REF. NO. F/12/71234

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Two storey front & single storey side extensions & conversion of dwelling into 2no. two bed dwellings with ancillary parking & new pedestrian access 2A Freegrounds Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 0HH

SITE VISIT DATE: 6/8/2012

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application is for a two storey extension to the front of the existing property (north elevation) and a single storey side extension (east elevation). The two storey extension will project 2.8m from the existing footprint. The single storey extension will remove an existing garage to provide wc for each unit and a garden shed. The extension is intended to facilitate the conversion of the property into two 2no. bed units. The entrance point of the property will change from facing Freegrounds Road to facing Burseldon Road. The application will widen the existing vehicular access and shows an enlarged parking area to accommodate three parking spaces with bin / recycling area adjacent.
SITE AREA	0.04ha
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	5dph
TOPOGRAPHY	level
TREES	One small tree on site boundary. One mature tree within the grounds of no. 2 Freegrounds Road. Couple of mature trees on highway land adjacent to the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Mature dense hedge of approximately 1.3m in height around all boundary other than adjacent to no. 2 Freegrounds Road where there is 2m high boundary wall
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site comprises a contemporary semi detached two storey dwelling with single flat roof garage. The site is located at the end of Freegrounds Road and is surrounded on three sides by Freegrounds Road, Burseldon Road and St Johns Road. The vehicular access to the site is via Freegrounds Road which is a cul de sac.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site sits at the cusp of two different character areas, the first being south of the site along Freegrounds Road which is residential in nature comprising cottage style detached two storey properties. The second character being to the north, east and west more commercial in nature comprising shops and public buildings along St Johns Road. Buildings

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	along St Johns Road are mixed in terms of form, bulk and design but are mainly two storey in height. A bus stop is located adjacent to the boundary of the site on St Johns Road.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
1A Bursledon Road Hedge End		
Z/13812/001/00	CONVERSION OF EXISTING EXTENSION AND DOUBLE GARAGE TO A SINGLE BEDROOM DWELLING	Refused 13/01/1989

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
LOCAL GROUP	Not applicable
OTHER	
The Lodge, 1A Bursledon Road	Objection: **Shared Drainage:** The proposal will mean 2 dwellings 'downstream' instead of 1, increasing the likelihood of drainage problems by 50% and possible flooding. **Overlooking/lack of privacy:** The plans include bedrooms, which would overlook the garden of The Lodge 1A, resulting in a lack of privacy. **Over-development of the area:** The area is well-developed and there are plenty of available vacant properties, relatively newly built on the site of the old Fountain public house. **Highway Matters:** There will be insufficient parking on and off site **Excessive Noise:** Harmful impact upon residential amenities arising from noise and disturbance associated with construction.
Furtree Cottage, 2 Freegrounds Road	Objection: 1. Blocked views of the village centre 2. Front garden overlooked by development. Suggest frosted glass 3. Insufficient on site parking will add to already problematic parking and congestion on Freegrounds Road.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Parish Council	NO OBJECTION, But the Committee would question proposed access on to Bursledon Road, especially as they have access to the rear of the property.
Eng	Objection – insufficient parking on site

REF. NO. F/12/71234

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Commercial/Residential Area Within Flood Zones 2 and 3

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE, 28.ES (waste collection), 43.ES (Flooding), 100.T (sustainable development), 101.T (Highway contributions), 104.T (Parking provision), 147.OS (provision of open space), 190.IN (provision of services and infrastructure), 191.IN (provision of infrastructure, services, facilities and amenities)
Pre Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011 - 2029) DM1, DM8 (contributions public utilities), DM23 (Transport contributions), DM24 (parking provision), DM32 (contributions open space), DM37 (funding infrastructure)
Supplementary Planning Document : Quality Places SPD
Supplementary Planning Document : Residential Parking Standards
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Planning Obligations 2008.

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, street scene, flooding, and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

No comments

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Loss of views and disturbance during construction process not material consideration in respect of assessing planning applications.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

The applicant has stated in writing their willingness to pay the required contribution amount direct to the Council. As the application is recommended for refusal, this has not been progressed.

