HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/17/80443

DESCRIPTION	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension
ADDRESS	74 Devon Drive, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 3GH

SITE VISIT DATE	7th June 2017
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	It is considered that sufficient information has been provided to allow for the assessment of the development proposed.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. For exact proposed dimensions, see drawing nos. 01 Rev A plus Section 11 (materials) of the planning application form.
TOPOGRAPHY	The subject site slopes gently south. The road slopes gently east.
TREES	The proposal will have no impact on trees.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front has an open appearance with low level picket fencing and vegetation. Wooden panel fencing to the rear.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi-detached two-storey dwelling house with an attached brick shed/store to the side with a flat roof which is set back from the front building line by 3m. The rear garden area is large with a depth of 21m. The front of the property has an open appearance and can cater for a minimum of 4 off-street car parking spaces.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Houses in this part of Devon Drive are mainly two-storeys in height and arranged in pairs or groups of four. Dwellings are of a broadly similar scale and design, and are characteristically linked by walls or buildings of an approximately single-storey height. This creates a distinct rhythm within the street scene and establishes a clear degree of separation between the street's two-storey buildings. Where side extensions have been erected, they are generally only a single storey in height. As such, they are generally consistent with the above-noted development pattern.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None	Application site **99 Devon Drive, Chandler's Ford,Eastleigh, SO53 3GJ**	
F/11/68739	Two storey side and single storey rear extension and conservatory; garden/'bike' bike store	Refused: 28.04.2011 Dismissed at appeal: 01.08.11

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Chandler's Ford Parish Council	No response

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within HRA Screening Area, river buffer 400m, SAC, SPA, Ramsar 7000m

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies: 59.BE and 104.T

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014: DM1 and DM24 (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 Character Area – ELAC 27

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not 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

See above		See below		
N/A				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	None received		See 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."

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.

Policy 104.T of the Local Plan requires development to provide adequate off-highway parking up to the maximum standard set out in respect of the accessibility to that development.

The site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the principal of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable.

The main issue in relation to the proposed scheme is the effect on the area's character and appearance.

The size, mass, design, and siting of the proposed two-storey side extension is considered to be unacceptable. Houses in this part of Devon Drive are mainly two-storeys in height and arranged in pairs or groups of four. Dwellings are of a broadly similar scale and design, and are characteristically linked by walls or buildings of an approximately single-storey height. This creates a distinct rhythm within the street scene and establishes a clear degree of separation between the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

street's two-storey buildings. Where side extensions have been erected, they are generally only a single storey in height. As such, they are generally consistent with the above-noted development pattern.

The two-storey side extension proposed would be slightly lower than the roof ridgeline of the existing dwelling and would be set back 1.5m at first floor level from the building's main front elevation. However, the two-storey nature of the new addition would be clearly at odds with the distinctive arrangement of other properties nearby, as described above. As a result, the rhythm of development within the street would be disrupted and the degree of separation between the subject property and its neighbour would be markedly reduced. Given the street's established character, the resulting effect would appear incongruous and out of keeping.

The single storey rear extension proposed is considered to be acceptable, given it is not visible from the public realm and is only slightly deeper than the existing rear building line setback.

The proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light or overlooking.

The proposal is considered to retain a decent sized rear garden and therefore the proposal is not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

Sufficient sized off street car parking spaces would remain. The proposal has no impact on parking.

The proposed extensions are 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.

The proposal, specifically the two-storey side extension is therefore considered to be contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011).

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

In view of the above this application is recommended for refusal.