REF. NO. F/13/71929

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Conversion of chapel into a 1/2 bed dwelling Newtown Meeting Room 4 Northlands Road Eastleigh SO50 9AX

SITE VISIT DATE 24/01/2013

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Conversion of the existing building.
SITE AREA	Approx. 126 sq.m.
TOPOGRAPHY	Level site.
TREES	None affected by this application.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Currently the front boundary onto Northlands Road is marked by a low brick wall with brick piers. Both side boundaries are marked by the current building and to the rear is a 1.4 – 1.5 metre high brick and block work wall around a small external yard area.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site is currently taken up by a small red brick meeting/gospel hall (built in 1905) which sits at the end of a row of two storey terrace houses. To the front is a small entrance porch accessed through a gate in the boundary wall from the street. To the rear is a small extension which is ancillary to the main hall and behind this is a small external yard area surrounded by a boundary wall.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and made up of two storey red brick Edwardian terrace houses with small front gardens and decent size rear gardens accessed via alleyways just wide enough to allow vehicular traffic. Most properties remain as single dwellings but a number, in particular corner plots, have been converted into flats.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/11/68553	Erection of 4 no. one bed studio flats with ancillary bin and cycle storage following demolition of existing hall	Refused 18 May 2011
F/12/70470	Erection of 1No. 3-bed house following demolition of existing building	Permitted 27 April 2012

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

REF. NO. F/13/71929

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
LOCAL GROUP	No representations received
OTHER	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Env Health	This Service has identified the above application on a recent planning list. I have reviewed the information provided / that held by this Service and I would like to make the following comments: The current property attached to the end of a terrace of residential properties The proposed work will require extensive renovation work and internal work The development site is surrounded by existing residential properties We would therefore recommend that the following conditions are imposed for amenity protection reasons: NS05 - HOURS OF WORK No construction or demolition work must take place except between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays or 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. NS21 - DUST Developments shall not begin until a scheme of works to deal with dust from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall then be implemented and retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority NS18 - NO BURNING The burning of materials obtained by site clearance or from any other source must not take place without the prior written consent of the local Planning Authority.
PP & D	Policy Officer: No policy objections. Design Officer: Given the previous history and site constraints, no objection from a design point of view.
Eng	No objection. The dwelling will have no effect upon the highway, other than its conversion to a residential dwelling will likely reduce associated trips rates to / from the site compared to its existing use. As such, no developer contributions will be required. In regard to parking, I have spoken to Wayne Bailey (Parking Services Manager), and he has agreed that in this specific case, the parking need will be reduced from the needs associated with the existing use compared to the proposed use, and as such it is eligible to join the residents parking scheme. Basically, to issue permits the Council must be satisfied that the development will not cause an increase in demand for parking, and in this case this is believed to be true. If the case officer is minded to approve the scheme, then they should make Wayne Bailey aware of approval, so this can be recorded on the parking services database in readiness for a parking permit application.

REF. NO. F/13/71929

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	No objection in principal, but there needs to be a condition devised about no windows permitted to open out across the adjacent access way. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 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), 185.IN (Loss of Community Facilities), 191.IN (Social Infrastructure).
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029: S1, S2, DM1, DM10, DM23, DM25, DM29, DM32, DM35, DM37
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development
Supplementary Planning Document Residential Parking Standards

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

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, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

The conditions recommended by the Council's Environmental Health unit and Engineering unit are considered to be appropriate to the development and could be imposed should planning permission be granted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

n/a

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of Circular 05/05 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 sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Community Infrastructure, and Public Open Space. The applicant has agreed to secure the contributions through a direct payment.

REF. NO. F/13/71929

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 basic principle of redeveloping the site for residential purposes is acceptable as the site lies within the urban edge, close to the Town Centre and within an established residential area. However, any formal planning approval is based upon the proposed development meeting the necessary requirements of the relevant local plan policies and supplementary planning guidance. Of particular relevance in this instance are saved Policies 59.BE and 185.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011).

Policy 59.BE essentially requires development to be sympathetic to its locality and avoid undue impact on neighbouring properties and uses, as well as sets out a number of basic criteria that must be met. Policy 185.LB relates to the loss of established community facilities and states that their loss will not be accepted unless it can be proved that the facility can be suitably provided elsewhere or that it is now surplus to requirements.

