garage? • Has the roof to the garage been identified as Asbestos? If so what is the proposal for its removal. • What is the proposal to separate the two garages? • Drawing 05 & 07 show a gap of 250mm between the face of the proposed two storey extension and the neighbour's garage, what is the proposal to gain access to maintain this space after the competition of the project. • What is the proposal for access to construct the two story extension? Considering that the facia board is on the boundary line. • Drawing 05 shows a Velux window within the kitchen family room. This will give us direct sight into this room from our upstairs windows. For this reason we oppose this detail. • What is the proposal to gain access to maintain the Roof Valley? • What is the proposal to allow us access to maintain the back of our boundary fence? • I am concerned that the design has not taken into consideration any future maintenance requirements that the new development may need and causing possible future disputes once the extension is built. <u>Storm / Foul Drainage</u> • Currently the storm water from the two garages is collected with a down pipe shown on drawing 03. No indication is shown on the proposed plan or elevation drawings how the storm water from the neighbour's garage will be collected on the new purposed development. What is the proposal to collect the rain water from the neighbour's garage? • Drawing 07 shows the high level rain water guttering outside the properties boundary, if this is the case we oppose this detail. • Drawing 05 shows the new SVP located within the dining room goes to an external manhole, it would appear this is against the flow direction of the

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	main foul run. • Drawing 05 shows the SVP within study & WC/ shower going to a proposed new manhole to outside the boundary of the property. This falls within our garden. As we have not been approached to discuss this matter we do not approve of this element of the proposed works. • What is the proposal to remove surface water within the 250mm gap between the proposed 2 storey extension and the neighbour's garage? <u>Footings</u> • Drawing 07 shows the footing construction to be 1m deep and the edge of the footing will be 100mm from the boundary. What is the proposal to prevent partial collapse along the boundary line of the neighbours garage and our fence?

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	<u>Objection</u> on the grounds of overdevelopment and concern regarding the parking impact
Transport & Engineering	<u>Holding objection</u> The proposals retain a 3-bed dwelling, which in accordance to the EBC Parking Standards requires a minimum of 2 on-site parking spaces. Whilst these are currently catered for, the loss of the garage will result in only one driveway space remaining. As such, with on-road parking issues being reported, and also the site sitting between a bend and a highway junction, revised plans showing an extended driveway to accommodate a minimum of 2 vehicles are requested. Once received and assessed, if they are agreeable, Condition E04 should also be applied.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within HRA Screening 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: 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 Documents: Quality Places & Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not Within Detailed Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

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 AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	X	

- Comments regarding car parking, overlooking into the adjoining dwellings and the amount of development are noted and these issues will be considered in the assessment section.
- Having visited the site, it is noted that the front of the neighbouring two storey houses are in a line with this property and only the single storey element comes further forwards. The neighbour is correct in that this is an error on the drawing. However, this will not affect the overall assessment of the proposal.
- The technical questions regarding the building process, access, footings, drainage and future maintenance are not material planning considerations and so cannot be taken into account in assessing the application. It is understood that drainage and footing will be looked at as part of the building control application.

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.

Policy 104.T of the Local Plan states that planning permission will only be granted for appropriate development, which provides adequate off highway parking up to the maximum standard set out in respect to the accessibility of that development.

Character and Appearance

The design of the two and single storey extensions are messy. The two storey element is set back with a double pitched roof in contrast to both of the single storey elements that have a combination of pitched and flat roofs sections. The proposal has been designed to reduce the bulk of the large extension, but instead results in an awkward feature that does not sit comfortably with what is a fairly simply designed two storey house and garage. The proposal bares little relationship to the lines and design of the existing house and adjoining buildings and as such will significantly detract from the appearance of the property.

Furthermore, due to the spacing between the buildings, the side elevation is fully visible when approaching the cul-de-sac and is the first property viewed when entering Navigator Way. Therefore not only will the proposal detract from the appearance of the house, it will also create a unattractive and incongruous addition to the Chichester Close street scene, which is at odds with the 1970's/ 80's character and pattern of development of the housing estate.

For these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029) and guidance contained with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Quality Places SPD.

Residential Amenity

The proposal will sit along the boundary with Navigator Way with the 7m deep two storey element positioned almost directly behind the rear bedroom and lounge windows in no.1. The proposed two storey extension will bring the house 2.5m closer to this neighbour so that there will only be a distance of 8m separating the two buildings. In this position the two storey extension will detract from the outlook of the main rooms in the neighbouring house and make the property appear more enclosed.

While the neighbours rear windows may continue to receive just enough daylight (as set out within Quality Places SPD), this is not the case for the neighbours garden that is sandwiched between the two houses. The garden is within 30 degrees of due north and is already heavily overshadowed by neighbours house, the gardens length being significantly under the council's minimum 12m garden length (as set out within page 30 of Quality Places SPD). As such the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

neighbour's garden already suffers from a serve lack of sunlight and the proximity of the two storey extension will also result in a loss of daylight, making it feel even darker and enclosed.

For these reasons, the proposal is considered to unacceptably harm the amenity of the residents of 1 Navigator Way. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029) and guidance contained with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Quality Places SPD.

Car Parking

The council requires all dwellings with three bedrooms to provide two on site car parking spaces (as set out within Residential Parking Standards SPD). This is particularly important in areas where there is a reported issue with on street car parking, as outlined within the third party letters and Transportation Officer consultation response. While the property currently has two on site car parking spaces, one will be lost though the garage conversion and the second will be compromised as the front extension encroaches onto the existing driveway. The dwelling will be left with a reduced frontage and no information has been submitted to demonstrate that the property can safely accommodate the required two on site car parking spaces. Without adequate car parking the proposal is considered to pose a risk to highway safety, particularly as the property is situated between a bend and a highway junction.

For these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policies 59.BE & 104.T of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2001-2011), Policies DM1 & DM24 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029) and guidance contained with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Residential Parking Standards SPD.

Other Considerations

- The proposal does not introduce any first floor windows on the side elevation, which would look directly into the neighbouring properties along Navigator Way. Instead it adds windows on the front and rear elevations, which are not considered to cause significantly more overlooking than the windows on the existing property.
- The front and rear extensions are single storey and as such are not considered to materially harm the residential amenities of the adjoining neihgbours (by way of a loss of light, outlook or overlooking).
- The householder 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 even though it falls inside the designated zone of impact.

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

Recommend Refuse