MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/16/78527

DESCRIPTION	Extension & conversion of garage to create one bed dwelling with associated amenity space & parking & erection of single bay garage
ADDRESS	Land Adjacent to Hideaway 12 Cherry Drove Horton Heath Eastleigh SO50 7DS

SITE VISIT DATE	28/6/16
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	• Extension & conversion of garage to create one bed dwelling with associated amenity space & parking & erection of single bay garage
SITE AREA	• 0.03ha
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	• 14dph
TOPOGRAPHY	• The road slopes upwards slightly in a westerly direction.
TREES	• No protected trees on or adjacent to the site however there are many trees along the western and northern boundaries and several trees within the western end of the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	• The boundaries consist of a combination of hedging, and wooden fencing
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	• The application site is the side garden area to Hideaway (the existing house adjacent to the site) containing a detached garage
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	• Cherry Drove is a single track street with houses

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	of varying types and scales of properties. On the north side of the road properties are orientated with gardens running north. They are set relatively close to each other however the siting is off-set by the deep set backs and generous landscaping. The only structures in close proximity to the road are lower key garages. • The application site is made up of what was the garden of No.12. This plot is long and narrow with No.12 set forward on its plot in close proximity to the street. This siting is however off-set by the generous and long garden that runs west up the street. • The orientation of the plot belonging to No.12 and the siting of properties opposite give the street an open and spacious character and appearance.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/15/76489	Construction of 2no. four bedroom dwelling with integral garages, new access & associated bin & cycle storage	Refused 28/7/15 Appeal dismissed APP/W1715/W/15/3132064
F/15/76359	Erection of 1no. 4 bed dwelling with detached garage, new access and associated bin and bike storage (garden area west of No.12, Hideaway)	Permitted 10.7.15
R/15/74550	Reserved matters pursuant to O/14/74550 for the erection of 1no. 4 bed dwelling. (garden area west of No.12, Hideaway)	Withdrawn 1.5.15
F/15/76067	Addition of 2no. front dormer windows, first floor rear extension and detached double garage (No.12 Hideaway)	Permitted 28.4.15
O/14/74550	Outline: erection of 1no. 4.bed Dwelling (matters to be considered: access and layout only) (garden area west of No.12, Hideaway)	Permit Outline 25.9.15
Z/33943/000/00	Erection of garage (No.12 Hideaway)	Permitted 26.4.96
Z/33943/001/00	Erection of chalet bungalow to replace existing dwelling (No.12 Hideaway)	Permitted 4.8.97

Z/33943/003/00	Relief of condition 3 of planning permission 33943/1 to allow for part retention of original bungalow walls as a garden feature (amended scheme)	Permitted 11.2.02

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
5 Cherry Grove	Whilst I do not object in principle to the change of use of the garage I am concerned that there will be no further building work in Cherry Drove until the completion of the current building work which is in the garden of the same original bungalow at Hideaway, 12 Cherry Drove. There is very restricted parking for contractors and deliveries in Cherry Drove which is a single track road and I wonder if it is possible for a clause to be written in to restrict the commencement of this application until the completion of the current building work in Cherry Drove as both properties are being developed by the same developer, Rivendale. The front drive of this new application is currently used for parking by various vehicles required in connection with the constuction of a 4/5 house which is due for completion in September 2016. I am also concerned about visibility of vehicles leaving the drive, I had a 'near miss' with a car leaving the drive last week. Further comments 1. What arrangements have been made for deliveries of materials and parking of vehicles associated with the development? 2. There is currently further development of the site adjacent to No. 12 Cherry Drove. A large property is being built on the original site of 12 Cherry Drove and the site of this application (F/16/78527) is used for parking of vehicles associated with this development which is due for completion in September 2016. 3. I trust that if this application is granted it will not commence until the completion of the current development and that due consideration will be taken regarding delivery vehicles/parking of site workers/access to the upper part of Cherry Drove for residents.
6 Cherry Grove	Object on the grounds of: 1. Out of keeping with adjacent properties. 2. Over development of the existing site. 3. Poor/dangerous access/egress onto proposed site/garage. 4. Lack of parking in local vicinity.
Muddy Cottage, 8 Cherry Grove	This proposal is out of keeping with surrounding properties, represents gross overdevelopment of the site, creates dangerous traffic conditions in a very narrow road with no

