HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/77608

DESCRIPTION	Conversion of attached garage into habitable accommodation.
ADDRESS	39 Hindmarch Crescent, Hedge End, Southampton, SO30 0AN

SITE VISIT DATE	09.12.2015
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal is for conversion of the existing garage, into a sitting room. The garage door will be replaced with a large ground floor window.
TOPOGRAPHY	Flat and Level.
TREES	N/A
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	N/A
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached property within a recent residential development.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area within the urban edge. Recent residential development comprising a mixture of terraced, detached and semi-detached properties around estate roads.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
R/09/66299	Reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission O/05/54780 for construction of 118 dwelling units with car parking, bin and cycle storage, open space, access road and landscaping (matters to be determined: appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access).	Permitted 2010
O/05/54780	Outline: Residential development of 2.43 hectare site at a density of between 30-50 dwellings per hectare.	Permitted 2006

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	Objection on the grounds of overdevelopment and loss of parking.
Head of Transportation and Engineering	Objection. "As a 3-bed dwelling, in line with the EBC parking Standards, a minimum of 2 on-site parking spaces are required, and this is how the relative new-build estate was designed, with one driveway and one garage space for this unit. If the garage is converted, then there will be insufficient parking that will result in parking on the highway. This is not welcomed, particularly in this development where relative narrow roads will likely result in parking on footways. Whilst a layby is opposite, this is primarily for visitor parking, and if this development is granted and a precedent set, visitor parking will be eroded to below requirements. Again this will likely result in obstructive parking."

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within 25 metre River Buffer Within Flood Zone 3

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, (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' Policy DM1, DM24

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not within a Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports and encourages sustainable development which is considered to have three roles, economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that "These roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities. Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions."

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to parking and highway impact.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received		See below	x	
Other …				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received	x	See below		
Other …					

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

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 existing property has three-bedrooms. The Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document requires that three-bedroom properties have two on-site parking spaces. These are presently afforded in the case of the application dwelling by way of a single driveway space to the front and within the integral single garage. The proposal to convert this garage into habitable accommodation will result in a loss of one parking space on site. The aforementioned SPD requires that dwellings of this size provide three on-site spaces. The 3 bedroom property will only have provision for a one parking space on site on the front driveway. The development thereby fails to meet the required parking standard and the Council's Head of Transportation and Engineering and Hedge End Town Council has accordingly raised an objection on these grounds. Whilst it is noted that a property to the north at no.86 has converted their garage, the site has a deep front garden where 2 vehicles can park. The allocated on road parking as shown on the block plan is specifically reserved for visitor parking as this is not able to be provided on site.

Having visited the site, there is considered to be insufficient room within the property's curtilage for the creation of additional parking provision. The property does not have a deep front garden but rather the property is set back 2 metres from the pavement behind a small gravelled area. As a result, it is considered that the development would thereby encourage on-road parking which given the proximity of the site to the bend in the road, would be to the detriment of highway safety. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are dedicated on road parking spaces throughout this development as identified on the proposed block plan, however, these are reserved as visitor parking.

The design of the garage conversion is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality. There would not be an unacceptable impact to neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking due to the only external works proposed being the replacement of the existing garage door with a window.

However, due to the lack of an additional car parking space, the conversion of the garage would not be acceptable. It was established on site that there would only be one remaining parking space on site.

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

In view of the above this application is considered to conflict with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE and emerging Policy DM1 and is therefore recommended for refusal.

REF. NO. «AltRef»