MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/14/74624

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Two storey front and side extension, 1 and 2 storey rear extension, and front and side facing former windows to allow 3rd floor living accommodationn and conversion from HMO to 2.no 2 bed flats and 2.no 1 bed flats (amended description) 140 Southampton Road Eastleigh SO50 5QX

SITE VISIT DATE	11th July 2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes (although they have not been re-consulted following an update to the application description)

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Two storey front and side extension, One and Two storey rear extension, and front and side facing former windows to allow 3rd floor living accommodation and conversion from HMO to 2.no 2 bed flats and 2.no 1 bed flats (amended description)
SITE AREA	283.8sqm / 0.028ha
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	141dph
TOPOGRAPHY	Flat and level site.
TREES	No protected trees on or adjacent to the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front is enclosed by a low level boundary wall with shrubs planted behind. A 1.8m wooden gate separates the front from the back. The rear is enclosed by a combination of varying heights of brick walls and fencing.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	End of terrace two storey house with a front bay, canopy, and recessed porch and plane pitched roof that runs parallel with the road. The property is set back from the road by a 3.8m (d) walled front garden area. To the side is driveway access which creates separation between it and the neighbouring block of flats. To the rear is an enclosed rear amenity space, mainly of hard standing which leads via a fenced gate to a large area of hard standing used for parking and opening out onto a back way.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area opposite open railway tracks. The area is depicted by typical Eastleigh Victorian/Edwardian terraced housing. Within this section of Southampton road the rows of terraces appear fairly original with no front dormer windows apparent. Each terraced row is separated by space between buildings. This space is replicated (and slightly bigger) between the site and the adjacent newer build 3-4 storey block of flats which are modern in appearance and address the corner.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/06335/004/00	Conversion into two flats	Permitted 21.12.89
EAB0286800000	Change of use of ground floor room to workshop	Permitted 1960
EAB0404000000	Use of ground floor front room as shop and installation of shop front	Permitted 1963

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
142 Southampton Road	Objected to the application on the following grounds: The application states that the current status /use of 140 Southampton Road is an HMO. This is not correct - the current tenants are an adult couple and their young child. The previous owners were also a family. It has no self contained units of accommodation, and I believe has been a family home for quite some time. 1) Form and plans - very poor presentation - do not show commitment to good design 2) Description of work in the planning application does not reflect the proposal, in that the proposal is three storey side and rear extensions (with two storey and single storey parts) and alterations including loft conversion to form four dwellings. 3) Section 17 of form is completed incorrectly - existing and proposed in wrong places, existing dwelling not 1 bed, and includes new house as separated vertically. 4) Plans do not show parking, cycle storage, refuse/ recycling storage and collection, amenity space for each dwelling. 5) I would have expected to see a design and access statement - see Quality Spaces document. 6) Housing policy page 86 refers to conversions in that approval may not be given where existing property is less than 100m2 - check on plans shows about 95m2. 7) there would be insufficient parking for the development, and it would likely have to include tandem parking. There could be up to 10 individuals living in the new development, with only 3 parking spaces between them (not even 1 per flat) Eastleigh Parking Standards document I think would stipulate a minimum of 4, but probably 6 parking spaces based on the likely car ownership of the prospective tenants. 8) Inadequate provision of parking for the property could cause serious difficulties for both proposed new, and existing residents. 9) The increased mass and scale of the proposed development would be oppressive and the addition of 2 more windows overlooking garden, one of which will be on the 2nd floor would reduce the level of privacy 10) Extensions and alterations will have a deleterious impact on the character and appearance of the front street scene, in that it will no longer look like a trio of Victorian houses. 11) The party wall is not built to current building regulation standards, and daily life is now much noisier than when the house was originally built. The proposal has 3 kitchen living rooms directly on the party wall

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	of the main part of the house - a significant increase from the original one. The party wall would be particularly poor at reducing the noise from kitchen work tops, switches, large white goods, extractor fans and televisions, and could have a substantial detrimental impact on the level of noise in my house and the ability to enjoy a quiet and peaceful environment within it.
18 Unity Court	Objected to the application on the following grounds: (1) Over development the house was and is being used as a family home. (2) Loss of light into my property as my window facing the proposed development is a major source of light into my property. (3) Visually intrusive the property is an end of terrace house and the proposed development would be totally out of place. (4) The proposal is for 4 flats and 3 parking places and 9 bikes in an area that already has significant parking issues. (5) Loss of privacy as the proposed extension will be very close to my window. It was also noted that the site is visible from the public highway as it faces Southampton Rd with Market St to the rear and that there is a dire need for accommodation of all sizes but feels that these properties should remain as family homes rather than being jumbo sized just so the owner can make a fat profit. If the council has a mind to pass the application might i respectfully suggest that the issue's of noise and parking are brought to the applicants attention.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Head of Transportation and Engineering	Holding objection on grounds of insufficient vehicle parking and lack of detail in regard to cycle parking and bin requirements. Whilst the application form states 3 vehicle parking spaces will be provided, in accordance to the EBC parking standards, the minimum quantum of parking for a 1-bed dwelling is 1 space per dwelling and for 2 bed flats 2 spaces per dwelling if all spaces are unallocated. Whilst in this area where a Controlled Residential Parking Permit Scheme is in operation (to which it should be noted that future residents will have no entitlement to join and as such utilise the on-street parking as a redevelopment of a property) and as such highway obstruction would not occur due to restrictions, in terms of neighbour amenity and visitor parking requirements, the minimum quantum of parking should still be supplied. Revised plans should be produced that show how parking would be achieved, and onwards conditioned. Additionally, the secure and locable storage facility for the shared cycle parking unit for the proposed 9 cycle spaces also needs adding to the drawings in terms of site location, as well as individual specification drawings to demonstrate that it is fit for purpose. Is this to be combined with the required bin store? This has also been missed from plans. Is each occupant to have two bins each, or is a shared bin proposed? How will this / these be collected?