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	visibility for exiting vehicles because of existing hedges and the proposed garage. It is also in conflict with HCC Highways previous recommendations for the total number of entrances and vehicle movements on this Private Street.
11 Cherry Drove	1. When the original application for this plot was submitted I discussed the existing garage with Tracey Payne as it appeared the developer had intention in the future to submit plans for it. Ms Payne assure me the plot was too small to substain any development-I trust this statement will be honoured. 2.The building and garage are too large for the plot. 3. the location of the garage has safety issues as vehicles cannot enter or exit without reversing into Cherry Drove. 4.The garage is too close to the boundary causing a tunnel affect to the road and certainly not in keeping with the rest of the houses in the road. 5.A single bed dwelling is not in keeping with the adjacent properties. 6.It will not possible to carry out the proposed work without significant issues to the residents of Cherry Drove - there is not space for contractors offices and toilets, parking or storage on site. 7.Cherry Drove is too small to take any future traffic
Brinton Botley Road	1) Parking: There is a public layby adjacent to my property where it borders with Cherry Drove. This layby has a high occupancy rate. Such is the demand for parking on Cherry Drove that cars are frequently double parked on the pavement either side of this layby. These vehicles frequently cause damage to the grass verges and have caused actual damage to my property (Several years ago I successfully applied to have bollards erected by the council to protect my fence). The creation of a large property to the west of the “Hideaway” has increased traffic to Cherry Drove and this further development will only compound things further. 2) Trees and Hedges: There is a large mature hedgerow that borders my property and the proposed development site. In section 15 of the “Application for Planning Permission” it is stated that there are no trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character. When the development of land to the west of the “Hideaway” commenced, the garage on the proposed development site was used as a site office/storage. A large pine tree that formed part of this hedge was cut down by the developer without my consent

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	and without consultation (no doubt for reasons of access or to facilitate the proposed development). I therefore do not have any faith that the developer will not cause further damage to the hedge boundary. For information the hedge is less than 1ft away from the garage that currently occupies the site. 3) Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Slow worms are present in the garden to the rear of my property and my neighbours also confirm that they have slow worms on their property. Slow worms are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and are classified as a Priority Species in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Due to the proximity of the proposed development site to my, and my neighbours', gardens I have strong reason to believe that slow worms are also present on the proposed site

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Fair Oak Parish Council	No objection – concerns were expressed on overspill parking and traffic congestion.
Head of Transportation and Engineering	Holding objection. The garage appears to be associated with the dwelling to the west, but no information has been provided as to where this parking will be relocated - i.e. will the adjacent property have any? There should be a minimum of 3 parking spaces retained on the site of the existing property, and this should be clearly shown on plans. Assuming adequate re-provision of parking is provided, the proposed site would be acceptable from a purely highway perspective. The access point to the parking area is already in location (existing parking area), so there will be no impact in this regard to the existing situation, and the spaces are set into site sufficiently to allow for a 6.0m turning aisle width. The angle of the garage is not ideal, but will not need to be included in the parking provision numbers and as such is considered as a storage area. For the garage to be utilised by a vehicle, the two driveway spaces would need to be empty, however this would allow for on-site turning to enable forward gear access/egress, so not requiring an angled drive out.
Head of Housing and Environmental Health	The development site is located in the rear garden of an existing residential property and within a larger residential area. • Access to the development site will be from Cherry Drove and a number of properties are located in close proximity to the roadway

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	• The site will require site clearance of the current vegetation. In view of this no objection is raised subject to conditions controlling noise, dust, hours of work, and burning.

