Awarded for excellence

Beacon Authority 2008-2009 Tackling Climate Change

Development Control
Application No O/11/68437
Your ref
Please ask for Rachel Illsley
Direct dial 023 8068 8446
Hours of work Wed-Thurs 9-5 Fri 9-4.30
e-mail rachel.illsley@eastleigh.gov.uk

Luken Beck Partnership
FAO Mr Graham Beck
30 Carlton Crescent
Southampton
SO15 2EW

22 June 2011

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010

Application No. O/11/68437

In pursuance of their powers under the above Act and in accordance with your application received on 15 February 2011, with subsequent amendments dated

13/04/2011, 16/05/2011

the Council, as Local Planning Authority hereby REFUSE OUTLINE PERMISSION for the following :

Description: Outline: Construction of 66 bedroom care home for the elderly with associated access, parking, amenity areas, landscaping and woodland management (matters to be considered: access, layout and scale).

Site: Former Dog Kennel Farm, Telegraph Road, West End, Southampton, SO30 3EH

For the following reasons:

(1) The proposed development, in an area designated as both countryside and strategic gap, is not required for an agricultural, horticultural, forestry or recreational use, and the applicants have failed to adequately demonstrate why the development could not be accommodated on a more sequentially preferable site with the urban area. Thus it would be unacceptable in principle and would result in a physical and visual diminishment of the strategic gap contrary to the aims of PPS1 and PPS7 and Saved Policies 1.CO and 2.CO of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and the Council's 'Accommodation for Elderly People and those in need of similar care' Supplementary Planning Document' (adopted May 2011).

(2) The proposed development would result in the loss of 15 protected trees, which cumulatively, make a positive contribution to the sylvan character and appearance of the site. There is no arboricultural justification for the removal of these trees and as such, the proposals are contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE(i) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011).

(3) The proposed development fails to meet the requirements of ESD2, ESD5 and ESD7 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, 'Environmentally Sustainable Development', (adopted March 2009) and as such, is considered contrary to saved Policy 34.ES of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and the above named Supplementary Planning Document.

(4) The proposed development, by reason of its siting and scale and the loss of trees, would result in the introduction of a building of undue prominence within the existing woodland setting and established street scene, to the detriment of the landscape character and appearance of the site, and would result in the urbanisation and physical and visual diminishment of this part of the strategic gap. The proposals are therefore contrary to the guidance contained within PPS7 and Saved Policies 2.CO and 18.CO of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011).

(5) Due to the lack of information submitted and the site's ground levels and tree coverage, the application has failed to demonstrate that the siting, layout and orientation of the building would not result in a poor quality residential environment and poor quality and useability of amenity space. The proposals are therefore contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and the Council's 'Accommodation for Elderly People and those in need of similar care' Supplementary Planning Document', (adopted May 2011).

(6) Contrary to the guidance contained within Circular 05/05, the Community Infrastructure Regulations, Saved Policy 101.T of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, 'Planning Obligations', (adopted July 2008), the application fails to make provision for contributions towards sustainable transport measures and public art in the local area, the need for which would increase as a result of the proposed development.



C L Thomas
Head of Development Control

N.B. See Enclosed Notes (ROL)