HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/77130

DESCRIPTION	Single storey front extension, enlargement of garage, erection of 1.8m high boundary fence and formation of driveway to front
ADDRESS	14 Grace Dieu Gardens Bursledon Southampton SO31 8GJ

SITE VISIT DATE	9.10.15
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Single storey front extension forming a porch measuring a depth of 2.3 metres and a maximum height of 3.6 metres under a pitched roof. The proposed porch will replace the existing canopy over front door. The enlargement of garage will be from a single to a double garage with a double width driveway in front. The erection of a 1.8m high boundary fence to enclose all of the applicants side garden. The proposed fence extends hard up against the pavement enclosing the existing grassed verge which forms part of the application site. The formation of a single width driveway covering the front garden to the north side of the concrete path. The driveway will adjoin the diagonal pedestrian footway to the front of the site. Amended plans were submitted to include a proposed log burner flue positioned on the rear roof slope. The flue measures 0.3 metres above the ridge line of the roof and as such is permitted development under Part 1, Class G of the GPDO 2015 and does not require an application for planning permission. For this reason, the proposed flue does not form part of the assessment of this application.
TOPOGRAPHY	Steep downward gradient from the front to rear of the site.
TREES	None.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.8 metre high fence to side and rear of site. No boundary treatment with no.13 at the front of the site.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	2 storey semi-detached dwelling house situated on a corner plot to the east of junction with Lionheart Way. Relatively deep front garden. A 2 storey side extension is recessed back from the front elevation of the dwelling leaving a gap of 2.5 metres to the boundary. An existing detached single garage faces onto Lionheart Way and adjoins the rear boundary with 122 Lionheart Way.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Long estate roads and cul de sac comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/05/53045	2 storey side extension	Approved – March 2005.
Z/24714/001/00	Relocation of boundary fence	Approved – Nov 1980.
Z/24714/000/00	Relocation of boundary fence	Refused – Oct 1980.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
N/A	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BUR	Object on the following grounds:- • Highway Safety issues including restriction of visibility. • Impact on Street Scene as it is out of character with the existing area.
ENG	Object due to siting of frontage parking space - too close to the junction of Grace Dieu Gardens and Lionheart Way. Rear parking layout acceptable.

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.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'

Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Character Area Appraisals – Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice & Hound (ELAC 50)

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not within a Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

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, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	X	
The presence of the lighting column and BT box are both off site and as such do not need to be surveyed as part of the existing proposed plans. A full on site assessment can establish their presence. Notwithstanding this, the issue regarding their relocation is not a material planning consideration. Furthermore, the formation of a new access and enlargement of an existing access will require separate consent from the highway authority. The remaining concerns raised by both the highway engineer and the parish council are addressed in the main considerations section below.				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received	X	See below		
N/A					

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.

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.

Layout/Design: The enlarged garage will cover over an existing paved patio area. It is considered that the enlarged garage will not significantly reduce the amount of garden space. The front porch is of a single storey height and set down beneath the first floor windows. It is considered to be of proportionate scale to the host dwelling.

The single storey front extension is considered subservient in scale, mass and height to the two storey dwelling house. The front extension is wider than a porch as it comprises both a porch and downstairs W/C. The dual pitched roof provides a perception of even greater width. However, the dwelling house has a 2 storey side extension which has increased its overall width. Furthermore, the dwelling house is set behind a deep front garden area and as such the proposed extension will be of a proportionate size and massing to both the host dwelling and plot.

Residential Amenity: The proposed front extension is single storey and set away from the boundary of the adjacent property by 2 metres. Given the scale, height and siting of the extension it is considered that it will not unacceptably impact on the residential amenity of no.13 Grace Dieu Gardens by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact.

The neighbouring property of no.122 Lionheart Way is to the east of the garage on lower ground. The proposed extension is to the western end of the garage and thus, positioned away from the eastern boundary. The enlargement of the garage is to create a double width and does not increase the height or depth. Thus, the proposed enlarged garage will not have an unacceptable impact residential amenity of no.122 Lionheart Way.

