MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/14/74749

DESCRIPTION	Erection of two storey 3no. bed dwelling attached to no. 9 Birch Road to form end of terrace property with associated access, parking and landscaping.
ADDRESS	Land to side of 9 Birch Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 4GA

SITE VISIT DATE	31/07/2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	The submitted drawings contain a number of inaccuracies. The site plan is not accurate at the stated scale of 1:500; the front porch projection has been omitted from this drawing. In addition, the depth of the proposed property is stated as being 6m on the floor plans, however, it is shown as extending the full length of the southern side elevation of No. 9 Birch Road which it would adjoin and which measures off at 7m in depth on the location plan provided.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks approval for the erection of an attached three bedroom, two-storey dwellinghouse which would adjoin the southern side elevation of No. 9 Birch Road and would be positioned within part of its current private amenity area. A single car parking space is proposed to be sited on the frontage of the plot to serve the new property with a pathway at the rear to provide access to the garden of No. 9 Birch Road from Long Close Road. The property will have pitched, gable-ended roof with a single-storey lean-to front porch projection.
SITE AREA	The total site area is approximately 393sqm with the plot of the proposed dwelling being 239sqm.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	41.84 dwellings per hectare.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site slopes gradually down to the north from Long Close Road towards the southern side elevation of No. 9 Birch Road. The ground within the part of the plot where the new dwelling is proposed to be positioned is also somewhat uneven and undulates to a degree moving east to west across the site.
TREES	There are no trees on the application site or in its immediate vicinity that would be impacted upon by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The frontage of the site is relatively open with there being only a low-level brick wall partially demarcating the boundary of the site with the highway footpath. The area within which the proposed dwelling would be sited is surrounded by 1.8m high timber fencing on all sides.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	No. 9 Birch Road is a semi-detached, two-storey three-

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	bedroom dwelling of red brick construction. The property has a pitched gable-ended roof and, owing to its corner location at the junction of Birch Road and Long Close Road, is set on a larger plot than the property which it adjoins, No. 11 Birch Road. The site has a relatively open frontage which is laid to lawn; there is currently no formal on-plot car parking to serve the existing property. The property has a sizeable area of enclosed private amenity space which is sited between its southern elevation and the highway and which extends around to the rear in the form of a paved patio area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is situated within an established residential area formed of a mixture of predominantly semi-detached and terraced properties, being both single-storey bungalows as well as two-storey dwellinghouses.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
11 Birch Road, Hedge End	*Concerned that the changing of a semi-detached property into a terraced will reduce the value of No. 11 attached to No. 9.*
18 Birch Road, Hedge End	*The occupier of No. 18 Birch Road made the following comments and objections in respect of the proposed dwelling:* • *Parking: It is already known to be an issue for parking on this road for many residents. The addition of another 3 bed house would introduce at least another two vehicles to the parking situation and the planning only shows one parking space on the driveway. The access would also lessen available on road spaces. Also questioned whether there was any provision for the parking of construction workers vehicles on the site.* • *Residential amenity: Overlooking towards my property resulting in a lack of privacy. Loss of sunlight into my rear garden in the afternoon. This would result in the devaluing of my property.* • *Overdevelopment: questioned the need for more housing in this area/road.* • *Impact on sewerage and drainage.* • *Loss of green land in the locality.* • *Visually intrusive when looking out of the front windows of my property.* • *Excessive noise, dust or smells during the construction period.*
20 Birch Road, Hedge End	*The occupier of No. 20 Birch Road made the following comments and objections in respect of the proposed dwelling:* • *The parking in Birch Road is very limited already with some residents already abandoning cars and trucks causing traffic problems.*

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	• *The daylight would be severely blocked from coming into my property.* • *It would close the area and make the road darker.* • *It would alter the view from my lounge window for the worse.*

