HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/17/80160

DESCRIPTION	Erection of single storey rear extension
ADDRESS	28 Wilderness Heights West End Southampton SO18 3PS

SITE VISIT	Yes
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	The information is sufficient to determine the planning application
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Single storey rear extension with a pitched roof and measuring 5m(w) by 3.8m(d) by 4.2m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	The site is relatively flat, although the land slopes sharply from its northern boundary towards the house at 9 Beechwood Rise.
TREES	Part of the site is covered by a woodland tree preservation order (TPO2). Although none of the trees are near the proposal.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The garden is enclosed by high panel fencing and vegetation.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached house with existing rear extension set in a medium sized plot.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area, the site is part of a 1980s development of detached properties on multi-headed cul-de-sacs to the west of West End.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/31431	SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF 1 GARAGE TO STUDY	Permit 1990
Z/31431/001	TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION	Permit 1991

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	No objection

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
1 letter of objection (9 Beechwood Rise)	Thank you for your letter dated 22nd March 2017, notifying us of the proposed planning application for the above property. Having studied the plans and the position of the property, we feel the proposal will have a detrimental effect on the privacy of the use of our house and garden, and we will be objecting to the current plans as they stand. Our concern is the run of windows at the side of the proposed extension. These windows will overlook the back and side of our house, as well as virtually all of our garden. There is at present just one small obscured first floor window on the whole side wall of their house, which we presume to be a bathroom, so we are not currently overlooked. As our property is situated down a hill, with our garden running up towards 28 Wilderness Heights, our house is positioned much lower than 28 Wilderness Heights, so much so, the proposed ground floor side windows are even higher than our bedroom windows. Our house is also at an angle to the side of their house. This means not only will we be able to see straight up in through their proposed side window, but they will also be able to look down in through our bedroom windows. We would also like to mention that as the properties are going down a slope, the 6ft fence positioned at the side of their property, does not reach up 6ft on the side of their wall. The plans mention them having to have the new side wall built up over a metre in height before they reach the level of the existing floor and then commence the 2.10m for the height of the main structure, plus the roof. This means the proposed ground floor windows in the side of the extension will not be covered by the fence and will look out freely over the rear and side of our property. As the current plans show the proposed extension will have a glass roof with opening vent and large glass area with doors to the rear, we can not see why the side windows are needed. We would see no reason to oppose the plans if the side wall of the new extension was of solid brick and contained no windows to the side. We have already objected to the planning application on line using your on line portal, but have decided to write to you too and explain our concerns more fully.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within HRA Screening 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: DM1 (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'

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places & 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	X	
Noted				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	X	
Comments are noted and the level of overlooking will be considered in the assessment section.					

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.

The development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE, in that:

- The size and design of the single storey rear extension is considered to be sympathetic to

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

the existing house and the residential character of the locality. The extension is positioned at the rear of the property, where it cannot be viewed from the public realm.

- The residents at 6 Beechwood Rise have expressed concerns that the ground floor side windows will look down the slope into their property and will increase the level of overlooking. While sympathetic to their concerns, I note that the extension will be a reasonable distance in from the side boundary, which has many high shrubs and 1.8m high fencing. Having stood on the existing raised decking at the site (which is set at the floor level of the house and will be replaced by the proposal) only the far corner of the neighbours' house and garden is visible over the boundary. As such it is not considered necessary to impose an obscure glazing condition, especially as ground floor windows usually fall under permitted development.
- The extension is single storey and is sited where it is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties (by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking).
- The site is retains a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.
- The proposed householder extension is not considered to result in a likely significant impact on a European Protected site (SPA,SAC or Ramsar). HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening was not required for this development even though it falls inside the designated zone of impact.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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