HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/13/73711

DESCRIPTION	First floor and two storey side extension
ADDRESS	3 Wylye Close West End Southampton SO18 3LF

SITE VISIT DATE	18/12/13
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	First floor/ two storey side extension partly over garage. Extension has a pitched roof, which is stepped down from the main house and is partially open at ground floor level. The extension measures 2.8m(w) by 6m(d) by 6.7m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	Gentle upwards slope towards rear garden
TREES	None
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	2m high close boarded fence
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached two storey house set in a small plot.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The house is the first in a row of two storey properties positioned in a cul-de-sac layout. On the other side of the property is a bungalow (no.2).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
3 letters of objection (Comments based on original plans)	• The extension will block light to no.2's conservatory and lounge and be visually obtrusive. It is only 1.1 metres from our lounge wall to their garage wall. • Change the visual appearance of the close. • Noise, mess and operators parking during construction period. Scaffolding will have to go up on the neighbours property. • Neighbour has ill health and spends a lot of time in the property. The extension will block the view from the front windows. • Extension will block the signal of the neighbours Sky dish. • The applicant should have brought a larger property. He is also away from the property a lot and doesn't need the extension.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	Objection – Extension is an overdevelopment of site, given the close proximity to neighbouring property.

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) 59.BE
Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029: DM1
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not within detailed Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

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, trees, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below		

The amount of development and impact on neighbours will be discussed in the assessment section.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	X	

- The affect on the appearance of the close and impact on neighbouring properties (in terms of light, overlooking etc) will be discussed in the assessment section. Although I am sympathetic to the loss of the neighbours view, this is not a material planning consideration.
- The proposal is for a householder extension and although there will be some level of disruption during the building process this is for a temporary period.
- The positioning of scaffolding, blocking of sky signal and the need for the extension are not material planning considerations.

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."

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.

Character and Appearance

The size and design of the first floor/ two storey side extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing house in that its matches its style, features, proportions and materials. The extension is stepped in and back from the main house and so appears subservient to the property and will not be prominent within the Hedley Gardens street scene.

Residential Amenity

The proposal has been amended so that the two storey side extension only projects 1.3m behind the bungalow at no.2. In this position the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing or increased levels of overlooking. It is noted that No.2 has one side window facing onto the extension. However, its forward position indicates it is a secondary window with the main window at the front of the bungalow. The proposal passes the daylight test outlined in Quality Places (Supplementary Planning Document).

Amount of Development

The proposed extension is mostly located above an existing garage and will not result in a loss of garden space. The proposal will result in a five bedroom property and is able to accommodate the require 3 on site car parking spaces (as set out in Residential Parking Standards SPD). As such the proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.

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

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. 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

Recommend Permit

12/2/14