HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/17/80471

DESCRIPTION	**Single storey side extension**
ADDRESS	48 UPPER ST HELENS ROAD, HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 0LH

SITE VISIT DATE	29 June 2017
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 erect a single storey hipped roof side extension. The side extension will be set back from the front elevation by approximately 1m. The footprint of the proposal
TOPOGRAPHY	Levels in the vicinity are relatively level although the application site is located on ground level slightly high than the neighbouring properties of Stockholm Drive.
TREES	The site does not contain any trees offered protection by a tree preservation order.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The boundary adjacent to the proposed extension is a timber fence with concrete posts approximately 2metres in height
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application site contains a detached bungalow with a detached garage. The property is brick built with facing brick elevations.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The area is predominately residential in character formed of a mixture of dwelling types both bungalows and two storey dwellings.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None relevant to this application		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
4 Stockholm Drive	object for the reasons given below. • The proposed extension nearly doubles the structure/length abutting the present boundary and would be visually

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	unattractive and intrusive. • Ridge line of proposed extension exceeds that of the existing garage which will have impact on our 'right to light' and would be very imposing. • The proposed new foul drainage is likely to undermine the existing boundary fence. • Party wall notices have not been discussed and are likely to be in rescind. • The proposed extension would likely cut through the root system of the Willow tree in our garden. • There would be a detrimental visual impact creating a fortress effect. • It will drastically change our outlook due to the proximity of the proposed extension and is likely to create a 'courtyard' effect in our garden; not something we would have chosen when we decided to buy our house. Our garden is already small and this would make it feel even more enclosed. Even now the garden partly suffers from a sense of being hemmed in, due to the existing brick building / summer house (labelled "Store" on the plan) and the proposed extension would make that complete. • Concern about the overlooking aspect to our privacy. • Concerned about the detrimental effect to the value of our property due to the change in aspect from our garden, and outlook through our patio doors. • We would not welcome the excessive dust and disruption, and would be unable to use our patio having only recently spent a considerable sum on the garden. Our patio doors. sliding doors and kitchen window would have to remain closed to prevent the ingress of dirt, and to cut down on the noise. • None of the other houses in our road have a brick wall completely taking away their open aspect.
2 Stockholm Drive	Object to the proposal on the following grounds • The position of the bathroom extractor will face, and be in close proximity the amenity area on No.2 Stockholm Drive • The proposal includes a bathroom window in cvlose proximity to the shared boundary of No.2 and in close proximity to the amenity of that property • The proposals do not advise how far away the proposal will be from the shared boundary with No.2. The proposal includes a soil vent pipe. It is not clear from the submitted plans whether this vent pipe can be serviced on the applicant side of the boundary. • The extension will be 50cm higher that the existing garage.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	This gives rise to a potential loss of light to the rear amenity area of No.2 • The proposed bedroom window would result in a loss of privacy to the neighbouring property No.2
8 Stockholm Drive	No objection to this application.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	No Objection
Head of Countryside and Trees	No Objection has been raised subject to appropriate conditions

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 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

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area 30

- Retain the grass verges.
- Maintain the predominant plot widths and continuity in building line.
- Maintain a uniformity in building heights within each street.

Strength of character: moderate.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site does not fall 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		See below	X	
No objection has been raised				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received		See below	x	
The matters relating to the planning issues are addressed n the report 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."

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle:

The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable, with any formal planning approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of that proposed being considered appropriate and in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies and supplementary planning documents and guidance.

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.

Fall Back Position

Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the general permitted development order allows the enlargement of residential dwellings. Single storey side extensions are includes within those allowable additions subject to a number of criteria.

As a result of the works the total area of ground covered by buildings within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse (other than the original dwellinghouse) should not exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage. In this instance the works would not go above the 50% threshold.

The height of the extension must be no higher than the existing roof of the property. Furthermore the eaves of the extension should be no higher than those of the original dwelling. In the case of the current application the proposal would comply with these criteria.

The proposal would not be forward of the principal elevation of the property and proposed works would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the property. Further complyiong with the criteria.

The proposed extension would be within 2 metres of the boundary, however, as the eaves of the proposal would be under 3m in height this would also comply with the criteria.

The proposal would not be greater than half the width of the original property, would not include any raised platforms and the external facing materials would match those used in the host dwelling.

However, the proposed side extension would be higher than 4m and as such formal planning consent is required.

However, if the extension was reduced to this height by an alteration in roof pitch, or an area of flat roof (both of which may look at odds with the host dwelling) express planning consent may not be required. As such an assessment must be made on the potential harm the additional roof form above the 4m limit may present.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Character and Appearance

The proposal will maintain the character of the host property through its design that matches the hipped roof and architectural detail of the original dwelling. The extensions remain subservient to the host dwelling set back from both the roof ridge and the front elevation of the property.

The facing materials will match those used in the host dwelling. This will further preserve the character of the area. Such materials can be secured by condition.

The proposed extension will replace and existing pitched roof garage. As such the proposal is not considered to result in any material harm to the rhythm and spacing of dwellings when viewed in the street scene.

The property will maintain an appropriate sized amenity area and is not considered to be over development of the site.

Residential amenity:

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.

Mindful of the fall-back position outlined above there is no conflict with this policy requirement in respect of the development. The extension is of single storey only and there is sufficient distance from the neighbouring dwellings to protect the light, outlook and privacy currently enjoyed by the occupants of the neighbouring dwellings.

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).

There is room available on the site frontage to accommodate 3 vehicles which is the maximum number that is required under the SPD requirements, with this being for a 4+ bedroom dwelling. Accordingly there is considered to be no conflict with the aforementioned policy requirements.

Landscape and Trees

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 site does not contain any trees offered protection by a tree preservation order.

There is a tree at the rear of No4. This tree is of particular amenity to the residents of that property as it provides screening from the application property. Following a visit to the site it was noted that the proposal will be in close proximity to this tree and an Arboricultural

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Impact Assessment was requested and supplied

The impact assessment demonstrates that the proposal can be implemented without harm to the tree. As such the proposal will not be in conflict with any trees or landscape features of particular amenity to the area.

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 proposal complies with the requirements of saved policy 59.BE and is therefore recommended for approval.