MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/12/71412

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Raising of roof & enlargement of existing bungalow & construction of 1no. adjoining 3 bed chalet bungalow, following subdivision of existing plot 1 Charmwen Crescent West End Southampton SO30 3AQ

SITE VISIT DATE	3/10/12			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. The application is the resubmission of a refused scheme (F/11/69366). The position of the rear boundary fence around the existing property has been altered so it encloses just the applicants land. In all other respects the proposal is identical to the previous scheme.					
SITE AREA	479.7 sq metres					
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	41 d/ha					
TOPOGRAPHY		Level	X	Sloping (West to East)		Other …
TREES	X	No		Yes, …..		
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	X	Existing high hedging running along Sharon road boundary and part front of the site with low level brick wall and gate. Close boarded and hedging with number 3 Charnwen				
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached bungalow set in a relatively large plot, with large side garden. Existing garage and parking area serving the site is to the rear of the plot.					
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Mixed residential					

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/11/69366	Raising of roof & enlargement of existing bungalow & construction of 1no. Adjoining 3 bed chalet bungalow, following subdivision of existing plot	Refused 06/09/12 Appeal dismissed 26/06/12
F/11/68909	Raising of roof & enlargement of existing bungalow & construction of 1no. Adjoining 3 bed chalet bungalow, following subdivision of existing plot	Withdrawn 04/7/11

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
1 letter of objection (1 Lancaster Court)	• Loss of privacy (views from side window into neighbours front bedroom). • Out of keeping (majority of bungalows within close are single dwellings with no roof extensions).

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	No objection
Transportation & Engineers	No objection • Parking for both the proposed and existing property will conform to standards for both vehicles and cycles. • The application plan shows that the eastern dwelling has a rear access gate proposed into the old track at rear of property, but there is nothing shown about what rights of access there are to gain access over that track. If access is proposed over the track for bins and bikes to get to the back garden, then notice would need to be served on the landowner of the track and rights of access negotiated. Otherwise separate access to the back garden needs to be provided in an alternative format. • Vehicular access is acceptable with adequate visibility. <u>Contributions</u> As a new build, Sustainable Transport Contributions are required in line with the HCC Transport Contributions Policy. This is calculated on a proposed less existing development basis, equating to a contribution of £3,745 (+ indexation). The aim of the policy is to ensure that every development 'pays its bit' in regard to providing improved highways infrastructure for potential new residents, whilst also mitigating against the accumulative impact of the new developments themselves on existing users regardless of development size itself – i.e. 100 single residential unit developments have the same impact as 1 100 residential unit development. The policy aim is to be fair across the board. In regard to the utilisation of any Sustainable Transport Contribution's to be collected from a development on Charmwen Crescent, I would outline the following for initial consideration: <u>Project TSI 680</u> - Traffic Calming Measures on Charmwen Crescent. Complaints have been received in regard to Charmwen Crescent being utilised as a rat-run by vehicles trying to avoid congestion at the A27 / Barbe Baker signalised junction. A study is required to ascertain the exact levels of rat-running, with consideration of traffic management measures to follow. This scheme is of direct benefit to future residents of the proposed dwelling, and will of course mitigate against the additional flows on the road that the development will add and make the situation worse. As such, I believe it fulfils the tests of CIL.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	This scheme was not on the Transport Scheme Inventory list at the time of the previous application, having been added to the database following an email of concern from a resident of Charmwen Crescent. The resident has reported near collisions and excessive speeds and is concerned that any additional development in the locality will just add to this. Initial thoughts (to be confirmed by the study to be undertaken by HCC) are to provide either (or a combination of) speed cushions and build-outs to slow vehicle speed and reduce the route attractiveness. The contributions received from this related development would go towards the overall cost of the scheme in its entirety.
South West Water	The exact position of the foul and surface water sewers must be determined on site by the application before the layout of the development is finalised. It maybe possible to divert the foul and surface water sewer, so long as this does not result in any unacceptable loss of hydraulic capacity and the work was under taken at the developer's expense to the satisfaction of Southern Water. Further details are given within their correspondence.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling), 59.BE (Development Criteria), 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, DM2, DM23, DM24, DM25, DM29, DM32 & DM37

Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places, Biodiversity, Planning Obligations, Environmentally Sustainable Development & Residential Parking Standards.

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area – 4 (strong character) which states:

- Retain grass verges
- Maintain the predominant plot widths and continuity in building line
- Maintain uniformity in building heights within each street

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

N/A

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

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

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

X	See below		Other…….

- The application will need to establish whether they rights of access over the rear track. If not refuse bins and cycles will need to be stored at the front of the property.
- Southern Water has indicated that the sewer could be diverted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	See below		Other…….

- Comments are acknowledged. However, the scheme was previously considered under F/11/69366 and was not refused on the residential amenity grounds.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Planning obligation contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For new housing developments The Council collects a set contribution towards Community Infrastructure, Public Open Space and Sustainable Transport. The contributions for this scheme total £7,181 (excluding index linking).

The Appeal Inspector accepted that the applicant should pay contributions towards the identified Community Infrastructure and Public Open Space projects. However, the Inspector considered that the Sustainable Transport contribution (towards the proposed cycle link between Swaythling Road, The Drove and Sharon Road) was not justifiable and did not meet the CIL requirements (as the site is within a medium accessibility area, with existing good bus route, cycle and pedestrian links).

Having reviewed the current transport scheme inventory list a new project has been identified to introduce traffic calming measures to Charmwen Crescent. Details were included in the transportation consultation. This scheme is of direct benefit to future residents of the proposed dwelling, and will of course will help mitigate against the additional traffic generated by the development. As such, I believe the project fulfils the tests of CIL and so Sustainable Transport contribution will also be required.

The agent has indicated they will secure these contributions through a direct payment.

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

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The proposal is a resubmission of a previous scheme (F/11/69366), in which only the rear boundary has been altered (to cover just the applicants land). In all other respects the two schemes are identical. The previous scheme was refused due to its size, siting, design and layout forming a visually dominant and cramped form of overdevelopment to the detriment of the prevailing character, appearance and spacing of properties in the locality. A second reason for refusal being a lack of contributions towards community infrastructure, sustainable transport and public open space infrastructure projects within the locality.

The scheme subsequently went to appeal. While the appeal decision acknowledged that the extended building would appear more prominent than the existing bungalow, The Inspector felt that it would sit comfortably within the transition zone between buildings of different sizes at the lower end of the street. The Inspector went onto explain that *"Given the proposal's unique position at the junction and the above average size garden, it would not appear unduly dominating or cramped or constitute an over development of this location."* The Inspector also considered that the affects of the high front wall could be dealt with via a pre-development condition.

Although the appeal was ultimately dismissed, The Inspector indicated that the development would be acceptable if the applicant secured contributions towards identified projects that met the CIL requirements. On the back of this decision the applicant has resubmitted the scheme and will pay the required contributions upfront.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to permit.