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	In regard to transport developer contributions, if a permission is to be given to the application, then these will be required in line with the HCC Transport Contributions Policy.
Head of Housing and Environmental Health	No objection subject to amenity protection conditions.
HCC Archaeology	Industrial and Railway Archaeology only and of limited interest. Due to the small scale nature of the site, no objection (verbal response).

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within an Established Character Area Within HCC Mineral Consultation Area Within HCC Archaeological Area

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011):
- 28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling),
- 34.ES (Sustainable Development)
- 59.BE (Development Criteria)
- 72.H (Density)
- 85.H (Conversion to Flats)
- 100.T (Minimise Travelling)
- 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions)
- 104.T (Parking)
- 147.OS (Public Open Space)
- 191.IN (Social Infrastructure)

Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029:
- DM1 (Development Criteria)
- DM2 (Sustainable Development)
- DM7 (Pollution)
- DM23 (Transport)
- DM24 (Parking)
- DM25 (Residential Development)
- DM29 (Internal Space Standards)
- DM32 (Public Open Space)
- DM35 (Community Infrastructure)
- DM37 (CIL/S106)

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

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Eastleigh Character Area – ELAC15

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

Not within a Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework highlights 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" (para 56) and goes on to state that decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development (para 58).

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Noted and where necessary addressed below.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

The comments made with regard to the nature of the existing use of the property are noted. The last noted planning use is as an HMO but to a large extent is irrelevant to the current proposal.

The plans and forms have been inspected and are considered acceptable for the determination of the application.

The application description has been updated to reflect the exact nature of the proposal.

All other neighbour concerns have been noted and are addressed below.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of the following;

- National Planning Policy Guidance
- Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (SI 2010/948) as amended by the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011 (2011/987)
- Saved policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011
- Emerging policies DM23, DM32, DM35 and DM37 of the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2011-2029
- Supplementary Planning Document – Planning Obligations

Planning obligation contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Community Infrastructure, Sustainable Transport, Recreational Disturbance Mitigation and Public Open Space. The applicant has agreed to secure the contributions through a direct payment however this has not been pursued further due to the overall proposal being considered unacceptable.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle: The application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where saved policy 72.H accepts the general principle of conversions/creation of new dwellings subject to compliance with other relevant saved policies of the plan.

Policy 85.H deals specifically with conversions of existing properties to flats. The existing property is an end of terrace and the existing floor area at approx 117sqm and in this respect complies with policy however it also requires consideration to the cumulative impact of conversions on the character of the area, environmental/amenity impacts, parking and loss of family housing. As the principle of conversion is not considered acceptable in this area, as the proposed extension is not considered acceptable, and as the proposal fails to demonstrate appropriate car parking, bike and bin storage the proposal fails to meet policy requirements. These matters are considered in more detail below.

Layout and Design: The proposed extension and alterations are considered to be significant in their scale and form. The design is also inappropriate having a detrimental impact on the host property, its appearance within the street scene, and its relationship to neighbouring properties, as set out in detail below. The layout of the site fails to address or demonstrate how appropriate car parking, bike, bin storage, and amenity space can be provided. The proposed dwellings are also of an inappropriate internal size and layout to meet building for life requirements.

Overall the layout and design is unacceptable and fails to meet policy requirements.

Street Scene/Character of the Area: The proposal includes significant alterations. The proposal includes a front dormer window which will be alien feature within what is a row of unaltered and clean roof planes. The side extension, as discussed above due to its front projection is not subservient and instead becomes the prominent feature unbalancing and undesirably altering the visual appearance of the row of Victorian/Edwardian terraces. In addition, whist the property remains an end of terrace, the side extension completely erodes the sense of space to the side of the property and between it and the neighbouring block of flats. These issues combine and result in the proposal having an unacceptable detrimental impact on the character of the host property and the street scene/character of the area, contrary to policy.

The rear of the site is open, albeit onto back gardens and a backway, however the full scale, mass, and bulk of the proposed extension/alterations will be highly visible. The various roof heights and forms, increased height to a 3 storey building, and the overall appearance will appear visually prominent and at odds with the prevailing appearance of the rear of properties in this area. The extension and alterations are therefore considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the character of the host property and its appearance within the locality.

