REF. NO. «AltRef»

MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/12/70289

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Erection of 1no. Four bedroom detached dwelling with attached double garage, following demolition of existing dwelling Whitehaven Brook Lane Botley Southampton SO30 2ER

SITE VISIT DATE	6th March 2012			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	X	Yes		Initially not. At the site visit I decided The Old Rectory should be consulted due to their close proximity to the site

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Construction of detached 4no. bedroom chalet bungalow following demolition of the existing bungalow and its two detached garages. The application is supported with a Design and Access Statement; SAP Calculations; Sustainability Statement; Site photos; Arboricultural Report.					
SITE AREA	0.20 ha					
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	5 dph					
TOPOGRAPHY	X	Level		Sloping …..		Other …
TREES	Trees to the front (inc oak) and along the southern boundary (mostly fruit trees)					
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Low boundary wall to front, 2m high wooden fence to the north boundary and open to the south apart from trees and brambles.					
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Modest bungalow with dormer windows and detached garages along both side elevations. Ugly lean-to to south side. Garden mostly laid to lawn.					
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Rural with large scattered houses of mixed designs along the lane and Manor Farm Country Part to the south/west,					

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Q/11/69627	Pre App Enquiry: Erection of 1no. 4 bed chalet bungalow with attached double garage to replace existing dwelling	Advice provided 2011
WIR20066003	Erection of dwelling adjacent to Whitehaven and garage for occupation by agricultural	Permitted 1972

REF. NO. «AltRef»

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	worker	
WIR20066001	OL: Erection of a dwelling adjacent to Whitehaven for occupation by agricultural worker with garage, plant house and outbuildings in connection with market garden	Permitted 1971

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Mr Bandey Old Rectory, Brook Lane	No objection

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Botley PC	No objection
Tree officer	No objection
Head of Transportion and Engineering	No objection
Enironment Agency	Initially raised an objection due to the absence of a FRA. They were reconsulted on receipt of the FRA (6th March 2012) and raise no objection.
Head of Env Health	No objection but condition recommended re contamination and amenity.
Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy	No objection

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Outside Built-up Area Boundary Adjacent to conservation area Adjacent to Country Park (POS)

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 1.CO (Countryside), 8.CO (Replacement Dwellings) 28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling), 59.BE (Development Criteria), 100.T (Minimise Travelling), 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions), 104.T. (Parking), 147.OS (Public Open Space), 191.IN (Social Infrastructure).
Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Biodiversity
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development
Supplementary Planning Document Residential Parking Standards

REF. NO. «AltRef»

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Although little weight can be attributed to them following are policies within the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2029 (Draft October 2011)

DM1 – General criteria for new development
DM10(vii) – Development in the countryside
DM14 – replacement dwellings in the countryside
DM29 – Environmentally Sustainable Development
DM32 – Flooding
DM47 – parking
DM50 – Residential development in countryside

National Planning Policy Framework considered.

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, trees, nature conservation, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

X	See below		Other…….

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None received

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of saved policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and supplementary planning document, planning obligation contributions are normally sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Community Infrastructure, Sustainable Transport and Public Open Space.

However, as a replacement dwelling no contributions are sought.

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 8.CO is supportive of replacement dwellings in the countryside provide the existing dwelling is permanent, its of appropriate design, not disproportionate to neighbouring properties or its plot, and does not have a physical of visual greater impact on its surroundings or the countryside than the original dwelling.

Policy 18.CO does not support development that fails to respect the intrinsic character of the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

landscape.

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 scheme is considered to comply with the aforementioned policies in that;

- The scale and massing of the building is not significantly different to that which exists on site at present. The width of the footprint does not exceed the width from garage to garage (as agreed at pre-app), although the bulk of the proposed dwelling is increased through the loss of the small break in the built form currently enjoyed by the detached garage arrangement. The height of the new dwelling is circa 0.6m lower than the existing chalet. The redevelopment will remove the lean-to structure to the front, as such overall the proposal is not considered to cause harm to the character of the immediate area of countryside as a whole.
- The siting is on the same footprint as the existing dwelling & garages a such accords with draft policy DM14.
- The design of the dwelling has improved from that tabled at pre-app and with the initial submission of this application. The change in pitch reduces the amount of roof visible and more importantly reduces the ridge length from 15m to 13m, moving away from the “hall” like scale and appearance of the dwelling. This also secures slightly smaller gables to the front, which is welcomed. The detailing of the proposed dwelling is of a good standard and with the correct choice of materials the dwelling would contribute to the character and appearance of the area in a more positive manner than the existing dwelling. Brook Lane has a variety of dwelling designs, many of which are large two storey dwellings. As set out above, the scale of the dwelling is suitable to this countryside location whilst the plot can easily accommodate a dwelling of this size.
- The comments of the Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy are noted in respect to the garage doors. However, at pre-app officer’s concluded to achieve side access to the garage would necessitate the front projection to extend at least a further 2m beyond the frontage and that this would be excessive in footprint, bulk and impact on the street scene. On balance, and given this is not a conservation area, the scheme as now tabled is found to be more acceptable.
- The dwelling would cause detriment to the amenity of occupiers of nearby dwellings through overlooking, loss of light or visual dominance.
- Car parking can be provided in excess of the adopted standards for a 4 bedroom dwelling.
- No trees of high amenity value are to be loss as a result of this development proposal. The arboricultural report identifies those trees to be felled as either category “C” or of such poor quality that they should be removed for good arboricultural reasons. None of the trees are covered by a TPO. Replacement planting is proposed along the SE boundary.
- No features of nature conservation interest are effected by this development.
- In accordance with the SPD on Environmentally Sustainable Development a sustainability statement has been submitted confirming the development will be constructed to CfsH

REF. NO. «AltRef»

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Level 4 and meet the other requirements of the SPD.

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 recommendation is to permit