HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/76657

DESCRIPTION	Construction of single storey rear extension & detached garage/store, following removal of existing conservatory
ADDRESS	9 Rogers Close, Bishopstoke, Eastleigh, SO50 6EB

SITE VISIT DATE	4/8/15
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	• The application is proposing a single storey rear extension and erection of a detached garage • The single storey rear extension would project 5 metres adjacent to number 8, and 2.3 metres in depth at the other side. It would extend 3.7 metres in width and 2.9 metres in height • The garage would project 7.1 metres in depth, extend 3.2 metres and 3.5 metres in height
TOPOGRAPHY	• No noticeable changes in level
TREES	• No trees will be affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	• Approximate 1.5 metre tall fence and wall
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	• The application site contains a semi-detached bungalow which has been extended • At the front elevation there is sufficient parking for 4 vehicles • There is access to the rear from the side garden • There are two sheds/garages on the boundary of the drive at the side and a summer house
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	• The immediate surrounding area contains similar style of bungalows

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
10 Rogers Close	Firstly, I would like to clarify that the Ordanance Survey map forwarded to the planners for use to determine this application is incorrect. The footprint of the building presented is the original plan and shows no evidence of the current bungalow extension and existing garage. I would like to say that I have no concerns regarding the proposed alterations to the bungalow itself, but I do have objections to the proposed garage / store. As per the achitect's drawings, there is no given height measurement. But from the plans it appears the roof ridge height of the proposed replacement garage would be equal, or, of a similar height to the existing bungalow extension, ie between 4-4.2 metres high. The boundary flank wall (being 2.4metres high) is going to run along my boundary for a total length of 7.0 metres. Historically, the main reason why I purchased my bungalow was for the aspect of the garden, knowing it was North facing but with the sun setting in the west bringing sunlight to my rear garden and rear of my property during afternoon/evening. I feel the proposed structure will drastically impinge on the amount of daylight and create a visual barrier over 4.0 metres high and 7 metres long along the boundary, casting a large block of shadow and thus remove the pleasure I experience from my garden. Looking at the proposals, I am additionally concerned that if you consider the total length of the individual buildings/structures ie. proposed garage, existing shed and recently erected summer house, being of an approximate length of 14 metres directly adjacent to my boundary, I consider this to be an over development.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BST	No comment

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 policy 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 (2011)

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

NA

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

NA

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

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

The dimensions are found by using the given scale. The overall height of the garage will be 3.5 metres, it is acknowledged that the depth of the garage would be large, however should the applicant reduce the height by 0.5 metres they can erect the garage using the properties permitted development rights. It is not known the overall length off the existing three structures on site, though the neighbour has stated that they amount to 14 metres. The garage proposed would replace two of these structures, therefore the perceived harm albeit a pitch roof is proposed would be less than what is currently on site.

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

Saved 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.

Impact upon the Character and Appearance

The proposed single storey rear extension would create a dog leg style of extension and would be 2 metres greater in depth than the existing conservatory. It is considered that the overall scale and mass would result in a proportionate addition which would not have undue harm to the host dwelling.

The proposed garage would replace the existing garages and would be visible from the front elevation where the most significant change would be the pitched roof. Owing to the set back of the proposed garage it is not considered there would be any undue harm to the streetscene.

Residential Amenity.

The proposed single storey rear extension would not be visible to the neighbours eitherside, as number 8's projects to approximately the same depth as the one proposed by the host dwelling and owing to the proposed garage, the proposed single storey rear extension would be shielded from view.

Likewise the impact from the garages to number 8 would not be significantly different to what is already experienced.

The occupier of number 10 has raised concerns about the garage and how it would affect their outlook and level received. The comments have been addressed but it is worth noting that the impact to their outlook and light would not be significantly different to what is already experienced.

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

The single storey rear extension and detached garage represents a suitably designed householder extension which would not result in undue to the host dwelling, streetscene, or to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is in accordance with Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policy 59.BE, Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, policy DM1, Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011).