**MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/11/70099**

| | |
|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS | First floor side extension<br>50 Leigh Road Eastleigh SO50 9DT |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SITE VISIT DATE | 13.2.12 | | | |
| ARE PLANS ACCURATE? | x | Yes | | No |
| HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? | x | Yes | | No |

**THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION | First floor side extension over the top of the existing single storey extension with a pitched roof and front/side/rear facing windows. | | | | | |
| SITE AREA | 0.035ha | | | | | |
| RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET) | N/A | | | | | |
| TOPOGRAPHY | x | Level | | Sloping ….. | | Other … |
| TREES | x | No | | Yes, ….. | | |
| BOUNDARY TREATMENT | Open front and side boundaries. The rear boundary to the car parking area consists of 1.8m fencing. | | | | | |
| SITE CHARACTERISTICS | Semi Detached two storey building within a row of converted residential properties. The site has side access via No.52 to a rear car parking area. | | | | | |
| CHARACTER OF LOCALITY | Mixed use area of pairs of semi detached properties, most of which in the immediate vicinity have been converted from residential to office accommodation. There are rear communal parking areas. The Good Companions PH is immediately opposite the site. | | | | | |

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

| REFERENCE | DESCRIPTION | DECISION |
|---|---|---|
| Z/25945/000 | Change of use from residential to offices | Permitted 1983 |
| Z/25945/003 | Single Storey side extension to offices | Permitted 1986 |

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| None | |

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Head of Transportation and Engineering | Site access is unchanged, and parking would appear sufficient for a site in this locality.<br><br>In regard to transport DC's, as an extension to a commercial property these will be reuired in accordance to the HCC Transport Contributions Policy and will be allocated to schemes of either benefit to the users of the site, or to mitigate against the additional multimodal trips associated with the expansion of the site. Potential schemes are outlined in the adopted ETAP.<br><br>This site is covered by the 1980s Leigh Road north side office development policy, which allowed for conversion of dwellings to residential use, subject to agreements with EBC/HCC regarding provision of a rear access road. The access road has been partly built along the back of properties further east, but not at the back of this site, although there is a 1980 s agreement between HCC and the site owners regarding its provision. From a planning aspect, it would be beneficial to provide a rear access road for various reasons besides rear servicing and parking:-.<br>1)enableing people to walk or cycle along the back way , thus being away from the traffic and associated air quality issues<br>2)Encourage walking and cycling by being further away from traffic<br>3) Assist with safe links to schools routes<br>4) Enable more rear parking to be provided, allowing for street scene improvements to Leigh Road if frontage car parking was removed or reduced. |

**POLICY CONTEXT**

| DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE |
|---|
| Within Built-up Area Boundary<br>Within Mixed use area close to the town centre |

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE (Development Criteria), and 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions)
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations

**CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA**

Not within a Character Area

**SPECIAL POLICY AREA**

Not within a Special Policy Area

**PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT**

PPG - 13 Transport

**PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT**

| | |
|---|---|
| PPS | -- 1 Delivering Sustainability<br>1 Planning and Climate Change Supplement |

**POLICY COMMENTARY**

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, street scene and character of the area

**COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| x | See below | | Other…… |

**COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | See below | x | None |

**PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS**

In accordance with the provisions of Circular 05/05 and saved policy 101.T the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and supplementary planning document. Planning Obligation contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Sustainable Transport. The applicant has secured the required transport contributions through a direct payment.

**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 site lies within the urban edge and within a mixed use area where the principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable, as set out below.

The proposed extension is modest in size and is of an appropriate design that it assimilates well to the host property. The extension is set a considerable distance back from the frontage giving it a subservient appearance which will have a minimal impact on the street scene.

To assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places has been produced which gives guidance on over looking, loss of light, amenity space. This guidance is however aimed at new dwellings and not office accommodation. It is acknowledged that the proposed windows in the eastern elevation come within close proximity to windows in the neighbouring property No.48 however this is not

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL**

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND**

considered to result in any loss of amenity given the use of the building as an office.

The site is considered to be of sufficient size and layout to accommodate the required parking for the enlarged office. A slight concern is means of access to this parking area, via a side access at No.52 or No.46. The access arrangements to the rear parking area has been in force for several year and appear to work well however if for any reason this arrangement were to cease it would not be possible to access the rear parking area of the site. Engineers have highlighted a 1980's agreement to provide a rear access way and although this access would be beneficial and would resolve any access concerns it would be unreasonable to burden the proposed development (26sqm extension) with the requirement to re-commit to providing this access way.

**OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The proposed development is considered to comply with the requirements of saved Policies 59.BE and 101.T and is therefore recommended for permission.