HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/17/80474

DESCRIPTION	**Front porch and single storey rear extension, following demolition of existing conservatory**
ADDRESS	49 Royston Avenue, Eastleigh, SO50 4NH

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	The planning application comprises: • Front porch, with a mono-pitched roof, measuring 2.1m(w) by 1.3m(d) by 3.3m(h). • Single storey rear extension, with flat roof and roof lantern, measuring 3.2m(w) by 5.2m(d) by 2.8m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat
TREES	A row of tall trees runs along the rear of the garden. These should not be impacted by the development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	High close boarded fencing and wall of garage enclose the rear garden. The front garden opens onto the road.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey semi detached house set back from the road, with a driveway at the side of the property. The property has a modest rear garden with garage, cabin and conservatory. The conservatory will be removed to make way for the proposal.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area consisting of similar style two storey semi-detached and terraced houses. There are examples of porches and rear conservatries present within the street scene, including a similar style porch at no.51 (its semi-detached neighbour).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/08/62276	Erection of log cabin in rear garden	Permit (13/6/08)

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
None	

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE

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: 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

Not within detailed Eastleigh Character Area

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

None received	X	See below		
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	None received		See below		
Other …					

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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, in that:

- The porch is a modest addition to the house that is of a similar style and proportions to the porch already present on its semi-detached neighbour (51 Royston Avenue). The porch is considered to fit in with the Royston Avenue street scene and its small scale means it will not have a material impact on the neighbouring dwelling.
- The design and proportions of the single storey extension reflects that of the host property. The extension is located at the back of the house where it will not be clearly visible from the public realm and will fit in with the residential character of the locality.
- The property is situated in a narrow plot, and so the 5.2m deep single storey extension has been positioned alongside the boundary with 51 Royston Avenue. However, the single storey extension uses a low flat roof, which helps to keep down its bulk. On balance the proposal is not considered to materially affect the outlook of the adjoining property, which will primarily look out to the rear trees. While the extension will have some impact on the neighbour's daylight this is not to such an extent as to warrant refusing the application, the proposal passing the daylighting test outlined in Quality Places SPD.
- The garden is well screened along its boundaries and the proposed single storey extension is not considered to result in an increase in overlooking into the neighbouring properties.
- The proposal will replace a smaller conservatory. The rear garden already has a garage and cabin and will be left with a small, but just usable garden area. On this basis the proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the plot.
- The householder 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 even though it 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