**HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/79343**

| | |
|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION | Single storey side extension & change of external facing materials, following approval of planning permission F/16/78585 |
| ADDRESS | 18 Boyatt Crescent Eastleigh SO50 4LP |

| | |
|---|---|
| SITE VISIT DATE | 3 November 2016 |
| ARE PLANS ACCURATE? | The plans are sufficient to determine the application |
| HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? | Yes |

**THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

| | |
|---|---|
| DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION | This application sis a resubmission of planning application F/16/78585. That application sort approval for the construction of a single storey side addition. The extension would increase the width a further 1.5m. The extension would be 9.9m (d) 2.2m to the eaves and 3.2m to the pitch. The roof would be finished with a mono pitch with materials to match the exciting dwelling.<br><br>This application differs from this previous proposal as the materials used in the external finish have changed. |
| TOPOGRAPHY | The street scene is relatively flat |
| TREES | None |
| BOUNDARY TREATMENT | The property is bound by a closed boarded 1.8m (h) timber fence, abutting the northern boundary |
| SITE CHARACTERISTICS | The host dwelling is a detached semi-detached property, set back from the road. |
| CHARACTER OF LOCALITY | The site falls within an established residential area made up of predominantly detached, and semi-detached two-storey and single storey dwelling houses. |

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

| REFERENCE | DESCRIPTION | DECISION |
|---|---|---|
| F/16/78585 | Single Storey side extension | Permitted 2016 |

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| 19 Boyatt Cresecent | The proposal will result in a loss of light to the neighbouring property and will reduce the value of the neighbouring property. |

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | |

**POLICY CONTEXT**

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

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

**Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies**
Policy 59.BE applies

**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'

Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

**CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA**

Eastleigh area 1
• Maintain the predominant orientation of ridgelines in existing development relative to the slope on Boyatt Lane.
• Retain the grass islands and associated semi-mature trees.
• Retain and extend the continuity in building line.
• Maintain a uniformity in building heights within each street.
**Strength of character: moderate**

**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 residential amenity, highway matters, trees, street scene and character of the area

**COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| None received | X | See below | | |
| | | | | |

**COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | None received | | See below | x | |
| The matters raised are addressed in the materials considerations below. | | | | | |

**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."

Development Plan Policies:

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 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.

**MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Principle:

The application site lies within the urban area 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.

The development would occupy land to the side of the dwelling. The depth and height of the addition is considered to be of a modest scale, finished with a mono pitch roof which allows the addition to be subservient to the existing dwelling. Its distance from the boundary allows for a retained clear separation of dwellings in the street scene, therefore it would not detract from the character of dwelling nor the Eastleigh area 1 area by virtue of its moderate character.

The current proposal reflects the previously grant scheme F/16/78585 except the proposal seeks to change the external materials from facing brick to render. Namely the product K – rend. The application property lies within a group of very similar bungalows. These bungalows all have a uniformity in the finish of their external facing. Furthermore as the site forms part of an estate development the wider character of the area is of a facing brick finish.

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL**

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND**

There are rendered properties in the area, most noticeably the two storey dwellings Hawkley and Earlswood to the south of the application site. However these are the exceptions and they are some distance from the application property.

As part of the application process a legal opinion has been sought regarding the use of render on the external faces of the dwelling. They have advised as follows:

'*Having considered the current legislation/guidance, namely the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) Order 2016, and the Permitted development rights for householders; Technical Guidance, I am of the opinion that having regard to Part 1 of Schedule 2 Class A that:*

- *"cladding", including more specifically rendering, is only pd if deemed to be of a similar appearance to the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse;*
- *as the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse is primarily brick-faced full planning permission would be required for the rendering work;*
- *this in turn apply to any subsequent extension of the dwellinghouse; and*
- *A.2(a) relates to article 2(3) land and is therefore not applicable.'*

As such the proposed materials are not considered to preserve the character of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to the requirements of criteria (i) of saved policy 59.BE.

There is considered no harm by way of a loss of light to neighbouring occupiers, due to the location and scale of the extension, and distance from the shared boundary and the previous consent. Concern has been raised regarding the affect the proposal may have on the neighbouring property values, however, this is not a material consideration.

The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

Highway matters:

Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 requires that development provides a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles which includes an acceptable level of parking provision in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The parking arrangement would not alter as a result of the development. No car spaces would be lost as a result of the proposal therefore the development is deemed to have no conflict with the aforementioned policy requirement as a result of the proposal.

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

**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**

Overall, for the reasons as outlined above, the application is considered not to comply with the requirements of the development plan policies 59.BE, associated supplementary planning guidance and national planning policy.