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	*No objection.*
Head of Plannign Policy and Design (Sustainability Officer)	*No comments received.*
Head of Transportation and Engineering	*Transport Policy Officer:* *Holding objection:* *Whilst there is no objection in principle to the proposals, the plans show parking for 1 vehicle only. In line with the EBC Parking standards, a minimum of 2 on-site vehicle parking spaces should be provided in association with a 3-bed dwelling.* *If revised plans can be supplied that show the second parking space whilst still achieving access to the front door (there looks adequate space to accommodate this), the application can be re-assessed accordingly.* *In terms of transport Developer Contributions, in line with the HCC Transport Contributions Policy (TCP), there will be a requirement for these to be assessed in regard to the proposed site in terms of additional multimodal trips rates occurring following the construction of the new dwelling. In this case, the transport developer contribution requirement would be £3,745 (+ indexation).* *These funds would be allocated to schemes in the local vicinity which are either of benefit to the residents of the proposed development, or go to mitigate against issues caused by the development. Full details of identified transport schemes can be provided if required, and can be seen in the Eastleigh Borough Transport Statement http://www3.hants.gov.uk/eastleigh-transport-statement-final-2012.pdf* *DC Engineer:* *The highway adoption plans for Birch Road appear to indicate that a highway drainage pipe runs right across the garden where the dwelling is proposed. The proposed dwelling would affect this existing sewer, there is no evidence submitted to indicate that the applicants are aware of its existence.* *I am checking with HCC to ascertain if they have records of the highway*

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	drainage. It may be possible to reroute the pipework (if it is in situ at present) to a new position alongside the boundary in the gap between the flank end wall and footway, if levels enable that to be achieved. Please take up with applicants, I will send adoption plan separately. *In respect of other matters, the application should show cycle and bin storage provision for existing and proposed dwellings.*
Southern Water Services	*No comments received.*

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), Saved Policies 28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling), 34.ES (Energy and Climate Change), 59.BE (Promoting Good Design), 100.T (Minimise Travelling), 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions), 104.T. (Parking), 147.OS (Public Open Space), 191.IN (Social Infrastructure).
Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, DM1 (General Criteria for New Development), DM2 (Environmentally Sustainable Development), DM23 (General Development Criteria – Transport), DM24 (Parking), DM25 (Residential Development in Urban Areas), DM29 (Internal Space Standards for Residential Development), DM32 (Provision of Recreation and Open Space Facilities with New Development), DM37 (Funding Infrastructure).
Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area:

The site falls within the designated character area *HEWEB 37.* The Council's adopted appraisal document sets out the following guidance principles for new development:

- Retain the grass verges and associated semi-mature broadleaved tree planting.
- Maintain the predominant plot widths.
- Maintain the predominant open frontages while seeking to maintain a clear distinction between public and private space.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site does not fall within a designated special policy area.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

In respect of this application, the following sections or paragraphs of the NPPF are considered to be of particular relevance:

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

- Paragraph 6 states that "the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development".
- Paragraph 14 sets out that "at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking". The Framework sets out that for decision-taking this means "approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted."
- Paragraph 17 details the 12 core planning principles that should underpin decision-taking, these include that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings".
- Paragraph 32 states that decisions should take account of whether "safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people" and Paragraph 35 states that developments should be located and designed where practical to "give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities."
- Paragraph 49 states that "housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites".
- Paragraph 53 states that "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."
- Paragraph 56 states 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".
- Paragraph 64 states that "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".
- Paragraphs 95 and 98 respectively require that local planning authorities "plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse and gas emissions" and that they should, when determining planning applications, "recognise that even small-scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions".
- Paragraph 215 sets out that, following the expiry of the 12-month transitional period (March 2013) from the date of the publication of the NPPF "due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework".
- Paragraph 216 states that "from the day of publication [of the NPPF], decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: the stage of preparation of the emerging plan…; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies…; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework."

POLICY COMMENTARY

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the principle of the development proposed, its layout and design, residential amenity, highway matters, street scene and character of the area, environmental sustainability, and planning obligations.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	See below		Other – the comments made are noted and are responded to where appropriate in the below assessment of the proposals.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	See below		Other – the matters raised by the occupiers of Nos. 11 and 18 Birch Road concerning the potential impact of the proposals on the value of their respective private properties is not a material planning consideration and therefore cannot be taken into account in the assessment or determination of the application. The other matters raised in relation to residential amenity, area character and highway considerations are addressed in the below assessment of the proposals.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with paragraphs the provisions of Paragraphs 203 to 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework, saved policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and the Council's adopted Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Community Infrastructure, Sustainable Transport, Public Open Space (POS) and Play Provision, POS – District Park/Playing Fields, and the Special Protection Area Disturbance Mitigation Project.

