HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/17/80238

DESCRIPTION	Single storey side and rear conservatory
ADDRESS	9 Sunningdale Close Bishopstoke Eastleigh SO50 8PU

SITE VISIT DATE	3rd May 2017
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application is proposing a side and rear conservatory (L-shape). See drawing nos. 02 and 03. The side of the conservatory will extend 2 metres in width, project 7 metres in overall depth and be 0.5 metres away from the boundary with no.8 Sunningdale Close. The rear of the conservatory will project 3 metres in depth, 5.3 metres in width and 2.9m in height at its maximum.
TOPOGRAPHY	Flat and level
TREES	No protected trees on site
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The southern boundary comprises a 1.8 metre high close boarded fence with 3+ metre high evergreen trees dotted along the boundary (within the rear garden area of no.8 Sunningdale Close.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached chalet style dwelling located along a shared drive with ample rear garden amenity area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Detached residential development addressing multi-headed cul-de-sacs located east of Bishopstoke.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Bishopstoke Parish Council	No objection
The Gardens Trust	No comments received

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hampshire Gardens Trust	No comments received

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'

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

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Application site not located within a 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		
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

x	None received		See below		
Other …					

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.

The application is considered to comply with the relevant development plan policies and associated supplementary planning guidance for the following reasons:

- The size and design of conservatory extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and is located at the rear and side of the house where it is not visible from the public realm and fits in with the residential character of the locality.
- The proposal is single storey and considered to be of a modest size. The proposal is not considered to be unacceptable to neighbouring dwellings in terms of loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking.
- The proposal is considered to retain a good sized garden and therefore the proposal is not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.
- The proposed 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.
- For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in keeping with the existing property, will preserve the character and appearance of the Sunningdale Close streetscene, and will not materially harm the amenity of the neighbouring residents. The development complies with the requirements of Policies 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

Permit subject to conditions.