The proposed 1.8 metre high fence adjoins the highway and is sited away from any neighbouring properties. Furthermore, a 1.8 metre high fence that adjoins neighbours is permitted development under Part 2, Class A of the GPDO.

It is considered therefore that the proposals would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking due to the fact that the proposals are of a small scale.

Street Scene/Character Area:

The enlargement will not substantially increase the size of the garage which is set back from the road by approximately 8 metres. Thus, given the resultant size and the siting of the garage it is considered that it will not appear particularly noticeable within the street scene.

The immediate surrounding properties within Grace Dieu Gardens have lean to canopies over their front entrance doors. The dwelling houses along Lionheart Way have larger lean to front porches. Thus, the introduction of a porch is considered acceptable within this street scene. Whilst the proposed porch has a dual pitched roof as opposed to the mono-pitched roofs of the existing porches within the road, it is considered that this would not appear incongruous within the street scene. The proposed porch is considered to be of a small scale and height. The proposed porch is positioned on the front elevations set back from the road behind a deep front garden on lower

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

ground. Thus, the proposed porch will not appear overly dominant within the street scene.

This part of the road features dwelling houses set behind long open front gardens. The corner plots within this part of the road have 1.8 metre fences that are set back from the edge of pavement providing a strip of grass verge. There are grass verges which extend up to the road on either side of the junction of Lionheart Way and Grace Dieu Gardens with the pavements further back. The set back of the fences and the open front boundaries provides visible spaces that create an open, spacious and verdant character along this part of the road. The proposal to relocate the 1.8 metre fence to extend hard up against the pavement enclosing the grass verge is considered detrimental to the street scene. Thus, proposed relocation of the fence will introduce an enclosing form that will reduce the amount of visible space disrupting the sense of openness that is intrinsic to the character of this part of the road.

The enlargement of the existing driveway within the rear of the site is permitted development subject to it providing direct run off water from the hard surface under Part 1, Class F of the GPDO 2015. Equally, the formation of a driveway to the front is permitted development subject to it providing direct run off water from the hard surface under Part 1, Class F of the GPDO 2015. The formation of a new access onto an unclassified road is permitted development under Part 2, Class B of the GPDO 2015. However, in conjunction with the proposed relocation of the boundary fence, the increase in hard standing will result in a more built up character dominated by hard edges and features. Taking into consideration that the site is on a prominent corner plot, it is considered that this change in character will appear incongruous within this verdant and attractive street scene.

However, as stated above, this is permitted development and whilst not supported for the reasons above; there is no scope within planning to prevent this change. However, it should be noted that the enlargement and formation of an access onto the road does require consent from the highway authority.

Highway Safety:

The extension of the 1.8 metre fence flanking the driveway where it is at right angles to the highway could be done under Part 2, Class A of the General Permitted Development Order 2015. Furthermore, there will be infrequent number of vehicle movements from this driveway. Due to a lack of maneuverability space, the likelihood is that the driver will reverse onto Lionheart Way and will have restricted vision due to their position within the vehicle in relation to the access. When reversing a driver would therefore have to adopt a cautionary manner when exiting the driveway. Thus, it is not considered that the proposed 1.8 metre fence will pose a significant risk to highway safety. It is worth adding that the highway engineer has not raised any concerns regarding the relocation of the 1.8 metre fence. Thus, it is not considered that the relocation of the 1.8 metre fence will result in a significant impact to highway safety.

As stated above, the formation of the driveway to the front is permitted development and therefore, does not require an application for planning permission. Whilst the concerns raised by the highway engineer are acknowledged, the issues cannot be assessed within the scope of this planning application. The formation of the access would require an application for consent from the highway authority. The issues raised by the engineer would therefore form part of the assessment of this application.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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 not considered to comply with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE and emerging Policy DM1 and is therefore recommended for refusal for the following reason:-

(1) The proposed fence, by way of its height and siting, would significantly reduce the visible open space within the corner plot with an unwelcome and enclosing form disrupting the sense of openness to the detriment of the spacious and verdant character of the locality. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review [2001-2011].