The applicant has been informed of the requirement for these contributions, however, arrangements have not been made for their provision and therefore this will form an additional reason for the refusal of the planning application.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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."

Development Plan Policies:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011):

Saved Policy 28.ES requires that provision should be made in the design and layout of housing developments for the storage and collection of domestic waste and recyclable materials and that

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

these must be sited in locations that would not give rise to disturbance to the occupiers of residential property.

Saved Policy 34.ES states that planning permission will only be granted for proposals which make an appropriate contribution towards the Government's target to reduce levels of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere by (i) ensuring the use of the most sustainable construction materials and construction methods; (ii) minimising the energy demands associated with the occupation of the development by using energy efficient equipment and incorporating high levels of insulation; and (iii) maximising the proportion of energy that is generated from renewable sources.

Saved 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 both in relation to themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, natural features and trees worthy of retention. 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 100.T states *inter alia* that development which accords with other relevant policies of this Plan will be permitted provided it is, or could be well served by public transport, cycling and walking; and it includes measures that minimizes its impact on the existing transport network.

Saved Policy 101.T states that development which results in additional traffic on the local road network greater will: only be permitted if the Council is satisfied that there is a proven need for the development in the location proposed and; be the subject of the provision of contributions towards the implementation of the Local Transport Plan and/or other transport proposals set out in the Local Plan.

Saved Policy 104.T requires that adequate off-highway parking is provided to serve new development.

Saved Policies 147.OS and 191.IN respectively state that where development involves a net increase in residential units, the Council will seek agreements for a contribution towards open space provision in the locality as well as for the provision of infrastructure, services, facilities and amenities directly made necessary by the development.

Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (February 2014):

The document intended as the current Local Plan's replacement, the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, has reached pre-submission stage. Whilst it is acknowledged that, owing to its current unadopted status, this document can only be afforded limited weight, it is still considered to be a material consideration in the determination of this planning application. The relevant policies to this application essentially replicate the requirements of those of the current plan (as listed above) with regards to this development proposal.

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle:

The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable, with any formal planning approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of that proposed being considered appropriate and in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies and supplementary planning documents and guidance.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Housing allocation and presumption in favour of sustainable development:

Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Plan policies relating to housing supply cannot be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029), whilst as yet unadopted, sets out the Council's current intentions for development and understanding of strategic housing needs. In addition, the Council has adopted a Housing Implementation Strategy for the borough of Eastleigh to provide a locally applicable strategy for delivering sustainable residential development over the next five years.

Whilst on this basis the Council considers that it has a deliverable five year housing supply, in instances whereby it may be considered that this is not the case, paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that "housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development" (para. 49). For decision taking this means (para. 14) "granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted."

In this regard, it is acknowledged that the property would be fairly sustainably located within an existing urban area and that the proposals would deliver an additional dwelling towards the Council's housing land supply targets which, whilst having very minimal effect on the overall supply of housing land in the Borough, would constitute a modest benefit of the development. It is not, however, considered that this would be sufficient to outweigh the harm caused by the proposals to both residential amenity as well as to the character of the area.

Layout, design and impact upon the street scene and area character:

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and Policy DM1 of the Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 require development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality. This requirement is reiterated within the guidance contained within the Council's adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document, as well as in the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should "resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area" (paragraph 53) and that "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" (paragraph 64).

This section of Birch Road and Long Close Road consists of modest sized dwellings either in short terraces or as semi-detached pairs. Whilst the creation of a further short terrace within this area is therefore not considered in itself unacceptable in principle and the proposed property would be largely sympathetic to those that it would adjoin in terms of its design, it is considered that the siting of the particular development for which permission is sought and the inadequacy of the plot layout proposed relative to the scale of the dwelling would result in a cramped and inappropriate form of residential development which would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the locality.

