REF. NO. F/11/68471

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Construction of detached 3no. bedroom dwelling, following demolition of existing bungalow 2 Maidenstone Cottages, Bridge Road, Bursledon,Southampton,SO31 8AL

SITE VISIT DATE Various dates, Inc 21/01/2011

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Application seeks permission for construction of replacement two-storey 3-bed dwelling, following demolition of existing bungalow.
SITE AREA	425 sqm
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No increase in density – no additional dwelling units proposed
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly level site
TREES	Trees to the front of the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Low level fencing to front and side.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	1960s pyramid bungalow sat in an open plot with vehicular access to the rear. Property fronts onto a fairly busy road – Bridge Road and is fairly run down. It was originally built as a pair with the adjacent property but over time, alterations have occurred and they no longer appear as identical or particularly linked in appearance.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area along a busy highway, within designated countryside.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
No recent history		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
1 Maidenstone Cottages	I have inspected the site plan for the application and am puzzled by the legend on the arrow pointing to 'existing boundary fencing renewed'. The boundary fencing referred to was erected by me about 2 years ago and is in a perfect state. Does the statement mean on the site plan mean that the existing fence will be taken down and then renewed by the builders (after seeking my consent) or that the fence will be left intact as it is? Thank you, in advance, for any guidance you can give.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Environmental Health	I have reviewed the information provided and note that: The application site is approx 30m from a soil type of tidal flat deposits where there is an occurrence of natural ground gas. However, there is an indication that the underlying bedrock geology of the application site is clay. Further investigation will be necessary to confirm whether clay does underlie the application site and if this is the case, then the clay may provide a degree of protection from ground gases. The application site is directly adjacent to Bridge Road (A27) a highly trafficked area. A brief noise assessment has been carried out by this service which indicates a high level of road traffic noise at the front façade of the proposed development and would place the development site in NEC noise category C meaning that local plan policy 31.ES is relevant. The internal layout of the development needs to be considered to try and reduce road traffic noise in living spaces – however, due to the size of the development site, we understand there are limitations with this. This service estimates that a reduction of approx 38dBA for road traffic noise will be required within the internal living spaces of the proposed development. The following needs to be included within the design scheme in order to achieve this: - a high standard of specialist glazing that mitigates road traffic noise and specialist window frames - any glazed doors or windows greater than a standard size on the façade fronting Bridge Road may require additional acoustic protection - there is a requirement to install a rapid ventilation system which should not undermine any acoustic mitigation or increase noise levels inside the property, as well as providing adequate cooling - the construction materials used for the building fabric must provide sufficient noise insulation Due to the complexity of the issues associated with the road traffic noise, this service advises that a specialist acoustic consultant is employed to design the scheme of works or carry out a suitable acoustic assessment. As the development is likely to be affected by road traffic noise, I recommend the following condition: - NS03 External noise – before any development is commenced a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from road traffic noise from the A27 must be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. All works which from part of the scheme approved by the LPA must be completed before any of the permitted dwelling(s) is occupied, unless otherwise agreed by the LPA.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	As the proposed development has the potential to be affected by naturally occurring ground gas and further investigations are necessary to confirm the geology of the site, I recommend the following condition: - No development shall take place until the applicant has carried out an adequate assessment of the risks to, or arising from, the proposed development and a report of this assessment, including recommendations for protection of the development, has been received and approved in writing by the LPA. BS10175:2001 'Investigation of potentially contaminated sites – code of practice' of a useful source of advice on site investigation. Any recommendations for protection of the development, the remediation scheme, must be supervised by a competent person and a completion certificate provided by that person to the LPA to certify that the works have been implemented in accordance with that scheme'. The applicant should be advised that in advance of the commencement of the development, the condition requires that the assessment be completed and approved. Also, that as a result of the assessment, amendments to the design of building structures may be required, further that adequate provision of time needs to be made so the assessment can be completed before works commence on site. The applicant should also be advised to contact Env Health to discuss the options open to them in order to comply with the above condition. Further information and advice about developing brownfield land can be found on the Council's website – the relevant web page is entitled 'Development of Brownfield Land'. Should you be minded not to impose the condition, I would request that you contact me to inform me of your decision. We recommend the following conditions are applied for amenity protection reasons: NS05, NS18, NS21 & NS06.
Head of Regeneration & Planning Policy	The property lies on the countryside edge of Old Bursledon, close to the boundary of the Old Bursledon Conservation Area. It is a modest bungalow fronting Bridge Road, but partly concealed from it by trees and shrubs on the road frontage. Access is from Blundell Lane. There is an adjoining very similar bungalow to the north. An area of flood risk extends into the garden. The proposal is to replace the bungalow with a larger two-storey dwelling. The most relevant policy is 8.CO which allows replacement dwellings in the countryside, subject to a number of criteria. Criterion (ii) requires that the development is of an appropriate design reflecting its countryside location, is not disproportionate in size to neighbouring

