**HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/10/67639**

| | |
|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION | Two storey side extension & attached single garage & porch |
| ADDRESS | Pinewood Lowford Hill Bursledon SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8ER |

| | |
|---|---|
| SITE VISIT DATE | 31.08.10 |
| ARE PLANS ACCURATE? | Yes |
| HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? | Yes |

**THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

| | |
|---|---|
| DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION | The proposed porch and garage would measure 4.3m in width by 5.3m and the rear part of the extension would measure 4.7m by 8.3m. Amended plans have been submitted that show the provision of 2 spaces on the drive, with one in the garage. Access to bins is via the internal garage. |
| TOPOGRAPHY | The ground level is lower rises as you enter the site. |
| TREES | No trees to be affected. |
| BOUNDARY TREATMENT | Brick walls to front and side with neighbour. |
| SITE CHARACTERISTICS | Semi detached two storey property with access to the property on the side of the building, side drive and parking area and relatively medium sized rear garden. |
| CHARACTER OF LOCALITY | Residential, largely a mix of detached and semi detached. |

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

| REFERENCE | DESCRIPTION | DECISION |
|---|---|---|
| None found | | |

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| None received. | |
| | |

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| BUR | Do not object |
| ENG | Objection on grounds of insufficient vehicle and cycle parking.<br><br>Under the proposals, the dwelling size is to be increased from 3 to 4 bedrooms. Accordingly, the parking standards requirement will increase from 2 to 3 vehicle parking spaces an provision for two cycle parking spaces.<br>The plans show enough room for only two vehicle parking spaces (1 drive / 1 garage), however a third will need to be demonstrated on the plans - seems |

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | feasible via removal of a small proportion of the front garden. In regard to cycle parking, as the garage dimensions are below 3.0 x 6.0m, there will be insufficient room for both the vehicle and cycle storage. As such, a separate storage facility will be required (shed), measuring a minimum of 1.0 x 2.0m.<br><br>If these parking issues can be resolved and included on the drawings, I would be happy to reconsider my objection.<br><br>**********<br><br>**Amended Plans Received:**<br><br>No objection providing the alterations to the front of the property to provide two driveway spaces as shown are completed.<br><br>**DC Engineer:** Eric Reed<br><br>**DC Engineer**<br><br>1) As Matt's comments, proposals affect parking layout. The scheme needs amending to provide parking for 3 cars and maintain clear access for pedestrians to reach front door.<br>2) Also, what are bin storage arrangements? The new garage blocks off the back garden access path.<br><br>**Amended plans 20 October 2010**<br>1) Parking is ok<br>2) The plans seem to show a side path that is only about 400mm wide between the boundary wall brick pillars and new garage side wall--- that will not be wide enough to fit the wheeled bins through the gap. The garage is not wide enough to fit bins past a parked car. So how is it envisaged to get bins in and out -- may be better to have a bin store at front of property behind the front boundary<br><br>**Email from applicant 11 Nov 2010**<br><br>I attach our revised drawing to show route of bins through garage and also an alternative location for bins. The wall of the garage is 530mm from the brick boundary wall, this narrows by 100mm where there is a pier in the wall. |
| HEH | Advise applicant about the site being located adjacent to a former excavation site. Hours of work and no burning conditions. |

**POLICY CONTEXT**

| DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE |
|---|
| Within Built-up Area Boundary<br>Within Established Residential Area |

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh
Supplementary Planning Guidance:Storage and Collection of Domestic Waste & Recyclable Materials
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Biodiversity

**CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA**

| |
|---|
| Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area – 56 (no criteria) |

**SPECIAL POLICY AREA**

| |
|---|
| n/a |

**PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| PPG<br>PPS | -<br>- | <br>1 Delivering Sustainable Development |

**POLICY COMMENTARY**

| |
|---|
| The above policies 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 | | See below | x | |
| Other … The amenity protection conditions are considered to be too onerous for a development of this size. The land use note to applicant will be added. | | | | |

**COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| x | None received | | See below | | |
| Other … | | | | | |

**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:-<br><br>"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.

The size and design of the extensions are considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality. Plans have been amended to show a better positioning of the garage that was originally shown hard up to the boundary of the site. The plans now show a gap of 0.53m reducing down to 0.43 at the point of the pillars. The design of the extension is in keeping with the design of the property. The first floor element would be set back 3.2m and the garage 0.8m. The layout plan now incorporates the provision of parking spaces and bin storage. The layout of the parking spaces show a clear path to the front door, and 2 alternative arrangements for bins have been shown. The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

There would not be an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking due to the siting of the proposals. The two storey element would sit against the existing property and the single storey extension would be in line with the existing single storey rear extension. Having carried out a 45 degree light test in accordance with the guidance contained in the Borough's Residential Amenity document, the application would not fail in relation to impacting daylighting to neighbouring properties. With regards to the 25 degree test, although the test demonstrates that the neighbouring property would be affected, this would only be by a small amount. On this basis and giving consideration to the height of the extension being set lower than the existing ridgeline, the orientation of properties and distance of the extension then it is not considered reasonable to refuse the application on the grounds of a resulting loss of light to the adjoining property at Oakleigh. As the two storey extension would be set 8.2m then 9.5m from the side of this neighbouring property, then an overbearing impact is not considered from the development. The extension would not impact upon the main usable amenity space that serves the neighbouring property.

The development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

**OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

It is considered that there is/are no other/other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

**CONCLUSION**

Recommend approval.