REF. NO. «AltRef»

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Replacement detached garage. 110 Pine Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 1JT

SITE VISIT DATE – 25/04/2017

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above to preplace the existing detached garage with a larger version.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	Generally flat and level.
TREES	None affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.8 metre timber fencing to side and rear boundaries.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	1950s chalet bungalow with later additions to the rear and a fairly recent loft conversion to provide new first floor accommodation. Parking to the front with a driveway to the side leading to the existing detached garage at the rear. To the rear is a fairly generous private garden.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The surrounding area is residential in nature and made up of mainly detached single and two storey dwellings on good size plots. To the rear of the site is Hiltingbury Recreation Ground.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/13/71978	One and half storey rear extension, raising of roof and addition of 2No. front facing dormers and 3No. rear facing dormers.	Approved Mar 2013
Z/12625/003/00	Replacement conservatory.	Approved Dec 2002

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Homes – 108 Pine Road	Object. The scale of the building is excessive for a residential area, visually intrusive, potential damage to fence and plants. Concerns that

REF. NO. «AltRef»

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	applicant intends to restore cars and the noise and disturbance this would cause.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
HCC Highways	No Objection to the proposals on highways grounds. As a 4-bed dwelling, a minimum of 3 on-site vehicle parking spaces are required and the accommodation of these appears to be achievable on the front drive, with the garage to the rear providing additional parking over and above this quantum, as well as additional storage opportunities with its enlarged size. Due to the large size of the garage, there is potential that it could onwards serve other uses such as a business purpose. As such it may be worth considering a condition to prevent this, and there would be onward parking requirements – Condition E02.
Chandler's Ford Parish Council	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 25.NC, 59.BE & 104.T

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, DM9 & DM24

Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
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, the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, parking and nature conservation.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Comments noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

See below.

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 construction of a detached garage, 5.2 metres wide, 11.3 metres in length and 3.4 metres to the ridgeline. This is significantly larger than the garage which it would replace, which measures approximately 3.2 metres wide, 6.5 metres long and 3.5 metres high. It is also proposed that the new garage would be set back a little further into the site than the present structure.

In terms of the street scene and general character of the surrounding area, while sizable, that proposed would have little visible impact from any public vantage point. The large plot will also mean that more than sufficient usable garden space would remain.

Residential Amenity – The 2013 application for enlargement of the bungalow originally included a replacement detached garage of a similar albeit slightly larger footprint and a ridge height

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

approaching five metres. This raised concerns with regards to the outlook and visual impact upon the neighbouring property. These concerns were principally related to the length of the garage combined with its height. Subsequently the garage was withdrawn from the application.

These concerns have again been raised by the occupier of the neighbouring property. However, while that now proposed is not dissimilar in length to the previous garage which raised a concern, it is actually slightly lower than the existing in terms of ridge height and has the same eaves height as the existing. In terms of impact upon the neighbour therefore, while it is acknowledged that there would be a negative impact to some extent, it is not considered that the impact upon outlook and visual amenity would be so bad as to warrant refusal of the application on these grounds. It also needs to be taken into consideration that there is a further structure behind the existing garage – a playhouse – which when combined with the present garage would not be dissimilar to the resulting structure.

With regards to the concerns of disturbance, these are noted. However, provided any activities taking place within the garage are reasonably related to the applicant's hobby and not for any business purposes, there is little that the local planning authority can do to control these activities. If activities are to the extent that an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance is caused, the Council's Environmental Health Unit has the power to investigate and enforce if necessary. Notwithstanding this, a condition restricting the use of the garage to purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwellinghouse is recommended.

Due to the orientation, proximity and relationship of the application property to its neighbours, as well as the nature of the development proposed, it is not considered that there would be any adverse or unacceptable impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook. As such the application is considered to accord with the amenity requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the current Local Plan, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Local Plan and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Parking – The existing driveway can easily accommodate the minimum of three off-road parking spaces required by the Council's 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD. 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.

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 5.6km buffer zone for the Solent SPA and is of a type where a contribution is not required to mitigate any increased recreational pressure resulting from the development.

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

For the reasons given above the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.