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	properties or its plot, and does not have a greater physical or visual impact on the countryside than the existing dwelling. The proposal is for a two-storey dwelling of a suburban style on a footprint that is larger than that of the existing dwelling. It is large than the existing bungalow and the adjoining bungalow to the north, although the plot size appears slightly larger than that of the adjoining bungalow. Design officer comments do not suggest that this materially increases visual impact on the countryside and that the proposals may even represent a modest improvement in terms of visual impact. However, the Design Officer suggests some amendments to the design of the building and on this basis, a holding objection is raised pending resolution of these concerns. Note: the views of the Env Agency should be sought on the flood risk implications for this application. Design Officer: A total lack of shadow and modelling does nothing to help the application. No's 1 and 2 Maidenstone Cottages were originally a symmetrical pair apart from No 1 being forward of No 2. This is not readily apparent and some accretions to No 1 have diluted the effect as well. The proposal is for quite a modest replacement for a plain modest bungalow. The apparent bulk of the new is broken up by having the first floor cladding different to that of the ground floor and some articulation with the garage on the north-eastern side. The south-western elevation facing Blundell Lane presents a very dour face of a single angle catslide punctuated by roof lights. This would be considerably improved by the replacement of the skylights with a dormer window or two. One unexpected benefit of this development would be the masking of the gas governor house from Yachtsman Close. With regard to countryside effect, the proposed form is basically similar to the existing and although of greater volume, is actually half a metre lower than the existing, (if the height of the existing is taken to include the chimney), assuming the final product matches the drawing. If decently built, this could be a smart replacement for a mediocre building. Holding objection.
Bursledon Parish Council	No objection
Head of Transportation & Engineering	No objection.

REF. NO. F/11/68471

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	No developer contributions required – like for like dwelling size replacement. I seem to recall that this site was linked to the parking provision for the extensions to Riverside Chinese Restaurant, in that the back garden areas were identified as parking associated with the restaurant extension applications and the restaurant employees lived in the bungalow. I can not recall if those applications were approved and the parking at this site conditioned to be retained – that needs to be checked out before a rebuild of the house is approved.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Outside Built-up Area Boundary Within designated countryside Adjacent to Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) Saved Policies: 1.CO, 8.CO, 59.BE, 104.T
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3 - Housing

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the design and relationship to neighbouring properties, street scene and countryside setting.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Please see report below.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Please see report below.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Not required – no additional dwellings proposed.

REF. NO. F/11/68471

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."*

Principle

The application seeks permission for the construction of a two-storey 3-bed dwelling to replace the existing bungalow.

The site lies outside the defined urban edge in an area designated as countryside. Policy 8.CO of the adopted local plan states that replacement dwellings in the countryside will be permitted, subject to consideration of the design, size, physical and visual impact in relation to countryside setting, demolition of existing unit and no increase in overall number of residential units.

Siting & Design

Although originally built as a matching pair, the application property and its neighbour have been altered over the years and are no longer particularly linked in appearance. There is no uniformity to the street scene with a wide mix of properties present. The overall built form is not dissimilar to the scale of the adjacent bungalow and the modern, attractive design is considered to add interest and variety to the street scene. The position almost sits over the footprint of the existing house and retains the building line set by the adjacent property.

The comments from the Design Officer are acknowledged, and amended plans were sought, and received, showing the addition of 2no dormer windows on the south east elevation. This addresses the holding objection placed.

Due to the prominence within the street scene, it is felt necessary to impose a condition to request details and samples of external materials prior to the commencement of the development, along with a scheme of landscaping.

Impact on countryside location

Due to the scale, which is only a little larger than the dwelling already present, and the specific design of the new property, it is not considered to materially worsen the visual impact on the surrounding countryside. The roof design retains all the bulk of the property at the ground floor level which has less impact on the views allowed to the rural land behind the property. It also helps to minimise the visual impact in general, resulting in there being no material harm to the edge of countryside location. Although designated countryside, this area is significantly built up with large building comprising flats positioned directly opposite. The proposed replacement dwelling is not considered to result in physical or visual harm to the existing character and appearance of the locality.

A condition can be imposed to ensure the original dwelling is demolished with all materials removed from site prior to any development commencing.

Residential amenity

Due to the scale, design and siting of the proposed replacement dwelling, it is not considered to result in any overlooking, loss of light or any visual overbearing impact on the amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

The siting of the property allows amenity space to the rear, away from the noise of the adjacent highway, as per the current dwelling. A garage was originally proposed on the north side of the property requiring vehicular access through the designated amenity space. This was not

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

considered ideal, having a significant impact on the amount of useable amenity space. Amended plans were sought to remove the garage, replacing it with a utility room/store and with parking shown adjacent to the rear vehicular access. At present, the entire site is hard paved with no private amenity space so the addition of the proposed grassed area will be a significant improvement both in terms of landscaping appearance and residential amenities.

There are no windows proposed on the elevation facing the adjacent property and a condition can be imposed to ensure this is maintained, in order to protect the privacy of the adjacent occupiers.

This proposal replaces an existing dwelling that is currently occupied. Under permitted development, the current dwelling could be extended to provide additional accommodation and on this basis it is therefore considered unreasonable and unnecessary to impose the conditions suggested by Environmental Health officers relating to noise. Under current building regulations, the new dwelling will be a significant improvement from the existing.

Regarding the suggestion by Environmental Health officers to impose a condition requiring a land contamination risk assessment, this is considered to meet the tests set out in circular 11/95 as the replacement dwelling will involves new foundations being dug.

Sustainability

In accordance with the Council's adopted SPD: Environmentally Sustainable Development, the applicant needs to demonstrate that the development will comply with the essential requirements, including meeting Code 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. These details will be secured by planning condition.

Highway Issues

No objection from the Council's Engineers. Parking can be provided within the curtilage of the site and this can be controlled by a planning condition. There are no historic links with parking for the restaurant.

Impact on trees

There are some trees immediately in front of where the new dwelling will sit but the Council's Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposal.

Flood Risk

Only a small part of the garden falls within designated flood zones so no consultation with the Environment Agency is required in accordance with their matrix chart. No objection on flood risk grounds.

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

Recommendation is to permit for the reasons stated above.

REF. NO. F/11/68471