Residential Amenity: To support policies 59.BE and emerging Policy DM1 and to assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places has been produced which gives guidance on overlooking, loss of light, amenity space for new dwellings and refuse storage. It also provides details of the expectations for new development in terms of internal and external space standards.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The proposed extension, whilst unacceptable in scale, form, and design is such that, due to the stepping of the built form away from No.142, it is unlikely to have an unacceptable impact by way of loss of light. The built form is however undeniably big and bulky and due to no windows being inserted into the southern elevation results in an expanse of brickwork which will appear imposing and no doubt alter the outlook however it is not considered to have such a detrimental impact as to warrant refusal. There are however concerns regarding the conversion to flats and the impact the proposal will have on No.142 in terms of noise transference. It would appear that kitchens and lounges abut onto bedrooms which can be disruptive. Details to prevent this would have been requested via a condition had the application been acceptable in all other forms.

With regard to the amenities of properties within Unit Court, due to the largely parallel siting of the extension in relation to the flats it is unlikely to have any detrimental impact. The proposed frontage does step out further than the existing building line however due to Unity Court having a stepped frontage any effected windows are set sufficiently away from the proposal that there will not be a detrimental loss of light or outlook.

The Quality Places guidance provides advice on the level of private/communal amenity space required for flats. The requirement for communal space is 25sqm per flat with a minimum of 3sqm private space. The proposal does not identify any area specifically for amenity space. Whilst there is a large remaining area to the rear it is not possible to establish what would be given over to amenity space and what would be needed to meet parking, bin and bike storage requirements. It is not therefore possible to establish if any amenity space would meet policy requirements.

In addition Quality Places provides guidance on internal space standards and requires spaces that provide appropriate space for furniture, equipment, space for access, circulation space, separate space for normal living activities, storage, and sufficient separation between spaces and uses. This supports emerging Policy DM29 which specifies minimum internal spaces standards of 66sqm for a 2 bed flat, and 51sqm for 1 bed flat. All proposed flats fail to meet these minimum space standards.

Highway Matters: Access to the front of the site will be on foot via Southampton road as there would no longer be access from front to back. Any frontage parking would be prevented by the front element of the proposed extension. To the rear access would remain as existing via a backway off of Market Street. Whilst there would be increased vehicle movements generated by the proposal access is considered to be acceptable.

Saved Policy 100.T expects development to be sited close to, or well served by, public transport, cycling and walking. The site is in Eastleigh Town Centre where there main bus routes, train station, and is within easy walking distance from schools and shops. The site is therefore considered to be highly accessible.

Saved Policy 104.T states permission will only be granted for development that provides adequate off-highway parking provision and our Parking Standards SPD supports this. EBC Parking Standards require 1 space per one bed property and 2 spaces per 2/3 bed property plus a 20% provision for visitor/overflow parking. The application forms idenify that 3 car parking spaces which equates to 0.75spaces per unit will be provided however these are not demostrated in plan form. Whilst reduced parking in this area may well be considered acceptable 3 spaces are not sufficent for the proposal 4 units and no justification for a deviation from policy requirements provided or how overflow parking would be controlled in what is a controlled parking zone where additional permits will not be issued. In view of this and given the uncertantly regarding the amenity space being provided (see above) the proposals in their current form fail to meeet policy requirements.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

With regard to cycle parking, again the application forms idenify that 9 spaces will be provided however these are not demostrated in plan form. Whilst in principle 9 spaces are acceptable as these are not shown on the plans in terms of the location, design, and form of starage it is not possible to establish if the physical provision is acceptable (it would not be desirable for provision to be made on the Southampton Road frontage or for any amenity space to be further erroded by the cycle storage, and provision within the existing hardstanding for cars would further errode space for parking). The lack of details and plans in terms of amenity space, car parking and bin storage compound the uncertanty with the cycle provision and therefore the proposals in their current form fail to meeet policy requirements.

Refuse Collection: Saved Policy 28.ES, emerging policy DM1, and the Quality Places SPD requires adequate provision of waste disposal/bins to be provided. The plans do not indicate the location of bin storage and whilst it may well be possible to make the necessary provision it is not possible to assess whether such provision is acceptable and does not undermine residential amenity or compromise amenity space, bike storage or parking. On this basis the proposal fails to make adequate provision for bin storage contrary to policy.

Sustainability: In accordance with saved policy 34.ES and 37.ES dwellings require development to be sustainable. Our Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD supports and enhances these requirements. The proposal however is a conversion of an existing building and therefore the SPD requirements are not relevant to this application.

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 outside the designated zone of impact.

The site falls outside the 5.6kn buffer zone for the Solent SPA. A contribution of £170 per dwelling is not required to mitigate the increased recreational pressure resulting from the development.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft 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

In view of the above the proposal is considered to conflict with saved and emerging local plan policies and is therefore recommended for refusal.