**REF. NO. C/12/70978**

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL**

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND**

**Residential amenity**

The nature of the application and distance from residential properties means there will be no impact on the amenity of nearby residents, by way of a loss of light, outlook or privacy.

**Car parking and highway safety**

The additional car parking is to cater for the users of the hall/ church and so should mean less overspill car parking in the locality. As such use of the car park and associated access is likely to be sporadic and should not generate large volumes of vehicles movements through out the day. The Transport Policy Officer is satisfied that adequate site lines can be provided for vehicles exiting the site (on the basis that the hedge is 'maintained in the trimmed back position indicated on plans').

**Trees**

The expansion of the car park will result in the loss of six trees and will bring vehicles closer to other trees on site. The trees are not covered by a TPO and the six trees to be lost are not considered of significant amenity value to warrant this level of protection. The Tree Officer has suggested additional condition to ensure that the proposal does not damage the health of the trees to be retained.

**Archaeology**

The proposal work to the car park should not involve excavation or levelling and as such there should be no archaeological issues.

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

**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**

Recommend Permit

**REF. NO. C/12/70978**

**ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL**

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND**

*"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".)*

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan 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, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

169.LB Planning applications for new buildings, and alterations and extensions to existing buildings, within Conservation Areas, will be permitted, provided all the following criteria are met:

(i) the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting;
(ii) any new building or extension does not detract from the character of the area and where appropriate retains the existing street building line and the rhythm of the street-scene;
(iii) the mass, materials and form of the building and associated landscape features are in scale and harmony with the existing and adjoining buildings and the area as a whole and the proportions of its parts relate well to each other, to the existing building and to adjoining buildings;
(iv) architectural details on buildings of value are retained;
(v) with regard to retail premises, a high standard of shop front design and signing, relating sympathetically to the character of the building and the surrounding area, is required;
(vi) the materials to be used are appropriate to and in sympathy with the existing buildings and the particular character of the area; and
(vii) they do not generate excessive traffic, car parking, noise or cause detriment to the character of the local environment. Existing inappropriate uses will not be allowed to expand or intensify and the Borough Council may encourage their relocation if serious loss of amenity is occurring.

---

**ASSESSMENT**

**Character and Appearance**

The gates will provide an attractive and usable entrance to the hall and church, replacing the current gap. The hedge will be trimmed and retained (albeit at a lower height) and this provides a setting to the church & hall and adds to the rural feel of the locality.

The proposal will tidy up and formalise the car park with short logs to delineate parking spaces. The car park will be expanded to provide additional parking on the grassed areas around the hall. The grass will be retained and be allowed to wear naturally with use. This has already occurred in sections of the car park with no harmful affect on the appearance of the site. The church and hall retains a large lawned area and is surrounded by woodland. Car parking will only take up a relatively small section of the site and is not considered to adversely affect the appearance of the buildings, countryside, local gap or conservation area.

**COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

Tree Team – relevant conditions will be applied.

Planning Policy and Design

1. The applicant wishes to lower the hedge, as it will give the impression of a welcoming site rather than a deterrent from entry. This work can be done without requiring planning permission or listed building consent.
2. & 3. Amended plans have be received with shorter logs at the rear of the car parking spaces and setting the gates back from the road.
3. The one way system will not work as the applicant intends for the most part to close the route between the Hall and the Green on the grounds that this would protect children who may be using the Hall and wish to also use the Green. They are prepared to leave the signage at present until there is a demonstrated need.

Transportation and Engineering

**COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

- The impact on trees is discussed in the assessment section.
- It is unreasonable to refuse the application because there is alterative parking in the locality.
- The flow of cars can be controlled through management of the site and so should not impact on the highway safety.

**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:

[In addition, the proposal affects a Listed Building or its setting and section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

*"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Listed Building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority … shall have regard to the desirability of reserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses".]*

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

**REF. NO. C/12/70978**

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | The layout generally conforms to standards in regard to space sizes and isle widths, however I have a couple of concerns:<br><br>1. The use of 1.5m salvaged logs is fine in theory as a method for marking out spaces. However, no only do they tend to 'shift around' and so space dimensions change, but they could also be a trip hazard particularly in the dark and/or wet. Additionally, they rot and collapse eventually. One solution would be that utilised in the Itchen Valley Country Park overflow car park. Here, strips of concrete were used (which look better than they sound) to delineate spaces, and these are long standing and less of a trip hazard.<br><br>2. The plans show the access gate opening inwards. This should be the case, as under no circumstances should the gate open outwards onto the highway.<br><br>3. Visibility appears achievable so long as the hedge is 'maintained in the trimmed back position indicated on plans'. If it is allowed to grow back to what is there at present, then there may be an issue. Is there a condition that could be applied?<br><br>**DC Engineer**<br>I think that the access arrangement so close to the boundary will make it awkward to use with the tight turn needed and lack of visibility. Shifting it south would make it easier to use. Have the applicants considered alternative arrangements before the scheme shown was submitted? |
| Parish Council | No objection |
| Biodiversity | No response |