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."

REF. NO. F/12/71234

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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.

Policy 28.ES requires residential layouts to make provision for waste Collection and recycling in a manner that does not give rise to disturbance of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Policy 43.ES requires that development proposed in areas at risk of flooding demonstrate that the site is adequately defended from flooding and that a flood risk assessment adequately demonstrates measures incorporated into the scheme which prevent life being endangered or damage to property.

Policy 100.T requires that proposed development is well served by public transport, cycling and walking, that the proposed development includes measures for minimising impact upon the highway network.

Policy 101.T requires that development which results in additional traffic on the road provide contributions towards the implementation of the Local Transport Plan and other transport proposals set out in the local plan.

Policy 104.T requires the provision of off highway parking.

Policy147.OS requires the provision of open space to support new residential developments.

Policy 190.IN permits development provided adequate services and infrastructure are in place to support it.

Policy 191.IN permits development provided the developer has made arrangements for the provision of infrastructure, services, facilities and amenities that are directly relevant to the proposed development.

The following policies from the Pre Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029) DM1 (design), DM8 (contributions public utilities), DM23 (Transport contributions), DM24 (parking provision), DM32 (contributions open space), DM37 (funding infrastructure) are the replacement policies for those listed above.

Also of relevance is the guidance set out in the following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) - Quality Places 2011, Environmentally Sustainable Development 2009, Residential Parking Standards 2009 and Planning Obligations 2008.

The proposal is considered to conflict with relevant Development Plan policies in that it will provide insufficient amenity space on site, will create harmful levels of overlooking and in respect of flood protection/prevention measures and fails to provide adequate infrastructure to support the application.

In this case policy issues for consideration include:

- Principle of development

REF. NO. F/12/71234

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

- Impact upon character and appearance of area
- Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact upon Highways
- Impact upon trees
- Amenity provision to future occupants.
- Impact upon Flood Zones
- Impact upon provision of services and infrastructure

Principle of development

The site is located within a settlement area and as such the proposed development is acceptable in principle subject to meeting other relevant local plan policies.

Impact upon character and appearance of area

The area is mixed in character in terms of both use and building style. The proposed two storey extension will follow the form and design of that existing on site. There is sufficient space within the site to accommodate the bulk of building proposed here and as there is no clear building line at the point where the extension is proposed and noting that there would remain a distance of between 7m to 13m to boundaries. It is therefore considered the extension can be accommodated without harm to the street scene or character of the area.

The single storey extension is located on what is currently the side elevation, adjacent to no. 2 Freegrounds Road. This extension will be in the approximate position of the existing garage on site, and will be between 50cm to 1.2m higher that the garage. The footprint of this extension will overall be located slightly further away from the side boundary to no.2 Freegrounds Road than the garage. The extension in terms of its mass, form and design is considered to be subservient and sympathetic to the main house and the application is therefore considered acceptable in this respect.

The existing hard standing area is proposed to be enlarged to accommodate a total of three parking spaces. Refuse and recycling bins are located adjacent to the vehicular access which itself is proposed to be widened. The existing hedge that runs around the east, north and west boundaries of the site is proposed to be retained, other than where two pedestrian access points are proposed from Bursledon Road. That hedge is approximately 1.3m in height, is fairly dense and will provide screening around the enlarged hard standing area. This part of the scheme is not considered to harm the characteristics of the area.

The proposal shows the pedestrian entrance to the dwellings located to the Bursledon Road elevation. This will slightly improve the appearance of the elevation facing this road which contains a large proportion of blank wall. Additional windows on this elevation would be beneficial to the buildings overall contribution to the character of the area however as the application is recommended for refusal this has not been requested.

