REF. NO. F/15/76997

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Construction of 1no. 5 bed two storey detached dwelling with associated landscaping and boundary treatment following demolition of existing bungalow. 20 Park Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 2EU

SITE VISIT DATE – 26/10/2015

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. This is the latest in a number of applications for a replacement dwelling on the site.
SITE AREA	Approx. 760 sqm.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	No change.
TOPOGRAPHY	The site slopes gently in westerly direction. Within the garden area there are topographical changes that have resulted in part of the garden being elevated approximately 1m.
TREES	TPO58/G116 – 2 Limes (not present removed 1980's) No other protected trees on or adjacent to the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front of the property is bound by 1.2-1.5m fencing with an open side access to the parking area. The fencing increases to 1.8m in height encompassing the side and rear of the property
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Single storey hipped/pyramid roofed bungalows with gabled bay windows flanking the front door. To the front is a gravelled area used for parking. To the rear is a large tired and open garden. Located in an open and prominent position due to its siting next to a public footpath and access drive to a neighbouring property.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area dominated by traditional and chalet style bungalows of mixed designs and forms with no consistent character. There are larger two storey dwellings to the south and a row of two storey 1960's dwellings to the north however the dominant character is that of bungalows and chalet bungalows.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/15/76236	Construction of detached five bedroom two storey dwelling following demolition of existing bungalow.	Refused Jun 2015 (currently at appeal with a start date of 10th Nov)

REF. NO. F/15/76997

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/14/74815	Erection of 1no. 4 bed dwelling and access to bin storage, 1.2 metre high automatic gate, following demolition of existing bungalow.	Withdrawn Jan 2015

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Fenn – 35 Park Road	"The revised design is in keeping with the wide variety of designs along Park Road and Kings Road and will not detract from the existing heterogeneous visual setting of this area. We support this modest redevelopment which is in proportion to the plot size and local properties."
Hobbs – 36 Linden Grove	Object. Proposal would result in the loss of another bungalow and further reduce the number of smaller properties available for those who want to downsize/retire.
Dinsdale – 22 Park Road	Object. A two storey dwelling would not fit in with surrounding development. Loss of privacy and outlook. Obstruction of the access and right of way to No.22. Disturbance, noise and dust during construction and interruption of services/utilities.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Head of Transportation & Engineering	No objection. "Whilst the garage does not specifically conform to standards, utilised as a single garage its internal dimensions would be acceptable. Onwards, there will be driveway space for at least a further two vehicles, and as such it will conform to the EBC Parking Standards. In terms of access to the rear for the neighbouring property, this is also acceptable. Access remains unchanged." Conditions with regards to ensuring that the garage is retained for parking purposes recommended.
Tree Services Manager	"I can confirm that I have no arboricultural concerns therefore raise no objection."
Biodiversity Officer	Holding objection. No information has been submitted with regards to how the nearby Monks Brook will be protected from pollution during and after construction works, i.e. silt, oil spills, etc. Also no information has been submitted to demonstrate that bats are not present in the building to be demolished.
Environment Agency	"The proposed development falls within flood zone 3 which has the highest probability of flooding. The chance of flooding in any one year is greater than or equal to 1% for river flooding. Although the proposed footprint is larger than existing development the new proposed building

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	will incorporate under croft voids and therefore there will be no impact on flood storage. The finished flood levels are to be set at least 600mm above the 1 in 100 year flood level and resilience and resistance measures are to be incorporated into the new building. The applicant also intends to sign up to Environment Agency flood warnings and set up an evacuation plan. On this basis we have no objection to the proposal." Conditions recommended with regards to flood prevention measures.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within the 25m River Buffer Within Flood Zones 2 and 3 Within HRA Screening Area

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved Policies 25.NC, 28.ES, 34.ES, 42.ES, 45.ES, 59.BE, 100.T, 101.T, 104.T, 146.OS & 191.IN

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, DM2, DM5, DM9, DM23, DM24, DM32, DM35 & DM37

Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations

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."

Paragraph 17 sets out twelve core principles that underpin the planning system, one of which is that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings".

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that “The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.”

It goes on to say in paragraph 64 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.”

