REF. NO. C/11/69455

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Conversion of existing detached store to one bed self contained annexe accommodation Maidenstone Heath Blundell Lane Bursledon Southampton SO31 1AA

SITE VISIT DATE 19/08/11

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? Yes, amended plans have been received to address various points raised by the Design Officer.

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks planning permission for the conversion of an existing detached store into to a one bedroom self contained annex. The existing store is located adjacent to the main dwelling house and is intended to be used as ancillary guest accommodation. The amendments have addressed the following areas: • Replacement of proposed glass blocks on north east elevation with an oak window frame and normal glass. • Clarification that existing roof lights will be retained, but if required would be replaced with conservation roof lights. • Clarification that materials to be used for windows will be oak framed, this has been amended on the planning application form. • Retention of existing unique curved roof light on the north east elevation.
SITE AREA	n/a
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	n/a
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat site.
TREES	No trees to be affected by the development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Close boarded fencing and a brick wall to the north west elevation adjoining the existing barn.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Large site, detached two storey property set in a very large

REF. NO. C/11/69455

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	plot with long drive and parking areas and large surrounding gardens.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential, although the site is close to commercial uses as well.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
C/05/55200	Conversion of existing detached store to one bed self contained annexe accommodation	Approved Nov 2005
C/05/54523	Conversion of existing detached store to one bed self contained annex accommodation –	Withdrawn 25/08/2005

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
LOCAL GROUP	
OTHER	None

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Design Officer comments	**24.08.11.** 1. This building is worthy of retention as a positive contributor to this corner of Bursledon particularly with the patterned roof tiling, so a scheme to restore it is to be welcomed. 2. There are about half a dozen trees growing up from the roadside foundations of the building. These will need to be removed for the health of the building. 3. The structure is an odd combination of timber frame building with masonry incursion from the south-east end. This proposal includes infilling a doored access in the north-east elevation in the timber framed element with brickwork and glass blocks. The blocks are contrary to the character of the building and timber would be a more appropriate material for this infill with either timber doors retained on the outside or weather-boarding to match the remainder of the timber framed portion. 4. The four roof-lights on either side of the roof currently have the glass flush with the roof tiling. There is no annotation to suggest any work is currently being considered to these but to meet modern building regulations there may well need to be, as this is a 2005 drawing. If this is the case it is important to retain the existing glass to roof relationship and the use of heritage style rooflights should be employed. 5. There are discrepancies in the application form information and the drawing. The drawing shows oak window frames with brick and weatherboard cladding, the form says s.w. painted frames and weatherboard cladding. The oak window frames are preferable to the s.w. painted and see point 3 above regarding the cladding. **20.09.11.** 1. Following my earlier comments and the agents response, a closer inspection through the vegetation was made today which reveals that apart from the doors themselves onto the road the whole roadside wall is infact brick, contrary to the 'proposed' drawing although I can now see that the 'existing' drawing does

REF. NO. C/11/69455

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	infact show the last part of the wall as brick. In the context of the whole wall being brick and given its situation against the road one can see the logic for the proposal. Glass blocks are still somewhat alien to the character of the building and as the boundary for fire calculations will be the centre of the road, strong glass in a more normal frame would be more appropriate. 2. The drawings suggested that there are four roof lights existing in the roadside elevation already - I could only see one which has a rather unusual curved head, giving added interest. Holding objection
Engs	There is no clear definition of where the vehicle parking associated with the development is to be located, and if it is to be taken from the existing parking associated to the existing dwelling, does it reduce the existing dwelling to below standards? Additionally, what appears to be the access point from plans is currently utilised for bin storage, and has very poor sight lines. The existing main access would be a better option, assuming the proposed dwelling will have a right of access across it. **DC Engineer:** Eric Reed **DC Engineer Comments:** Which access is proposed to be used, the access off east side to property is quite tight with very poor sight lines. What is parking associated with this building, various parking spaces are shown but not clear what is meant to be associated with proposal. Cycle storage, bin storage needed.
Parish	This application was considered at Wednesday night's Planning Committee Meeting and the decision made was *TO OBJECT on policy no. 16CO to include 15CO.*

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Outside Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within Designated Conservation Area The proposed development is outside of the flood zone

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 169.LB, 1.CO, 3.CO, 16.CO
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPG -
PPS - 1

POLICY COMMENTARY

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to conversion of the existing building in this area, visual impact and highway matters.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

It is considered that all the points raised by consultees have been addressed via the submission of amended plans (design officer) or clarification by the case officer (engs).

