HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/77998

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, front porch, and new parking space to front of property, along with dropped kerb
ADDRESS	18A Bursledon Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 0BR

SITE VISIT DATE	21 March 2016
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 northern side of the dwelling, along with a single-storey extension to the rear. The proposals also include the provision of a front porch, as well as a dropped kerb on Bursledon Road along with an associated frontage car parking space.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site slopes up from front to back and from north to south in line with the general gradient of this section of Bursledon Road.
TREES	There will be no trees affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The site frontage has a low-level wall to its northern and eastern sides with there being dense hedging to the boundary with the adjoining dwelling. The property's rear garden is surrounded by a mixture of timber fencing and hedging.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application property is a two-storey, three-bedroom, semi-detached dwellinghouse situated to the western side of Bursledon Road. The property is of red-brick construction with tile-hanging to part of the upper section of its front elevation. There is private amenity space to the rear which is predominantly laid to lawn, with there being a detached single garage to the rear.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site falls within an established residential area formed of a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellinghouses of a range of periods and designs.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
18a Bursledon Road		
None		
18b Bursledon Road		
Z/18749/001	2 storey side extension	PERMIT – 26/08/1983
18749/002	Construction of single storey front extension	PERMIT – 14/06/1996

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
18 Bursledon Road	Objection on the grounds of visual intrusion, loss of light, overdevelopment, external design, layout and appearance.
18b Bursledon Road	The occupier of No. 18b raised concerns that the single storey rear extension would prevent access to their conservatory for the purposes of cleaning as well as restrict their ability to install soffits and guttering to the property in future.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	No objection.
Head of Transportation and Engineering	Holding objection. Whilst the development proposal increases off-road parking options (without losing off-road options), from plans received it would appear that development will result in a 4-bed dwelling with 2 on-site parking spaces. In line with the EBC Parking Standards, a minimum of 3 on-site parking spaces will be required. It is noted however that there is adequate space on the front garden (approx. 7.3m x 8.5m) to further convert some more of this area in order to provide the 3 required spaces – 2 at the front and 1 to the rear. If revised plans can be submitted showing this, a re-assessment can be undertaken accordingly. If suitable, condition E04 will be required. It is not anticipated that there will be drainage issues. The extension will need to route into existing drainage services.

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 Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area:

The site falls within the area *HEWEB 28.* The Council's adopted character appraisal document sets out the following guidance principles for new development in this area:

- Maintain the importance of the recreation ground and the associated semi-mature / mature broadleaved tree planting.
- Maintain the importance of the views of the Church of St John the Evangelist.
- Mitigate the effects of the heavy vehicular traffic on St Johns Road and Bursledon Road in new development using measures such as boundary planting, set backs, transition spaces and orientation of internal spaces.

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 proposed, layout and design, residential amenity, highway matters, and the impact of the proposals on the street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	X	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received		See below		
Other – the issues raised by the occupier of No. 18b Bursledon Road concerning access to their property and conservatory are in this case considered to be civil issues between respective private land owners. They are therefore not considered to be material to the determination of this application. The issues raised in respect of residential amenity are considered in the below assessment of the proposals.				

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

There are no planning obligations requirements associated with this application.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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."

Development Plan Policies:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011):

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, a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, provision to be made for refuse and cycle storage, and development to 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 impact upon the character of the area:

Saved Policy 59.BE (i) of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011 requires that development takes full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality or neighbourhood and that it is appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stipulates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning (para 56).

The proposals are considered to be acceptable in this respect. The additions to the rear, front and northern side of the dwelling are each proportionate in size and scale to the main property and are visually complementary in terms of their design. Amended plans have been received to alter the roof form of the side extension, such that this is now fully hipped rather than being a gable as originally proposed. This serves to reduce the overall bulk and massing of the resulting roof and replicates the roof form of the extension previously undertaken to the adjoining property. The dropped kerb and frontage car parking space raise no particular concerns on layout or design grounds, with this being similar to the arrangements at the neighbouring dwellings in this part of Bursledon Road. As such, it is considered that the additions are both complementary to the host building and respectful of the character of the street scene. The property will also retain a good sized area of private amenity space and the proposals will not therefore result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

Residential amenity:

Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) requires that development avoids unduly impacting upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, in particular by way of overbearing impact, loss of light or

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

outlook, and overlooking. In this regard and owing to the siting of the development and the application property itself, the main considerations concern the impact of the proposals upon the amenity of the occupiers of those neighbouring properties immediately either side of the site.

In respect of the adjoining property (No. 18b) first of all, the two-storey side extension is fully screened by the main application property itself and the front porch is set at a good distance from the shared boundary such that these elements will not have any unacceptable impact upon the amenity of its occupiers. The rear extension is also single storey in height and projects a modest 2.3m from the application dwelling's rear elevation. As a result, it is not considered that it would be unduly overbearing, or cause an unacceptable loss of light or outlook. There are also no side facing windows within the rear extension and no undue overlooking will therefore result.

With regards to the property to the north, No. 18 Bursledon Road, whilst the objections raised are noted, again it is not considered that the impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of this property would be unacceptable or contrary to the provisions of Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) or the associated guidance contained within the Council's adopted Quality Places SPD. The single-storey extension to the rear is, as noted above, modest in depth and owing to the relative siting of the two dwellings will project only very marginally beyond the rear elevation of No. 18. The front porch is also limited in scale and a good degree of separation is afforded to the shared boundary. Whilst the side extension is of a two-storey height and is sited much closer to the boundary, it is set alongside the neighbouring property which has only secondary windows (in the form of a kitchen door at ground floor level) or those serving non-habitable spaces (in the form of a stairwell at first floor level) present in its facing elevation. As such, it is not deemed that any resulting loss of light or outlook from or to these would be sufficient to justify the refusal of the application. There are no amenity related concerns in respect of the proposed dropped kerb or frontage car parking.

For the reasons given, the application is therefore deemed to comply with the requirements of Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) of the adopted Local Plan.

Highway matters:

Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) requires that development provides a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles which includes an acceptable level of on-site car parking provision in accordance with the requirements of the Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Council's Head of Transportation and Engineering has raised concerns in relation to an increase in the number of bedrooms relative to the number of available car parking spaces. There is, however, no increase in the overall number of bedrooms which is to remain at a total of 3. As such, there is no associated requirement for additional parking provision, notwithstanding which, the application includes a dropped kerb and frontage car parking space. This new means of access is acceptable from a highway safety perspective and as such there is therefore deemed to be no conflict with the provisions of Saved Policy 59.BE (v.).

Conclusion:

Overall for the reasons as set out above, the development is considered to comply with the relevant development plan policies, associated supplementary planning documents, and national planning policy.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made 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 withdrawn the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. 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.