HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/14/74993

DESCRIPTION	Construction of detached garage following demolition of existing garage/store & shed
ADDRESS	96 New Road Netley Abbey Southampton SO31 5BS

SITE VISIT DATE	28/8/14
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Construction of a single storey detached garage/ workshop at the rear of the garden. Building has a low mono-pitched roof and measures 5.6m(w) by 6.7m(d) by 3m(h).
TOPOGRAPHY	There is a gentle downwards slope towards the rear of the garden.
TREES	There are some trees and vegetation throughout the site and along the western side and rear boundaries. The trees within the garden are not covered by a TPO. However, there is a Beech Tree in the rear garden of Sedgemead Court close to the site. The Beech Tree is is protected under TPOI 90.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	2m high close boarded fence and wall alongside boundary with footpath and wire fencing along the rear boundary.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached house with a long rear garden. The proposal replaces an old garage/ workshop at the rear of the garden which has been recently removed.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
1 letter of objection	• Overdevelopment – a garage of this size is not necessary. The garage footprint looks like the size of a house. • Maybe later converted to a hoilday let/ summer house or overflow rooms for their bed and breakfast. • If permitted would like a condition restricting its use.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hound Parish Council	No response

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Trees Team	No objection

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

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014 Policy 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 Document: Quality Places

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area – BHH1 (No relevance 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

None received		See below	X	
Noted				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received		See below	X	

- The size of the building will be discussed in the assessment section.
- The applicant has confirmed that the building will be used for domestic storage and any non-domestic use will require a new planning application.

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.

Character and Appearance

The proposed outbuilding fits comfortably at the end of the property's large garden and is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal replaces an old run down outbuilding and is not much larger than the structure it is replacing. The size and design of the outbuilding and proposed materials are often found on outbuildings within residential areas. As such the proposal is considered to be a sympathetic addition to the property and will not harm the character and appearance of the locality

Residential Amenity

The proposal is for a reasonable sized single storey building, and its siting at the back of the garden means it should not be prominent from the neighbouring dwellings or adjoining footpath. The outbuilding will be used for storage and the site has a good level of boundary screening. As such the proposal should not create an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking.

Nature conservation and Trees

The proposal is a reasonable distance away from the large Beech tree on the neighbouring site, so as not to affect its roots system. No objection has been raised by the Tree Team to the development. It is noted that the site is close to the solent water, which is a European designated site of nature conservation. However, the size of the outbuilding is unlikely to result in a significant impact on the European Protected site. As such it is considered that a HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening is not required.

The development complies with the requirements of Policy 59.BE.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards 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