It is located within a high accessibility area with good access to public transport in the Town Centre and good pedestrian and cycle links to nearby facilities. The density of this proposal is 79 dwellings per hectare, (the average density on the area is approximately 48 dwellings per hectare) and subject to the consideration of the detailed matters, the principle of development is acceptable.

Loss of the community use – The loss of the meeting hall as an established community facility has been considered as part of the previous application which was approved in 27 April 2012 (F/12/70470), which involved the demolition of the building and a replacement dwelling being constructed.

Saved Policy 185.IN states that “The Borough Council will not permit development proposals which would result in the removal or loss of an established community facility unless suitable alternative provision is made which is of an acceptable quality and siting or is more appropriate to the needs of the community, or the existing facility can be shown to be surplus to local needs.” Information has been provided by the applicant in the previous application which demonstrated the availability of similar facilities nearby. At that time the Council’s Planning Policy section commented, “In terms of the loss of the community facility, it would appear that this use has already been lost, in that the property has not been in community use for a number of years, and appears to have little potential for such use in the future. There is no evidence of any marketing for a community use, but given the very constricted character of the site and the absence of any parking provision, it is not clear what demand there would be. Given the recent history of the site and the availability of other community facilities locally, it can reasonably be concluded that it is surplus to local needs within the terms of policy 185.IN.” For this application, no policy objection has been received.

This earlier application resulted in the loss of this building. However, the current application is for the existing building is to be renovated. The building is of some historic local importance, being the first building in the street and remaining in the same community use since it was built in 1905. The loss of the hall was justified for the previous application due to the poor condition. However the developer has had the building surveyed and is confident that it can be renovated and converted to residential successfully. This allows the retention of a building which contributes historically and visually to the residential area and should permit its continued retention through bringing an empty building back into continuous use.

REF. NO. F/13/71929

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Street scene and character of the area - The existing building, whilst currently in poor condition, contributes to the character of the street, and once renovated should be of significant visual benefit. The low brick wall and small frontage along the street is to be retained and the boundary adjacent to the alleyway will be formed by the flank wall of the house and a 2.1m high brick wall. Where the existing extension will be demolished and the ridge of the back projection raised to meet the main ridge, a traditional red brick will be used to tie in the new with the old. This will need to be specified as a reclaimed brick and will need to be secured by condition to ensure a satisfactory relationship. This will need to be continued along the boundary wall.

Residential amenity - To assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places has been produced which gives guidance on overlooking, loss of light, amenity space for new dwellings and refuse storage. The amenity of future occupiers of the development also needs to be considered.

The impact on neighbouring properties will be less than that which would have resulted from the approved replacement dwelling. There will be no overlooking onto other properties, nor any significant overshadowing as a result of the increased ridge height at the rear. There is the potential for overlooking onto the platform/first floor bathroom through the rooflights, however this is limited due to the distance from first floor bedrooms and should it be a problem for future residents can be addressed through the use of obscure glazing or blinds, as these windows are not the sole light source to these spaces.

The garden space is relatively small and does not meet the minimum space standards of 60% of the floor area, at approx. 30%. However, given the proposal allows the retention of the meeting hall close to its original form and the development site is located in close proximity to the town centre and the recreation ground, this compromise is considered acceptable.

Cycle storage is to be provided in a garden shed, which can be conditioned. It is appropriate for the refuse bins to be stored at the front of the site, to maximise the available amenity space, however an acceptable form of screening will need to be agreed to ensure the bins do not detract from the character of the property. This can again be conditioned.

Parking – Lack of parking for future occupiers and existing parking problems were raised as a problem in an earlier application that was refused. It is acknowledged that the area does suffer from parking difficulties despite it being within a resident's parking scheme and that further vehicles would most likely not help the situation. However, as commented by the Council's Engineering unit, its conversion to a residential dwelling will likely reduce associated trips rates to / from the site compared to its existing use. The parking need will be reduced from the needs associated with the existing use compared to the proposed use, and as such it is eligible to join the residents parking scheme. Conditions can also be imposed to ensure the retention of the garden area by the removal of the appropriate permitted development rights.

Environmental Sustainability – The Council's Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD requires new dwelling to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. As this proposal is for the conversion of an existing building, this requirement does not comply. The reuse of an existing building, in place of its demolition and construction of a new dwelling is, however, inherently more sustainable. Given the proximity of the site to the town centre and its good transportation links, the location itself is sustainable.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

REF. NO. F/13/71929

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.

CONCLUSIONS

Recommend permission, subject to conditions and the receipt of the necessary developers contributions.