HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/16/79043

DESCRIPTION	Construction of detached garage & games room (revised design to approval F/15/76642)
ADDRESS	12 Queens Road Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 5AH

SITE VISIT DATE	2 September 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	The application seeks to demolish the existing garage and erect a larger replacement garage with a games room. The footprint of the proposal is 5.7m x 11.3m. The ridge height of the pitched roof is 3.7m. The external finish of the elevations is render and with concrete roof tiles to match the host dwelling. A similar scheme has received approval under application F/15/76642.
TOPOGRAPHY	The road is relatively flat and level. The site is also flat on the frontage but gradually falls away in a SW direction past the house before levelling out again.
TREES	TPO58/W2 – All tree species in the area
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front of the property is relatively open with landscaping and hedging along each side. The rear of the site is bound by a combination of concrete post and mesh fencing, dense hedging, and traditional lap and close boarded fencing, all of which is at varying heights from 1.5m-2.5m.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Works implementing planning permission F/15/76642 have commenced on site. Large detached two storey dwelling set at the end of a cul-de-sac. The frontage is fairly small for the plot with a small garden area and two driveways, one of which leads along the eastern boundary to detached garage beyond which is a very large garden containing numerous mature trees.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	This section of Queens Road is depicted by large two storey housing on large plots. The area has an open and spacious appearance to it and particularly around the turning head properties appear largely unaltered in their appearance giving it strong visual cohesion.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/15/76642	Two storey rear extension with addition of roof lights to provide additional second floor accommodation, raised decking, front porch and detached garage	Permit
F/15/75951	Two storey rear extension, front porch, raised decking at the rear and erection of detached garage	Refused 30th April 2015 on basis of inappropriate design and lack of subservience
Z/06611/007/00	Single storey rear extension	Permitted 25/4/91
	Various tree applications	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
32 Gordon Road	If the garage will mean trees need to be felled then we object. If the building of the games room will mean trees need to be felled then we object. Furthermore unless the games room is fully soundproofed then we object. We live in a residential and woodland area and currently enjoy the peace and serenity that goes with living with wildlife and we would not want this disturbed by excessive noise from a games room.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
CFD	

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), saved policies
saved 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

Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area

Hiltingbury Road West where development is expected to be commensurate with the size and character of the plot and that the design of new building works is compatible with the character of good quality adjacent properties and fits in well with the overall street scene.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a Special Policy Area

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		
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	x	

Concerns have been raised regarding the loss of trees and potential noise and disturbance. An assessment with regard to the potential impact to trees has made in the report below.

With regard to potential noise and disturbance the proposed games room will be ancillary to the main dwelling and maintain the residential use of the site. As such any noise emitted from the proposed room would not be expected to be any greater than would be omitted from the existing residential use of the site.

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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Principle: The application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable, as set out below.

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 proposed garage is located in the approximate location of the existing. It is however much larger in footprint. A similar garage has already received permission under the previous application F/15/76642.

The difference from the previously approved scheme and the current application is the garage has been subdivided in a garage and a games room. As a result an additional door and larger fenestration have been added to the right (west) elevation.

The external materials of the previously approved garage red face brickwork to match the existing house. The current proposal uses rendered elevations '*to match the extension of the house'*.

The revised proposal has a comparable footprint to the previously approved scheme. The garage will also remain of single storey and be subservient to the host property. It is also fairly well screened by boundary planting with only the higher sections of the sloping roof being visible. Overall its design and position is considered acceptable.

The garage will be located to the rear of the property where it will not be highly visible from the street. The proposal is therefore not considered to have a detrimental impact on the street scene or the wider character of the area.

Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) requires that development avoids unduly impacting upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, in particular by way of overbearing impact, loss of light or outlook, and overlooking. As part of the previous application the impact of such an outbuilding on the amenities of the neighbouring properties was assessed. There have been no material changes that require this to be reviewed. As such the current proposal will not result in any material harm to the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupants of the neighbouring properties.

Highway matters:

Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) requires that development provides a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles which includes an appropriate level of parking provision in accordance with the Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The site can easily accommodate any additional parking requirements as a result of the previously approved extension works. Furthermore the proposed garage accords with standards and provides additional parking, if necessary. Overall parking provision on the site is considered acceptable.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Trees and Landscaping

Saved Policy 59.BE (i) of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011 requires that development takes full and proper account of the context of the site including natural features and trees worthy of retention. The proposal will not pose any further threat to the protected trees or landscape features previously approved on the site.

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

Nature conservation

The proposal 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 as it falls outside 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

The development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE and is therefore recommended for approval.