MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/11/68424

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Single storey rear extension 32 Selwyn Gardens Eastleigh SO50 4PX

SITE VISIT DATE	28/02/11			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	This application seeks approval to construct a 2.0m deep x 6.41m wide x 3.5m high rear extension					
SITE AREA						
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	N/A					
TOPOGRAPHY	x	Level				
TREES	x	No				
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	x	1.8m high fence				
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	No, 32 is the bottom flat of 32/33 Selwyn Gardens consisting of a side entrance and rear garden, accessed via a footpath off Selwyn Gardens and backing onto the Selwyn Garage Court.					
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area backing onto the shopping area of Boyatt Wood shops. Within ELAC 31 character area consisting of 1970/80s terraced/semis on multiheaded cul de sacs. A few of the semis have had rear additions previously.					

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Lynda Woodford, 33 Selwyn Gardens	I own the property above 32 Selwyn Gardens (no 33). I don't live there personally but it is rented out to tenants. Whilst I have no objection to the extension being built (so long as it doesn't adversely impact my tenants in any way once under development is underway e.g. they can still access the garden at the end of the footpath that runs alongside both properties), I do wish to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:- 1. The roof will be attached to my property on the wall above the floor

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	screed and effectively cuts off any access I have to those walls. 2. The cavity wall will be cut into thereby creating a risk that my property could be damaged if the work was not carried out correctly.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
NIL	

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE (Development Criteria),
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Eastleigh Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

N/A

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPS 1 - Delivering Sustainability

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, nature conservation, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	See below		None received

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	See below		None received

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

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.

Layout and design

The development site consists of a ground floor flat development, with a rear amenity space. The proposal seeks to extend the kitchen and bedroom of the flat by 2.0m deep and comprising of a lean to roof reaching 3.5m in height. While such a development is not usually encourage on flats and maisonettes, I consider that the design and appearance of the extension is in keeping with the regular blocks of semis and their associated rear additions, in which the development site sits. Therefore the design of the proposed extension is considered acceptable. In terms of siting, subject to meeting the appropriate party wall issues with the neighbour, the development is considered appropriate and sympathetic to the appearance of the existing property.

Street scene and character of the area

The development is sited to the rear of the property and only accessed via a footpath. Therefore I do not consider that the development will be notably visible within the street scene and due to its appropriate siting and design and its sympathetic relationship with surrounding development, the proposal is considered congruous to the character and appearance of the area.

Residential amenity

To assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh has been produced which gives guidance on over looking, loss of light and amenity space for new dwellings. Upon drawing a 45° line from the back of the extension and the top of the eaves where the roof meets the rear wall of the extension, the development just meets both tests on loss of light and outlook. In addition the north facing orientation of the extension exacerbates the fact that loss of sunlight to the neighbouring property of No, 30 will be minimal. Therefore subject to meeting the civil issues raised by the neighbour, I do not consider that the development will adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring properties and therefore the development complies with the criteria of Policy 59.BE

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to permit