HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT Ref No. F/15/77532

DESCRIPTION	Replacement balustrade around front balcony & repositioning/widening of existing dropped kerb
ADDRESS	Limewood Grange Road Netley Abbey Southampton SO31 5FF

SITE VISIT DATE	15/12/15
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Replacement balustrade around front balcony & repositioning/widening of existing dropped kerb. Existing metal railing balustrade to be replaced with timber frame and glass panels to approx. same height as existing balustrade 1.10m high. Existing dropped kerb will be moved to centre of plot.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level frontage
TREES	No trees affected
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Existing front boundary to road – low brick and concrete decorative block wall. Boundary to Feroz – hedge and shrubs Boundary to The Retreat – Large shrubs
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached house with parking to front
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential road with a mix of house types – bungalows, chalets and large two storey dwellings of varying ages.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/37610/001/00	Construction of single storey front extension with balcony over	Permit 03/02/2004
Q/15/77280	PD Enquiry: Proposed single storey rear extension, formation of new vehicular access, rendering and replacement balustrading at front	RPA 02/10/15

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hound Parish Council	No objection
Head of Transportation and Engineering	No objection
Hampshire County Council Archaeologist	Thank you for your recent consultation. Although this is located close to the medieval abbey complex, in view of the very small degree of ground works implied I would not raise any archaeological issues.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Strategic Gap and Countryside Outside Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Adjacent Designated Conservation Area Within Site of Archaeological Interest Adjacent site of Ancient Monument

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies 1.CO 2.CO 3.CO 18.CO 59.BE 102.T

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'
- Policies DM1 DM23 S9

Supplementary Planning Guidance : Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area – BHH1

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

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				

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	None received				

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.

Saved Policy 102.T states that development requiring new or improved access will be permitted provided it does not: (i) interfere with the safety, function and standard of service of the road network; or (ii) have adverse environmental implications and is to the adopted standard of the highway authority.

Saved Policy 1.CO states that planning permission will not be granted for development outside the urban edge unless it is necessary for agricultural, forestry or horticultural purposes; it is for an outdoor recreational use; it is essential for a public utility or an existing health or educational facility; or it meets the criteria in the other policies of this plan. The policy also states that extensions of private gardens within the countryside will be refused.

Saved Policy 2.CO states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would physically or visually diminish a strategic gap

Saved Policy 3.CO states that planning permission will only be permitted for appropriate development in a local gap, if: (i) it cannot be acceptably located elsewhere; and (ii) it would not diminish the gap, physically or visually.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Saved Policy 18.CO states that development which fails to respect, or has an adverse impact on the intrinsic character of the landscape, will be refused.

The application is considered to comply with the relevant development plan policies and associated supplementary planning guidance for the following reasons:

Although designated as countryside, the west side of Grange Road very much reads as being within the urban edge. These works are not considered to undermine the character of the countryside or the objectives of the strategic gap.

The proposed dropped kerb will not result in any endangerment of highway safety and the Council's Head of Transportation and Engineering has raised no objections to the proposals on these grounds. The informative note to applicant (L03) which advises that the planning permission does not authorise the undertaking of any works involving excavations in the carriageway, footway or verge and that a road opening permit must be obtained from Hampshire Highways prior to the commencement of any works, will be added to the decision notice. Most dwellings in the locality have existing dropped kerbs to provide access to off-street parking on private driveways. It is therefore felt that the proposal is appropriate and will provide a satisfactory means of access allowing for the parking of cars on the frontage.

The size and design of the proposed balcony balustrade is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality and replaces the railing around the existing front balcony.

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 balcony being existing and the dropped kerb being relocated to a central position. The proposals are not considered to result in the overdevelopment of the plot.

To the rear of the site are the Scheduled Ancient Monument of Netley Abbey and the Netley Abbey Conservation Area, neither of which are considered to be harmed as a result of this scheme. Although the dropped kerb will be positioned within a site of archaeological interest the ground works associated with the proposed development will be limited.

Nature conservation
The proposal is not considered to result in a likely significant impact on a European Protected site (SPA,SAC or Ramsar). HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening was not required for this development as it falls outside the designated zone of impact.

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 permission