POLICY CONTEXT

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

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011):
- 28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling)
- 34.ES (Sustainable Development)
- 59.BE (Development Criteria)
- 72.H (Density)
- 100.T (Minimise Travelling)
- 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions)
- 104.T (Parking)

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising of the 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'
- DM1 (Development Criteria)
- DM2 (Sustainable Development)
- DM23 (Transport)
- DM24 (Parking)
- DM25 (Residential Development)
- DM29 (Internal Space Standards)

Supplementary Planning Document: Bishopstoke, Fair Oak, & Horton Heath (2008)
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011)
Supplementary Planning Document Residential Parking Standards (2009)
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development (2009)

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bishopstoke Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area – BiFOHH 26 requires back land development to be subordinate to the existing development and serviced via a separate access road.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) contains a number of paragraphs which would be relevant to this type of proposal however it is generally against development in residential gardens. Paragraph 53 states 'local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area'.

In addition the NPPF highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people" (para 56) and goes on to state that decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development (para 58). Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions (para 64).

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

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

The dwelling to the west Hideaway has had a garage built under planning permission F/15/76067, so there is no concern that there would be any loss of parking. All other comments are noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Noted. The comments about this development starting once the adjacent development has been completed is understood but if planning permission is consented then the applicant can implement it within three years from the date of approval.

The issues raised about storage of materials could be conditioned and regarding highway safety, the nature of the road is such that drivers must assume responsibility for due care. On site manoeuvring does appear to be tight, however the Head of Transportation and Engineering has not raised any concerns.

The neighbours comment that a pine tree was cut down is not an issue, there are no protected trees and as it was on the applicants land no permission was required. As far as the Local Planning Authority is aware the hedge is to be retained.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

The ministerial statement of 28th November 2014 from The Minister of State for Housing and Planning, and subsequent changes to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) has increased the threshold for when tariff based planning obligations can be required by new development. This means that developments of ten units or less (and which have a

maximum combined floor space of no more than 1000 square metres) will be exempt from the need to provide tariff based planning obligations or affordable housing.

This proposal is for both less than ten units and under 1000 square metres, meaning that planning obligations for community infrastructure, public open space, sustainable transport and affordable housing has not been required.

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

Principle

The application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being dependant on the details and impacts of the proposal being considered acceptable, as set out below.

Layout/Design, Impact Upon on the Character and Appearance

Saved policy 72.H and emerging policy DM25 accepts the principle of creating new dwellings, particularly in areas well served by public transport, services, and facilities.

The application site formed what was the original garden of Hideaway, the plot was generous in comparison to a number of the neighbouring dwellings on Cherry Drove. The application site has been subject to a number of planning applications, following the severance of the land.

Cherry Drove itself is a single track lane with housing to the north. The application site contains a detached garage which is set back from the highway to the south of Cherry Drove. To the west of the application site permission was granted for the erection of 1no. 4 bed dwelling with detached garage, new access and associated bin and bike storage, following severance of the garden of Hideaway. In addition to this Hideaway itself, has been extended to include a substantial detached garage.

The comments made by objectors with regards the development being out of keeping to resulting in over-development have been noted.

The application site has been severed as already mentioned and a number of applications have been submitted to develop the overall plot with additional dwellings. The most recent application was to the west of Hideaway for two four bed detached dwellings. The application was refused for the following reason; 'The proposed development by reason of the:

(i) Quantum of development
(ii) Inadequate plot size
(iii) Inappropriate dwelling footprint, layout, scale form and design represents an inappropriate form of development which when taken together are considered to be symptomatic of a cramped, congested, and overdeveloped site which undermines the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

spatial characteristics and existing pattern of development in the neighbourhood'.

