HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/76781

DESCRIPTION	Two storey rear extension & conversion of garage into habitable accommodation
ADDRESS	2 Yew Tree Court Botley Road West End Southampton SO30 3JS

SITE VISIT DATE	06 August 2015
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	It is considered that sufficiently detailed information has been provided to allow for the assessment of the development proposed.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks approval for the construction of a two-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling to allow for the provision of additional ground floor living space as well as the enlargement of two of the property's existing first floor bedrooms. The extension measures 3.0375m in depth and will span the width of the rear elevation of the main dwelling. The proposals also include the conversion of the property's existing attached garage to a habitable room in the form of a kitchen and new entrance hallway.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site is relatively flat and level.
TREES	There will be no trees affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The property has a fairly open frontage onto the parking/turning area which serves both it as well as the two neighbouring dwellings. There is a brick wall and hedging marking the boundary of this area with Botley Road to the north.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	No. 2 Yew Tree Court is a detached, two-storey, four-bedroom dwelling with a gable-ended pitched roof. The property is constructed of red brick with concrete interlocking roof tiles and has off-road parking provided by way of an attached single-garage and hardstanding to the front of this. There is private amenity space to the rear which is predominantly laid to lawn.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site falls within the urban edge with residential properties bordering the site to the rear and to both sides. The dwelling is one a group of three to the southern side of Botley Road which are served by a shared vehicular access from the highway. There are commercial uses further to the east of the site with the Moorgreen Hospital (health care use) being situated to the opposing side of Botley Road.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
No. 2 Yew Tree Court		
Z/17633/001/00	Erection of 3 detached dwellings	GRANT OUTLINE PERMISSION –

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
		11/11/1977
Z/17633/002/00	Erection of three detached dwellings with garages	PERMIT – 19/01/1978
No. 1 Yew Tree Court		
Z/39606/001/00	Two storey rear extension	PERMIT – 23/04/2003
F/06/57183	First floor side extension and rear conservatory	PERMIT – 21/07/2006
F/06/58630	1st floor side extension, rear conservatory and conversion of garage into habitable room	PERMIT – 20/12/2006

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	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 Policy 59.BE.
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 Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area Appraisal:

The site falls within the area *HEWEB 16.* The Council's adopted appraisal document sets out the following guidance principles for new development in this area:

- Mitigate the effects of the heavy vehicular traffic on Botley Road in new development using measures such as boundary planting, set backs, transition spaces and orientation of internal spaces.
- Maintain the predominant plot widths.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site does not fall within a designated special policy area.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework:

Of particular relevance to this application are both paragraph 17 which *inter alia* states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, as well as *Section 7: Requiring good design* which stipulates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning; that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment; and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the principle of the development, its layout and design, residential amenity, highway matters, and the impact of the proposals on the character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		
Other – the comments of West End Parish Council are noted.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received	X	See below		
Other …				

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

There are no planning obligations consideration associated with this application.

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."

Development Plan Policies:

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 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.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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 planning documents and guidance.

Layout, design and the impact of the proposals upon the character of the area:

The application is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with the requirements of Saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan in this regard. The extension is not excessive in size or scale such that it represents a proportionate addition to the property in this respect. It has also been well designed so that it is visually sympathetic to the host building with the roof form of the main property and its external facing materials being replicated in the proposed development. Being situated to the rear, the extension will not have any significant impact upon the character of the street scene or that of the immediate surrounding area. In this regard it is noted that the proposals are not dissimilar to a rear extension previously undertaken at the neighbouring dwelling to the east, No. 1 Yew Tree Court. The property will also maintain a good sized rear garden such that the proposals will not result in the overdevelopment of the plot. The works to the garage and the associated enclosure of the adjoining front canopy do not in themselves require express planning permission and could separately be undertaken under Permitted Development, notwithstanding which the exterior alterations to the property that are associated with this are considered to be acceptable and in-keeping with the host building.

Residential amenity:

Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) requires that development avoids unduly impacting upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The main considerations in this regard concern the relationship of the development to those dwellings immediately either side of the application site, Nos. 1 and 3 Yew Tree Court respectively. It is considered that those properties to the rear are sited a sufficient distance from the extension, such that it will have no notable impact upon the amenity of their occupiers.

With regards to No. 1 first of all, taking account of the limited extent of the projection of the rear extension and the degree of separation to the shared boundary (2.2-2.5m) that will remain, it is not considered that the development would be unduly overbearing to its occupiers nor would it unacceptably reduce the levels of light to or outlook from No. 1's primary habitable windows. As there are no side facing windows in the extension's western elevation, there will also be no direct or undue overlooking.

Whilst again there will be no such overlooking in respect of No. 3 to the east for the same reason, it is acknowledged that the extension will be closer to the shared boundary with this property at a minimum distance of 1.1m to the closest point of its rear elevation. Following the conversion of this property's garage to habitable accommodation in the form of a study area, there are patio doors present within this part of the property and there is the potential for the development to impact to a degree upon the outlook and light to them. On balance, however, and taking account of the extension being sited due west of the neighbouring property, the study area not being considered to be a primary habitable room, the availability of light to it from the window to the front of what was formerly the garage, and no objection being raised to the proposals by the occupiers of No. 1, it is not considered that any such impact would be sufficient as to be in conflict with the aforementioned development plan policy (59.BE vii.) such as to justify the refusal of the application on these grounds.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

There will also be no undue impact upon neighbouring amenity resulting from the proposed garage conversion and as such the application is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Highway matters:

Whilst the proposed rear extension will provide for additional floor space at the property's first floor level, there will be no resulting increase in the overall number of bedrooms within the dwelling which will remain at four. As a result, there is no associated requirement for additional on-site car parking to be provided in line with the provisions of the Council's Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

It is accepted that the converting of the property's garage and the enclosing of the adjoining canopy will serve to reduce the currently available parking provision. As noted above, however, the converting of the garage in itself does not require express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and could otherwise be undertaken under Permitted Development. As such, it is not considered that it would be reasonable for the LPA to require replacement parking to be provided or to impose planning conditions to such an effect. Notwithstanding this, it is evident that additional parking can be provided to the front and that this is the intention of the applicants as shown on the submitted site layout plans.

For the reasons given, therefore, there is considered to be no conflict with the provisions of the Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards SPD or Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) of the adopted Local Plan which requires the provision of a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles.

Conclusion:

Overall, for the reasons as outlined above, the application is considered to comply with the requirements of the relevant development plan policies, associated supplementary planning guidance, and national planning policy.

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

It is recommended that planning permission be granted.