The application property sits in a prominent corner location at the junction of Long Close Road and Birch Road and is situated in a recessed position from the highway which runs adjacent to its southern elevation, with this side wall sitting level with the front building line of those dwellings to the immediate west of the site. Whilst the area in between, which forms part of No. 9's amenity

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

space, has been previously enclosed by a somewhat unattractive timber fence, it is still considered to contribute to what is both a physical and visual sense of spacing between the residential development in this part of the street and the highway. This, along with the open nature of the site's frontage as well as the degree of setback of those properties on the opposing side of Long Close Road, gives a particularly wide and open feel to this section of the street and to the entrance into it from Birch Road. The proposed dwelling would be situated markedly advanced of the aforementioned established building line within Long Close Road and as a result the aforementioned spacing between the existing residential development in the street and the highway would be notably diminished. Owing to the resulting proximity of the new dwelling to the highway and to the junction of Long Close Road with Birch Road, as well as the open nature of the site and the longer range views that are afforded towards it from the south and west, it is considered that a property in this position would represent a visually intrusive form of development which would appear eminently and unduly prominent within both of the street scenes to which it would belong, to the significant detriment of their prevailing character and in conflict with the requirements of Saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan.

Waste collection and recycling:

The proposals show no provision to be made for the storage and collection of domestic waste and recyclable materials. In this respect the application is contrary to the provisions of Saved Policy 28.ES which requires such measures to be incorporated into the design and layout of housing developments. It is however considered that there is potentially adequate space available within the plot to suitably accommodate the required storage and collection areas both for the existing and proposed dwellings on the site, and that the matter could be covered by way of a planning condition requiring the submission of the details of this prior to the commencement of development. As such it is not considered that the application could reasonably be refused on these grounds.

Environmental sustainability:

Saved Policy 34.ES of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011, Policy DM2 of the Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, as well as the provisions of the Council's adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), require that all new residential development meets Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and state that it must incorporate a number of 'Essential Requirements' (ESD1-8) designed to maximise energy and water-saving measures in order to contribute to the Council's aims of ensuring that residential development in the Borough places the least practicable demands on the environment.

No information has been provided with the application to demonstrate that the proposed dwelling will meet these requirements. The Sustainability Checklist provided, which makes reference to Southampton City Council's respective policy requirements and not those of Eastleigh Borough Council, incorrectly states in respect of the matter of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, that 'the development is not a new build therefore does not have to meet this requirement'. Whilst the submitted Design and Access Statement does make some reference to Code Level 3, there is insufficient detail provided as to exactly how this would be achieved against the Code's accreditation system, notwithstanding which it would still fall below the Level 4 requirement as set out in the Council's Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD and development plan and emerging development plan policies. For the reasons given, this will form an additional reason for the refusal of the planning application.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Residential amenity:

Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) of the adopted Local Plan requires that development avoids unduly interfering, disturbing or conflicting with adjoining or nearby neighbouring uses. The Council's adopted Quality Places SPD provides additional guidance in support of this policy. In addition, Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings".

There are two main considerations in respect of the application in this regard, these being whether or not the development will provide an appropriate residential environment for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, as well as the manner in which it will impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of existing neighbouring residential properties. With regards to the latter of these, firstly the matters raised in the neighbour representations received concerning potential dust generation and contractors parking could be controlled by way of a planning condition requiring the submission of details of a construction management plan for approval prior to the commencement of development. With regards to the impact of the proposed dwelling upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, whilst the relative arrangement and orientation of the two dwellings is not ideal, it is not considered that this would be unacceptable in respect of the property to the rear, No. 55 Long Close Road. The proposed dwelling is set away from the shared boundary such that it will not be overbearing or result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook for the occupiers of No. 55. The rear facing first floor windows of the proposed house will also only directly overlook the frontage/driveway of this property with there being only oblique angled views available towards this it's front windows which, again whilst not an ideal arrangement, would on balance not be sufficiently harmful to warrant the refusal of the application.