**POLICY CONTEXT**

| DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE |
|---|
| Countryside - Outside Built-up Area Boundary<br>Within Designated Conservation Area – Netley Abbey (Area 3)<br>Strategic Gap<br>Adjacent to a Grade II Listed Building<br>Within Site of Archaeological Interest |

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 1.CO, 2.CO, 59.BE, 168.LB, 169.LB & 174.LB
Supplementary Planning Guidance :

**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.

**REF. NO. C/12/70978**

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| | walk. |

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| CONSULTEE | SUMMARY OF RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| Tree Team | No objection - Will need standard condition for pre commencement meeting with site manager and consultant arboriculturalist to go through method statement. I think the method statement was generic and will need to be site specific and a detailed tree protection plan will be required. This can also be conditioned. |
| Planning Policy & Design | Holding Objection<br><br>1. While a reduction in the hedge height would be good in front of the church, I am not convinced the same is true of the hall. These hall buildings, while distinctive, are not the most beautiful in the world and I think benefit from being behind the hedge. A further aspect is the height barrier. One can see the reasons for this but with the hedge reduced it will stand out like a sore thumb; if the hedge is retained at its existing height but trimmed, it will be about the same height as the barrier. The hedge could then be reduced in front of the church at say, the electricity pole, approximately where the notional boundary is between the two buildings.<br><br>2. I am surprised that logs are being suggested for the parking bay divisions. While it makes it quite clear where the bays are, does it not make life more difficult for people to get in and out of their cars, particularly as the general demographic of church attendance in particular, tends to be older and less agile with those attending the toddler group having the opposite end of the spectrum with again, less ability to manage obstacles. There does too seem to be a proliferation of poles etc along the rear boundary of parking bays. I would not have thought both logs and posts are required to designate bays but accept some form of definition is required due to lack of consideration in parking - even at churches! Surely shorter logs starting at the rear of the bays would be sufficient indication, avoid access difficulties and save money with only one log centred in the radial bays and just the central post, if even that at other bays.<br><br>3. Although taking the hedge away by the entrance should enhance the sightline, the installation of the kissing-gate pen will nullify it unless driving a bus. If this structure and the gate are moved back for the front if it to be in line with say the back edge of the hedge, it will improve the sightline more I suggest.<br><br>4. Instead of having such a plethora of signage why not have a one way system clockwise, around the hall? A couple of no entry signs level with the front of the building would sort it - another saving! |
| Transportation & Engineering | Transport Policy Officer – No objection |

**REF. NO. C/12/70978**

## PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS | - | Reconfiguration and surfacing of car park, widening of vehicular access and addition of gates and height restriction barrier following removal of 6 trees<br>The Church Hall, St Edwards Church Grange Road Netley Abbey Southampton SO31 5FF |

SITE VISIT DATE – 27/7/12

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

**THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

| | |
|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION | As above, car parking area will be expanded around the hall to include grassed area. The spaces will be marked by small wood dividers. The scheme involves the removal of six trees and the timber shed/ lean to the rear of the hall.<br><br>The width of the site entrance will be increased by removing a small section of hedge (under 1m). Installation of two gates at site entrance (a five bar gate for vehicles with height barrier and a smaller kissing gate for pedestrians). The gates are set back from the road. |
| SITE AREA | 1700m2 approx |
| TOPOGRAPHY | Gradual change in levels throughout the site. |
| TREES | Mature trees on site some of which will be removed to make way for the development. |
| BOUNDARY TREATMENT | The site is surrounded by high hedging, trees and woodland. |
| SITE CHARACTERISTICS | Two storey building used as a hall, surrounded by a gravelled car parking area. |
| CHARACTER OF LOCALITY | Predominantly residential. |

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

| REFERENCE | DESCRIPTION | DECISION |
|---|---|---|
| L/12/71066 | Listed building consent for: Reconfiguration and surfacing of car park, widening of vehicular access and addition of gates and height restriction barrier following removal of 6 trees | Valid |

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

| SOURCE | SUMMARY OF CONTENT |
|---|---|
| 1 comment and<br>1 objection letter | • If the car gates are kept locked and not supervised properly there will be a traffic build up on Grange Rd and bear in mind there are two bus stops in close proximity.<br>• Object to the felling of 6 trees to expand the car park. The scheme is unnecessary as there is a car park within 5 minutes |