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

n/a

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."*

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant Development Plan policies.

In this case policy issues for consideration include:

(The site also lies within a Conservation Area and Section 71(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

> *"In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in the Conservation Area of any powers (under the Planning Acts), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area".)*

The site lies within the Countryside and the Old Bursledon Conservation Area and as such the following polices are applicable; 1.CO, 16.CO, 169.LB. 18.CO and 19.CO are less relevant, but seek to protect or retain important landscape features, whilst 171.LB relates to protecting the rural landscape or townscape within conservation areas.

Policy 3.CO will only permit development that would not diminish the gap, physically or visually.

Policy 16.CO relates to proposals for residential use and requires development to be appropriate for the locality to ensure the protection of the amenities of nearby housing; protection of the character of the building and its setting and any new domestic features to be grouped together. In addition to meeting these criteria, development would need to meet all the criteria set out in Policy 15.CO, this policy states that proposals will only be permitted provided:

i. the Council is satisfied that the building is not required nor is likely in the foreseeable future to be required for agricultural purposes;
ii. the building is of sound construction with a reasonable expectation of life and lends itself to conversion without significant building work being required. A structural survey will be

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

required to support any application;

iii. the design of any conversion or alterations retains the intrinsic qualities of the building and avoids inappropriate external alterations;

iv. the proposal takes the form of a self-contained conversion, with no new buildings and any extensions comply with Policy 11.CO;

v. the development does not affect the amenity of any existing residential properties by reason of noise, smell, fumes, vibration or lighting;

vi. the development does not result in an unacceptable level of traffic generation, including heavy goods vehicles, or endanger existing road users, or necessitate changes to the highway network that are considered unacceptable and includes a green travel plan; and

vii. the proposal does not include extensive hard surfaced areas or open storage;

Policy 11.CO is not applicable in this instance as it relates to the extension of non-residential buildings in the countryside.

Policy 169.LB lists criteria against which development proposals within conservation areas are assessed and requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting, and requires the mass, materials and form of buildings to be appropriate to and in sympathy with existing buildings and the particular character of the area.

In addition, paragraph 11.11 of the local plan states, appropriate changes of use or extensions to existing buildings are not precluded provided they are not detrimental to the character of the area.

The principle of development is considered to be acceptable as a residential use is preferable to employment uses at this location as it will generate less traffic, have less of an impact on the amenities of the adjacent residential building, would protect and retain the character of the building and remain as an ancillary building to the main property. The building contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and its retention is therefore desirable. The annexe does enable independent occupation as it has all the facilities necessary for independent use from the main dwelling. The SPG on Annexes for Dependent Relatives states “Detached annexes will not be acceptable unless they involve the appropriate conversion of existing suitable outbuildings within the curtilage of the principal dwelling.” It also states an annexe possible of conversion to a dwelling would not be supported. On balance, despite the fully equipped annexe (i.e. kitchen) in this instance to secure the long term retention of the important outbuilding, a conditional approval stating no separation from the main dwelling, is reasonable and appropriate.

As clarified to the engineers, this proposed development is not intended to function as an independent dwelling unit but a conversion to an ancillary form of guest accommodation. On this basis the existing access, parking and use of amenity area would be maintained. The site is not suitable for the sub-division of the plot due to the designation of the site and position of the existing building. Conditions will be imposed that request details of drainage, storage of refuse and requirements of parking areas to be maintained. The concerns raised by the Head of Transportation and Engineering are recognised, but as a single planning unit the proposals are not considered to cause harm to highway safety.

There will be minor elevational changes to the existing store that are not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the locality/conservation area. The suggestions recommended by the Borough’s Design Officer have been incorporated into the proposals.

No impact considered to neighbours by way of overlooking due to the position of the building.

REF. NO. C/11/69455

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

CONCLUSIONS

Recommend approval.