With regards to those properties on the opposing side of Birch Road and to address the objections raised by the occupiers of Nos. 18 and 20, whilst these are noted, it is not considered that the development will have an unduly unacceptable impact upon the respective amenity of their occupiers. In terms of the matter of overlooking and loss of privacy, the front elevation of the proposed dwelling will be no closer to these properties than the existing development in this section of Birch Road and, at 25m, will be at a distance in excess of the 22m minimum set out in the Council's adopted Quality Places SPD (a measurement taken between first floor windows on facing elevations). Owing to this separation distance, the development will also not be overbearing nor will it unacceptably reduce the outlook from or light received to the habitable windows of these neighbouring dwellings. With regards to the matter raised concerning a loss of light to the rear garden of No. 18, it is considered that the proposed dwelling will have no unacceptable impact in this regard and will cause no greater noticeable degree of overshadowing to this area than the neighbouring building itself.

There are, however, concerns with regards to the resulting living standards for the occupiers of the existing property on the site, No. 9 Birch Road. This is notably in respect of the suitability of the area of private amenity space which is to remain to serve this dwelling. The Council's adopted Quality Places SPD (p. 29) states that for houses, the absolute minimum requirement for private amenity space is an area of at least 60% of the floor space of the property. The remaining garden area falls below this standard at 54.8% and will be notably smaller than the garden areas of the nearby neighbouring two-storey development. The garden will also receive a degree of overshadowing from the proposed property during certain parts of the day, particularly during the morning hours, and in addition it will have a two-storey gable-ended dwelling spanning the full width of its rear boundary. On this latter point, whilst it is accepted that this house has been in situ since the construction of the estate, its overbearing nature, with it being sited approximately just

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

7.8m from No. 9 Birch Road's rear elevation, will be notably accentuated with the significant reduction in the size of the property's private amenity area. It is considered that these factors together contribute to what is an unacceptable and inadequate area of private amenity space for the existing property on the site to the detriment of the residential amenity of its occupiers.

In respect of the matter of the residential amenity that would be afforded to the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, whilst it is considered that the proposed orientation would allow for adequate light to be received into the primary habitable rooms of the property and the dwelling to not be adversely overlooked by existing neighbouring development, there are concerns in respect of the amenity area to be provided for its occupiers. The submitted site layout plan fails to demonstrate the extent of such an area and the means by which this is proposed to be enclosed. The rear section of the plot between the dwelling and western boundary is also particularly short in terms of its depth, something which would notably compromise the usability of any such area and which serves to further accentuate what is a cramped layout to the nature of the development proposed.

For the reasons given above, the proposals are considered to be in conflict with the requirements of Saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan, the guidance contained within the Council's adopted Quality Places SPD, as well as the provisions of the NPPF, in that they will impact unduly upon the amenity of the occupiers of No. 9 Birch Road and fail to demonstrate that an acceptable area of private amenity space could be satisfactorily provided for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

Highway matters:

Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) requires that development provides a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles. Saved Policy 104.T in addition states that adequate off-highway parking should be available to serve new development with the required standards in this regard being set out in the Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The application proposes the construction of a three-bedroom dwellinghouse for which this SPD requires the provision of two on-plot car parking spaces. The submitted layout drawing shows only a single space on the property frontage with access from Birch Road. The Council's Head of Transportation and Engineering has therefore raised an objection to the proposals on the basis of an insufficient level of parking provision. Accordingly, and in the absence of information to demonstrate that the required number of vehicular parking spaces can be provided on the plot in an acceptable manner that would not endanger highway safety, the proposals are considered to be in conflict with the requirements of the aforementioned development plan policies and this will as a result form an additional reason for the refusal of the planning application.

Drainage:

The matter of the potential presence of a foul sewer running east to west across the site has been raised by the Council's Head of Transportation and Engineering in their consultation response. This sewer is shown on the original highway drawings for the estate which date from the late 1950s/early 1960s but does not appear on the Council's current indicative sewerage plans for the locality which show it to run only from north to south along the rear boundary of the site. No comments have been received from Southern Water Services on the planning application either in relation to the presence of the sewer or the potential impact of the development upon it. As the application is being recommended for refusal for a number of other reasons as set out above, whilst being brought to their attention, this matter has not been pursued further with the applicants during the application process.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Conclusion:

Overall for the reasons as set out above the development is considered to conflict with the relevant development plan policies, associated supplementary planning documents, and national planning policy.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised 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. 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

The application is recommended for refusal.