REF. NO. F/16/78355

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Construction of attached garage & store (amended design to F/16/77885). 69 Elliot Rise, Hedge End, Southampton, SO30 2RW

SITE VISIT DATE – 18/05/2016

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application proposes the erection of a garage and storage area to the front of the property. The proposed garage and storage area would be linked to the main dwelling, however, no internal access is shown on the submitted plans. This is an amended design to a recently refused application.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	n/a
TOPOGRAPHY	The land slopes slightly from SW to NE.
TREES	None that would be affect by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Close boarded fencing along boundary.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site consists of a two storey detached property located to the north of Elliot Rise. The property has a large front garden area, which is partially laid to land and partially hard surfaced.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area generally consists of detached two storey properties.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/16/77885	Construction of attached garage & store.	Refused Mar 2016
F/15/77550	First floor side extension, alterations to roof to provide habitable accommodation, insertion of 1no. dormer to front and 2no. dormers to rear and single storey rear extension	Granted 18/12/2015
F/07/60099	First floor side extension	Granted 21/08/2007
F/06/58595	Construction of 1st floor side extension and loft conversion	Withdrawn 19/07/2007
Z/37959/000/00	Construction of first floor side extension	Granted 03/09/2001

REF. NO. F/16/78355

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Taylor – 60 Elliot Rise	Acknowledges amendments made but still feels that the design would be visually intrusive and an overdevelopment of the site.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	No objection.

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 Policy 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising:

- 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' Policies DM1 & DM24

Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Character Area Appraisals – Hedge End, West End & Botley (HEWEB 64)
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports and encourages sustainable development which is considered to have three roles, economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that "These roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities. Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions."

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 that proposed, its layout, design and impact upon the street scene and character of the surrounding area, parking and highway issues, the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and nature conservation.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Noted.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

n/a

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."*

In this case policy issues for consideration include:

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. The most relevant policy in this case is saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan which 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, a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, to make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, and noise and fumes. Also of relevance is Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

Layout, Design, Street Scene & Area Character – The application proposes the erection of a garage and storage building to the front and side of the property. The proposed garage would link to the existing dwelling at the side of the property. The proposed garage, while smaller than that refused in footprint and height is still considered to be relatively large due to the width of the proposed garage being 7.8m and the length of the garage being 8.3m and 9.6m at the front of the site. Concerns remain regarding the size and scale of the proposed garage especially in relation to the size of the existing dwelling. However, it is considered on balance that the size of the garage now proposed would not result in a reason for refusal, especially given that this was not used as a reason for refusal of the previous application.

The proposed garage would be located in the corner of the site, due to the access of the dwelling being located at the end of this part of Elliot Rise and the location of the garage on the site, the proposed garage would be screened by the neighbouring property 68 Elliot Rise. It is considered on balance that the proposed outbuilding/garage would not cause material harm to the street scene or general character of the area.

Parking & Highway Issues – The existing driveway can easily accommodate the minimum of three off-road parking spaces required by the Council's 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD and will not be greatly affected by the construction of the proposed garage. The application is therefore considered to comply with this element of saved Policy 59.BE of the current Local Plan and Policy DM24 of the Submitted Local Plan.

Residential Amenity – The previous application was refused on the grounds of impact upon the outlook from neighbouring properties, specifically Nos.60 & 68 Elliot Rise and over dominance of their

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

gardens. While this amended design will still be in relatively close proximity to these garden boundaries, being sited a metre off the boundaries, its length, width and height in particular have been much reduced. Although that now proposed will still be clearly visible from these gardens, its much reduced scale would have a significantly lesser impact. While not an ideal relationship, on balance it is considered that the impact upon the amenity of these neighbouring dwellings would not be so bad as to warrant a reason for refusal.

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 inside the 5.6km buffer zone for the Solent SPA but a contribution is not required to mitigate the increased recreational pressure resulting from the development due to the nature of that proposed.

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

This amended design is considered to have adequately overcome the previous reason for refusal and now accords with the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan and 'Quality Places' SPD. As such the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.