A subsequent appeal was dismissed as the Inspector stated that 'the size of the proposed dwellings would appear to be cramped on this plot when compared to those in the surrounding area. As noted the pattern of development in this area is of individual detached properties on reasonably sized plots. This proposal would clearly conflict with this pattern'. Following the refusal and dismissed appeal the applicant has submitted this application to extend the existing garage and convert it to a one bed dwelling with a detached garage, this particular parcel of land is sited to the east of Hideaway. The garage would be extended with a single storey front extension, alteration to the roof to form habitable accommodation. Notwithstanding the fact that the application site is to the east of the refused application site it is considered that the reason for refusal and the upheld appeal is pertinent in this case. The refused application for two dwellings expressed concerns about the higher density of development in comparison to the neighbouring properties and whilst the scheme was able to demonstrate bin storage, car parking, landscaping and amenity areas, there was a concern that the development would create a cramped and congested layout.

The density of this proposal is 14dph, which is within acceptable limits for urban development and would be comparable to neighbouring dwellings which equate to a density of approximately 12-13dph. However much like the refused scheme there is a concern that the development overall will result in over development not just in isolation but also in terms of the entire site. Whilst appearing to provide the required bin/bin storage, car parking, landscaping, and amenity areas, there is a concern that the proposal appears to result in a cramped or congested layout that is not reflective of the pattern of development thus resulting in harm to the character and appearance of Cherry Drove.

The plot size when comparing it to the neighbouring plots would be much smaller, again meaning that the proposal does not reflect the character and appearance of the area. The existing dwellings are of varying types and scale but set on very large plots and orientated with gardens running north, with the exception of Hideway and the permitted dwelling which is currently under construction. They are set relatively close to each other however the siting is off-set by the deep and irregular setbacks and generous landscaping. The proposed boundary treatment appears to be very minimal with no details provided though the site plan shows hedging to the east and south. Again this is not reflective of Cherry Drove where the green nature is clearly evident owing to the set back from the highway of neighbouring properties, the boundary treatments are generous and verdant which are an important characteristic of the streetscene. A lack of landscaping treatment in such close proximity to the road will appear visually prominent and overbearing on the street scene. This would be further exacerbated by the addition of the two parking spaces, siting of a new detached garage, as well as the refuse storage in such close proximity to the highway in addition to the extension to the existing garage would result in a cramped and unwelcomed enclosing built form disrupting the sense of space around the building and detrimental to the pattern of development within the locality.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The proposed development owing to its scale and siting would result in a cramped and congested overdevelopment of the site, undermining the spatial characteristics and existing pattern of development of Cherry Drove, creating a sense of enclosure which would undermine the spatial qualities of this locality. The proposed development would be contrary to NPPF paragraphs 56, 58 and 64, Saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising of the 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', Supplementary Planning Document: Bishopstoke, Fair Oak, & Horton Heath (2008), Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011).

Residential Amenity

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and emerging Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan both requires development, amongst other things, to avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

There would be a 15 metre separation distance to the rear of Ain Croft which is sited to the north of the application site. This is considered acceptable as there would be more overlooking experienced to the occupiers of the proposed development from Ain Croft owing to their rear balcony and level of fenestration at first floor. A 40 metre separation distance would be maintained to Chailey which again is opposite the application site, this considered acceptable.

The properties to the east would have a 25 metre separation distance and a 13 metre separation distance to Hideaway. Overall it is considered that although the layout, siting, and design of the dwelling is not considered acceptable it would not result in detrimental harm in terms of outlook to neighbouring properties and are sufficiently separated that there will not be any detrimental overbearing or loss of light impacts.

In terms of physical amenity space for the proposed dwellings, the private amenity space would be to the west forming a side garden, the Quality Places SPD states that amenity areas should be 60% of the floor space of the dwelling. The proposed garden area would equate to 16.8sqm which is significantly below the guidance, whereas it should be 77sqm.
The Inspector when discussing the appeal at the rear garden of Hideaway concluded that the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) which specifies that the absolute minimum for private amenity space is 60% of the floor space. However, this guidance also notes that the size of private amenity space will need to increase where the local context requires it, such as in more suburban areas. On this basis I consider that the minimum SPD standard does not reflect the spatial qualities of this local area, and that local circumstances suggesting a higher level of provision is required have been demonstrated.
Further to which the position of the proposed private amenity area appears contrived and an afterthought, and in conjunction with the overall size of plot, the required level of private amenity space would not be possible, and this would not be reflective of the pattern of development on Cherry Drove.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The proposed development due to its insufficient plot size, would amount to an overdevelopment of the site and would give rise to a cramped and poor quality living environment detrimental to the amenity of their future occupiers and out of character with development in the locality.
The proposed development would be contrary to saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising of the 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', Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011).

