**HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No.** F/17/80391

| | |
|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION | **Retention of single storey side extension (retrospective application)** |
| ADDRESS | Hazeldene, Dodwell Lane, Bursledon, Southampton SO31 1AQ |

| | |
|---|---|
| SITE VISIT | Yes |
| 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 | Single storey, flat roof, extension with roof light and roof lantern. The extension measures 2.3m(w) by 5.8m(w) by 3.5m(h) and is positioned at the side of the property next to the boundary with Iona. |
| TOPOGRAPHY | Slightly sloping. There are steps from the back of the extension down to the rear garden. |
| TREES | None affected |
| BOUNDARY TREATMENT | High wall and extension along side boundary with Iona. High panel fencing and vegetation around rear garden. |
| SITE CHARACTERISTICS | Detached bungalow set in a modest corner plot. |
| CHARACTER OF LOCALITY | Residential area. |

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

| REFERENCE | DESCRIPTION | DECISION |
|---|---|---|
| None | | |

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| Iona (letter of objection) | I have an objection to the extension on the above property as it is obtrusive and intrusive to my property and also diminishes the natural day light to my kitchen, for 6 to 8 months of the year when the sun is lower than during the summer months.<br><br>The owner of Hazeldene has already had a roof extension which was built 1 foot or 30cm aprox higher than the original plans which also diminishes the natural day light to my kitchen, for 6 to 8 months of the year when the sun is lower than during the summer months.<br><br>There is also the fact that Hazeldean has planted hard up to our boundary with tall shrubbery that is not maintained, this causes diminished natural day light to my bedroom and no visibility from my driveway to the road, I have raised this before with Eastleigh Council as this is infringing onto the highway, and subsequently also opposite my drive people park cars and vans making it near impossible to get of my drive with such a narrow lane, this again I have raised with Eastleigh Council. |

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| | All of these impediments have reduced the value of my property, and it seems to me I am being fenced in one way or another.<br><br>As this extension is now near complete I feel there is little Eastleigh Council will do as they have not taken any notice in the past. |

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Bursledon Parish Council | |

**POLICY CONTEXT**

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

- Quality Places
- Residential Parking Standards

**CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA**

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area – BHH 17 (No relevant guidance)

**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 AND REPRESENTATIONS RECIEVED**

**COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND REPRESENTATIONS RECIEVED**

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

- Comments are noted, although only those which relate to the current planning application can be considered.
- The impact on the neighboring property, in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy will be considered in the assessment section. Whereas, devaluation of the neighbour's property cannot be considered as this is not a material planning consideration.

**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:

- The single storey extension is a relatively modest addition tucked away at the side of the bungalow. The size and design of the extension is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and will fit in with the residential character of the locality.
- The single storey extension is located along the side boundary with Iowa, facing their kitchen window. I am sympathetic to the neighbours situation, in that the outlook and daylight to the side kitchen window is already restricted by the bungalow at Hazeldene. However, the extension's wall is only slightly higher than the existing boundary wall and therefore the extension's impact on the outlook and daylight of the neighbouring bungalow is not considered to be significantly more than the boundary wall.
- The extension is being used as a utility room that is not a primary habitable room and its windows do not directly face the neighbouring bungalow as such the extension is not considered to result in an unacceptable level of overlooking.
- The site is considered to retain a good sized garden therefore the proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.
- The modest 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 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