REF. NO. F/10/68338

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Construction of 2 storey 1no. bed dwelling with car parking 2 Walker Gardens Hedge End Southampton SO30 2RL

SITE VISIT DATE – 2/2/11

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? – Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Construction of a two storey, one bed, dwelling which will be attached to the side of 2 Walker Gardens. The house will be stepped back from its neighbour and mirror its pitched roof. The two storey house measures 4.2m(w) by 6.9m(d) by 7.3m(h) with an extra 9m2 floor space provided in a rear conservatory. Behind the conservatory is a small garden and two on site car parking spaces.
SITE AREA	230 square metres (approx 115m for new house)
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	87 dwellings per hectare
TOPOGRAPHY	Relatively flat
TREES	A number of council trees are located alongside the application site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Front – 2m high hedge Side with Locke Road – 2m high brick wall Remainder of Rear Garden – 1.8m high close boarded fence
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Corner plot adjacent to Locke Road and entrance to Walker Gardens. The site currently forms part of the garden for no.2. At the rear of the site is a single detached garage that will need to be removed to make way for the proposal.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
None		

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
3 letters of objection/ comment (4, 6 & 60 Walker Gardens)	• The proximity of the new dwelling to Locke Road and the impact this would have on the appearance of the area. • The plot size is inadequate for a new dwelling and will create overcrowding. • There is not sufficient room for cars to use the proposed car parking spaces without jeopardising existing arrangements for cars using the rear parking area.

REF. NO. F/10/68338

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	• Parking spaces for No.2 will be altered as their garage is being removed. • The proximity of the dwelling to neighbouring properties (in particular 60 Walker Gardens). • State of the existing fence and who will maintain the boundary. • The development would adversely affect property prices.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Transport & Engineering	Objection - subject to additional plans as outlined below. The proposals have no impact on highways in terms of visibility and access, however I have concerns regarding vehicle parking for the existing dwelling (next door) and the potential loss of it. Whilst the application states there will be no change to existing parking, block plans suggest there is a garage currently situated to the rear, which has been removed on 'proposed site' plans. As such, I would like to see additional plans which demonstrate the parking for both the existing dwelling, and the proposed dwelling - 2 vehicle spaces for each 2/3 bed dwelling. Additionally, cycle sheds for two cycles (1.0 x 2.0m) should be located in the rear gardens to comply with parking standards - particularly if there is a loss of a garage. As new development, the HCC Transport Contributions Policy will apply, being £1,980 towards sustainable transport, as the development will generate multimodal transport trips on the network.
Hedge End Town Council	Objection – Overdevelopment and not in keeping
Environmental Health	Comment – Recommend conditions restricting construction/ demolition hours, no burning and scheme of works to deal with dust.

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) 59.BE & 191.IN
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh
Supplementary Planning Document : Residential Parking Standards
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Storage and Collection of Domestic Waste & Recyclable Materials

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPS 1 - Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS 3 - Housing

REF. NO. F/10/68338

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPG 13 - Transport

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not Within Detailed Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Noted

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

- Comments on the appearance of the area, amount of development and car parking arrangements will be covered in the assessment of proposal.
- The new dwelling is over 33m from the property at 60 Walker Gardens. At this distance the new dwelling will not adversely affect the residents of this property by way of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact or overlooking.
- Issues around maintenance and devaluation of properties are not material planning considerations and so can not be taken into account in the decision process.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Contributions are required towards community infrastructure, public open space & sustainable transport. The applicant has not entered into a legal agreement nor indicated that the payments would be made upfront.

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."

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.

Character and Appearance

The two storey house will be attached to a row of terraced houses (2-8 Walker Gardens), one of

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

many terraced rows along Walker Gardens. The terrace properties are set in pairs each mirroring its immediate neighbour and stepped in from the previous pair. The small house being a single property will stand out from its neighbours and be detrimental to the pattern of houses along Walker Gardens.

On the plans the house appears to be a similar width to its neighbours (4.2m). However, there is not sufficient space on site to accommodate the house so its width would need to be reduced to 3.5m. This is significantly smaller than its neighbours and so the house will appear awkward being squashed into a small piece of land.

The house would be located on a prominent corner plot at the entrance to Walker Gardens and adjacent to Locke Road. The existing properties have side and rear gardens adjacent to Locke Road that were purposely designed to give a natural break from the built form. In contrast the proposed two storey house will be located hard up against the councils land. Even with additional planting the house will create a bulky and obtrusive built mass that would be detrimental to the spacious and green appearance of Locke Road.

Residential Amenity

The proposed house is considered an overdevelopment of the site. The limited plot size means the house can be no more than 3.5m wide. This will give the new occupants an internal space of under 45 square metres (including space for stairs). The internal space provided is simply not large enough for a house resulting in rooms that are cramped and inadequate. The rear area is mostly taken up by two car parking spaces leaving very little amenity space. Although the garden is around 80% of the properties footprint (as required in Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh) as the property is undersized the garden will also be deficient.

The LPA considered the impact the new house would have on neighbouring residents (particularly no2). However, the siting and massing of the house and the position of its windows meant that it would not affect the light received, outlook or overlooking currently enjoyed by neighbouring residents.

Car Parking and Cycle Storage

The Council requires all houses with three or less bedrooms to provide two car parking spaces usually accommodated on the site (in accordance with Supplementary Planning Document Residential Parking Standards). The site plan shows that two car parking spaces can be provided for the proposed house. However, to accommodate these spaces the rear garage located in the parking court behind the spaces will have to be removed. This will reduce the number of car parking spaces available for the existing house. The applicant has not indicated the new parking arrangements for the existing property and how this relates to the rear parking court that services many of the surrounding properties. As such the parking arrangements remain a concern of both Council Engineers and many neighbours.

In addition the applicant has not indicated the location of cycle stores required to serve the existing and proposed house. These cycle stores should be located on site, which is likely to further reduce

REF. NO. F/10/68338

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

the amount of garden space available for the new house.

Trees

The two storey house will be positioned hard up against Council land and within 3m of the nearest tree. The trees are particularly attractive Scotts Pines that add to the green and leafy feel of the locality. The applicant has submitted no information as to how these trees would be protected during the building process and how the new house would impact on their long term health and retention.

Developer Contribution

Inline with national and local guidance, new residential properties are required to contribute towards infrastructure and improved community services and facilities for which they create an additional demand. The applicant has failed to secure the necessary Planning Obligations by way of a legal agreement or accepting an upfront payment.

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 Refusal