Access & Parking

The neighbours' concerns with regard to the access arrangements and parking have been noted.

The proposed access to the site is via the existing highway of Cherry Drove which, although narrow is considered acceptable to serve the additional properties and Transportation have raised no concerns with the access arrangements or sightlines.

Saved Policy 100.T and emerging policy DM23 expects development to be sited close to, or well served by, public transport, cycling and walking. The site is within the urban edge, minutes of a regular bus service, cycle routes and is accessible by foot.

Saved Policy 104.T and emerging policy DM24 states permission will only be granted for development that provides adequate off-highway parking provision. The two proposed parking spaces would meet the requirements as set out in the Residential Parking Standards SPD (2009). A bike store is shown within the garage, where generally a separate store is usually required but on this occasion this would be sufficient.

Drainage

No details have been provided on the drainage for the new dwelling; these details would have been required by an appropriately worded condition had the application been acceptable in all other respects.

Refuse Collection

Saved Policy 28.ES, emerging policy DM1, and the Quality Places SPD requires adequate provision of waste disposal/bins to be provided. The location of refuse facilities are shown at the front of the garage abutting the highway, this is not considered appropriate as it would not be reflective of Cherry Drove. An appropriate condition for an alternative siting of refuse facilities would have been imposed had the application been acceptable in all other respects.

Environmentally Sustainable Development

In accordance with the Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD and emerging Policy DM2 new dwellings are required to meet Code of Sustainable Homes level 4 and this would have previously been secured by way of an appropriately worded conditions.
Following a Written Update to Parliament from the Secretary of State for Communities and

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Local Government on 25th March 2015 and the coming into law of the Deregulation Act on 26th March 2015, the outcomes of the Housing Standards Review come into force which partly relate to sustainable design standards.
The outcome of the review will mean significant changes for the implementation of the EBC Environmentally Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document (ESD SPD). We are no longer able to grant planning permission requiring compliance with specific standards in the Code for Sustainable Homes. We are able to continue applying energy standards which exceed the Building Regulations (i.e. at Code 4 standard) until the 'Zero Carbon Homes' policy comes into force in late 2016.

The Local Planning Authority is able to require specific standards of water efficiency as well, given our existing policy requirement in the ESD SPD is for Code 4 where there is a mandatory water consumption standard to be met. The combined energy and water standards can be secured through standard conditions at design stage and post-construction stage.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policy and appropriate conditions requiring design and final stage certificates demonstration compliance with code level 4 for energy and water would have been imposed had the application been acceptable in all other respects.

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.
The site falls outside the 5.6kn buffer zone for the Solent SPA. A contribution is therefore not required to mitigate the increased recreational pressure resulting from the development.

A neighbour commented that their garden has slow worms and it is believed they are on the application site. No such information was found to confirm this and as previous applications to the adjacent site did not express concerns regarding biodiversity, there is no concern in this instance.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011-2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

1) The proposed development owing to its scale and siting would result in a cramped and congested overdevelopment of the site, undermining the spatial characteristics and existing pattern of development of Cherry Drove, creating a sense of enclosure which would undermine the spatial qualities of this locality. The proposed development would be contrary to NPPF paragraphs 56, 58 and 64, Saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising of the 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', Supplementary Planning Document: Bishopstoke, Fair Oak, & Horton Heath (2008), Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011).

2) The proposed development due to its insufficient plot size, would amount to an overdevelopment of the site and would give rise to a cramped and poor quality living environment detrimental to the amenity of their future occupiers and out of character with development in the locality. The proposed development would be contrary to NPPF paragraphs 56, 58 and 64, Saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising of the 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', Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011).