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 area, the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, access and parking, flood risk, as well as nature conservation.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

All comments are noted and responded to where appropriate below.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

All comments are noted and responded to where appropriate 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.

Also of relevance is the recent refusal in June this year for a very similar scheme which provides

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

guidance as to what is and is not considered acceptable by the LPA.

Layout, Design, Street Scene & Area Character – That currently proposed, while differing from that refused in some minor respects, is nonetheless essentially the same scheme. It is accepted that features such as the large glazed gables to the front have been removed and there has been a modest reduction in the overall roof form. However, these minor changes are not considered sufficient to have overcome the previous reason for refusal on the grounds of impact upon the street scene and character of the area.

The site is located within a residential area dominated by traditional and chalet style bungalows of mixed designs and forms with no consistent character. It is acknowledge that there are several two storey dwellings to the south however these are well screened by trees and hedges and do not therefore contribute significantly to the overall street scene. There is also a row of 1960's housing to the north, running west away from the site. Whilst these two storey houses are noted it is still considered the dominant appearance of the street is that of single storey bungalows and chalet style bungalows and conversions.

The existing traditional bungalow is largely unaltered having low eaves and pyramid roof with projecting gables over the double fronted bay windows either side of the front door. It is acknowledged that the bungalow is in need of some improvement, and while its replacement is acceptable in principle, it must be appropriate and respectful to the surrounding context.

The proposed dwelling will replace this modest bungalow with a large prominent two storey dwelling that is wider, deeper, and taller than the existing bungalow with a significantly increased footprint and overall floor space.

The submitted street scene shows that the ridge of the new dwelling will be increased from the existing dwelling by approximately 1.3m but shows the ridge to be no higher than the neighbouring property No.18. The dwelling does however appear considerably wider having a roof running parallel to the road rather than perpendicular and much deeper with the full northern elevations being visible in the street scene. The proposed dwelling has a pitched roof on the frontage which helps assimilation but this is undermined by the projecting elements either side of the main entrance and sizable front dormers. These elements accentuate the scale and form of the building and the design is such that it will appear alien within the street scene.

The more simplistic southern elevation will not be prominent or visible in the street due to its close proximity to No.18 however due to the position of the site in the street and its location adjacent to an access and public footpath the northern elevation will be just as visually prominent in the street as the frontage. The northern side elevation has been much simplified but does have a rather awkward eaves height.

Overall it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its scale, mass, form and design, if permitted would create a visually obtrusive and incongruous feature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality contrary to the requirements of saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Local Plan and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Residential Amenity – Despite the concerns raised by neighbours with regards to loss of privacy and outlook, it is not considered that the revised proposal would result in any adverse or unacceptable impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring property. Due to the dwelling's orientation and proximity to neighbours there would be no loss of light and conditions could be applied to ensure that first floor side windows are obscure glazed with restricted openings.

Equally, if approved conditions could be applied with regards to working hours, the control of dust and noise, etc. during the construction process in order to protect the amenity of nearby occupiers.

REF. NO. F/15/76997

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Access & Parking – The proposal would utilise the existing shared access and no objection has been raised by the Head of Transportation and Engineering. With regards to concerns raised on eth access being blocked during construction works, while this is really a civil matter between the relevant parties, a note to applicant could be included as part of any planning approval asking that the works and parking of contractor's vehicles be undertaken in a courteous manner. Also conditions could be applied requiring details of where contractors would park and the storage of materials were the application to be approved.

With regards to parking the resulting driveway and garage 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.

Flood Risk – As has been set out in the Environment Agency's response, the application site lies within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore at a potentially high risk of flooding. However, information has been submitted with the application which demonstrates that suitable measures can be taken in order to protect the dwelling in the event of a flood. Provided the recommended conditions are applied to any planning approval and the measures implemented, the proposal is acceptable in this respect.

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 required for this development as it falls inside the designated zone of impact but concluded that with an enhanced construction management condition to include measures to prevent water run- off into watercourses and dust suppression that there reasonable steps have been taken to prevent risk of harm.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014. While not to be adopted in its present form, it does give an indication of what the intended current local plan's replacement would include. 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

While some minor issues have been addressed with this latest application the main issues of concern remain. As such the application is again recommended for refusal.