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

Two properties are located adjacent to the application site, those being no.2 Freegrounds Road and no1a Bursledon Road. In respect of the latter of these two properties, both extensions are considered sufficiently removed. There are no new windows that would create harmful

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

overlooking onto no. 1a Bursledon Road and the application is not considered to harm the residential amenities of the occupants of that property in any respect. The layout of no. 2 Freegrounds Road is such that its front garden is adjacent to the boundary of the application site. The property at no. 2 Freegrounds Road is set back some distance into the site and as such the rear garden area is very small in size and the principle amenity area for this property is within its front garden area. The driveway and parking area of no. 2 Freegrounds Road is adjacent to the point at which the two storey element of the proposal is located. At the distance proposed of approximately 5.5m to the mutual side boundary, the two storey extension is not considered to create a harmful impact to the outlook of no. 2 Freegrounds Road. The single storey extension is located at the approximate position of the existing garage. As noted above the single storey extension will be higher than the existing garage (3.3m to 3.9m maximum in height). Noting the distances to the side boundary (1.7m to 4.8m) and the heights proposed, as viewed from no. 2 Freegrounds Road, this part of the extension is not considered to be visually overbearing or harmful to the outlook of residents at that property.

The current property has a landing and bathroom window on the side elevation at first floor looking into the direction of no. 2 Freegrounds Road. The bathroom window is obscure glazed. The proposed development rearranges the room layout and shows two first floor bedroom windows on the side elevation. This is considered to create a direct and harmful form of overlooking onto the private amenity area of no. 2 Freegrounds Road particularly the first floor bedroom window to unit 1. Had the application been recommended for approval, a condition could have been attached to require this window to be obscure glazed. This would have overcome concerns in respect of overlooking, although this is never an ideal solution for a bedroom. As the application is recommended for refusal no such condition can be attached and this therefore forms part of the recommended refusal reason.

Impact upon Highways

The existing property is three bedroom dwelling. The proposed dwellings are two bedrooms each. Three parking spaces are provided within an enlarged parking area. The residential parking standards SPD requires that two parking spaces be provided per two bedroom dwelling. The application therefore falls short by one parking space. The highway officer notes insufficient parking on site and the lack of potential for “off-site” over spill parking and objects to the application on this basis.

Impact upon trees

There a few small ornamental trees on site and larger mature trees around the site. All are considered to be sufficiently removed from the site to an extent where the proposed development would not harm either the trees or their roots. It is noted as the site is not located within a Conservation Area the trees within the application site could be removed without requiring any consent from the Council.

Impact upon Flood Zones

The site is located within flood zones 2 and 3. Insufficient information has been submitted to show what features the buildings design will address possible flooding of the site, damage to property or harm to life. Furthermore no information has been submitted to how the site is defended from flooding. The proposed development therefore fails to meet criteria i) and ii) of policy 43.ES.

REF. NO. F/12/71234

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Amenity provision to future occupants

'Quality Spaces' SPD 2011 requires that a private amenity space of at least 60% of the total proposal floor space proposed be provided. The amenity space will only qualify as usable private space where it provides a measure of privacy and is not directly overlooked. In this instance each unit will have a floor area of 66m2. Unit 1 has an amenity area of approximately 20m2 and unit 2 16.5m2. The guidance states that where the site is within 100m of a public open space the minimum 60% may be reduced. The application site is located approximately 189m from Greta Park on St Johns Road. Even if a reduction were deemed to be acceptable noting the distance of the open space to the site, the garden areas being 25% and 30% of the proposed floor space represent too significant a reduction in the required percentage set out in the guidance. Furthermore, although there is other garden space within the site, the height of the screening in such that it would not afford sufficient privacy to its users and is considered unacceptable in this respect.

Impact upon provision of services and infrastructure

The proposed development would create additional burden upon the infrastructure and services within the area and upon the provision of public open space. A contribution of £5691, not including legal and administrative fees, would be required to support and maintain services and infrastructure. The agent has advised in writing that the applicant will make the index linked payments and the administration fee as a direct payment to the council. As the application is recommended for refusal, so payments have been made and as such the requirements of policies 101.T, 147.OS, 190.IN and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.

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/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to refuse.