HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/75589

DESCRIPTION	First floor side extension & single storey rear extension
ADDRESS	30 Holly Gardens West End Southampton SO30 3RW

SITE VISIT DATE	30 December 2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks approval for the development as described above. The proposed flat-roof single storey extension which is to provide for an open-plan kitchen/dining and family area as well as for a separate study, measures 3.19m in depth and will span the full width of the property's rear elevation. The first floor extension will sit above the property's existing single storey garage and utility area which adjoins its western side elevation. This extension is to allow for the enlargement of one of the property's existing bedrooms as well as for the creation of an associated dressing room and en-suite.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site slopes gently down from east to west as well as from south to north.
TREES	There is a conifer tree to the rear of the plot which is situated in the vicinity of the boundary with No. 32 Holly Gardens and which is proposed to be removed in order to facilitate the construction of the single storey rear extension. This tree is not covered by a Tree Preservation Order and is considered to be of only limited amenity value. There will be no other trees affected by the development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The property's rear garden is surrounded by timber panel fencing on all sides with there being a length of conifer hedging in addition to this along the eastern side boundary. The site has a fairly open frontage onto Holly Gardens.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	No. 30 Holly Gardens is a modern, detached, four-bedroom dwelling set on a fairly prominent plot within the road. The property is constructed of red brick with it having concrete roof tiles and white fenestration. Off-road parking is provided by way of a driveway to the front as well as an attached single garage. There is an area of private amenity space which is predominantly laid to lawn to the rear of the property.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site falls within an established residential area and forms part of a modern housing estate of predominantly detached, two-storey dwellings set within multi-headed cul-de-sacs. A number of properties within the wider area have previously been extended; most notably No. 32 Holly Gardens (to the immediate west of the site) by way of a two-storey side addition, and No. 29 which has been extended at first floor

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	level in a similar manner to the that proposed as part of this application.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Application Dwelling (30 Holly Gardens, West End)		
Z/29910/004/00	OUTLINE: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, OPEN SPACE, CEMETERY, LANDSCAPING ACOUSTIC MOUNDS, DISTRIBUTOR ROAD AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES	GRANT OUTLINE CONSENT – 24/06/1988
Z/29910/010/00	RESERVED MATTERS: LANDSCAPING SCHEME	APPROVE RESERVE MATTERS – 13/12/1989
Z/29910/014/00	ERECTION OF 49 DETACHED HOUSES, LAYING OUT OF ROADS AND FOOTPATHS. (APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS) (OUTLINE PERMISSION REF. 29910/4 DATED 24JUN 1988)	APPROVE RESERVE MATTERS – 17/05/1990
29 Holly Gardens, West End		
Z/36345/001	Construction of first floor side extension	PERMIT – 20/04/2000
32 Holly Gardens, West End		
Z/40238/000	Two storey side extension	PERMIT – 10/10/2003

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 Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area – *HEWEB 62* (Summary Description Only):

"1980s to present day terraced/semi-detached/detached development on multi-headed cul-de-sacs on the northern edge of West End"

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

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

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Of particular relevance to this application are *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; and S*ection 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 obligation requirements associated with this application.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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

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.

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 development is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with the requirements of Saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 in this respect.

The gable ended design of the first floor extension is visually sympathetic to the host dwelling whilst at the same time not unduly detracting from the prominence of the larger two-storey gable feature at its eastern end. The resulting property will also not be excessive in terms of its scale relative to neighbouring dwellings and as noted earlier in this report, similar such developments have previously been undertaken at other properties within Holly Gardens. Most notably these include No. 32, as well as No. 29 further to the south of the site which has had a virtually identical addition to that which forms part of this submission. Whilst having a notable impact upon the property's front elevation and being visible from the road to the front therefore, it is considered that the proposed first floor extension is in-keeping with both the character of the street scene as well as that of the immediate surrounding area.

The proposed single storey rear extension raises no concerns in terms of its design or scale and being situated to the rear of the dwelling it will have no notable impact upon the Holly Gardens street scene. The property will also retain a good sized area of rear amenity space such that the proposals will not result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

Residential amenity:

The development will not unduly impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring residential dwellings and the application is considered to accord with the requirements of Saved policy 59.BE (vii.) of the adopted Local Plan in this respect.

The single storey extension is modest in depth at 3.19m and is relatively low-level in height owing to its flat-roof design. It is stepped in from the western side boundary of the plot by 1.7m and will project only approximately 2m beyond the rear elevation of No. 32 Holly Gardens. It is also set at a distance of at least 8m from the rear boundary of the plot. As such, it is not considered that it will be in any way overbearing, or result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook for the occupiers of either No. 32 Holly Gardens to the west or No. 28 to the north, nor will any undue loss of privacy

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

occur.

With regards to the first floor side extension, this will be situated immediately alongside and will not project beyond the two-storey side extension at No. 32 Holly Gardens. Whilst this property's eastern elevation does contain a single window at both ground and first floor levels, these are small secondary windows within the rooms that they serve with the upper of the two also being obscure glazed. As such any potential reduction in light to them which may occur as a result of the proposals would not in this case be sufficient to justify the refusal of the application. Finally, whilst the extension does provide for a further rear facing first floor window which may allow for views into neighbouring gardens, it is not considered that this is an unacceptable arrangement in a built-up residential area. Notwithstanding this, the window will serve a bathroom and it is likely that the applicants would wish for it to be obscure-glazed anyway to protect their own privacy.

Highway matters:

Whilst the proposals will create additional floorspace at the property's ground and first floor levels, they will not impact upon the level of on-site car parking necessitated or currently available. As a four-bedroom dwelling the Council's Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document stipulates that three off-road spaces should be provided. These are currently accommodated on the property's driveway to the front, with a further space being available within the attached single garage. As such the application is considered to accord with 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.