REF. NO.C/14/75052

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Erection of 2no. detached two storey dwellings (one 2no. bed and one 3no. bed) with associated access, parking and landscaping 1 Romill Close West End Southampton SO18 3NE

SITE VISIT DATE	14/8/14
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application proposed the demolition of three single storey outbuildings within the rear garden of no. 1 Romill Close and the erection of 2no. two storey detached dwellings (1x 2no. bed and 1x 3no. bed). The site will be accessed via a new vehicular access point off Romill Close which is located within the grounds of no. 2 Romill Close and within land in the applicants ownership. The driveway will run alongside the revised garden area associated with no. 2 Romill Close and lead to four parking spaces associated with two dwellings approved pursuant to planning permission C/13/72356 and an additional five parking spaces associated with the proposed dwellings. Each dwelling shows a cycle store in the rear garden and a bin collection point is shown adjacent to Romill Close.
SITE AREA	0.14ha
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	36 dwellings per ha
TOPOGRAPHY	The site is generally level. No. 3 Romill Close is noted as approximately 1m higher ground level that application site at point of their rear garden.
TREES	There are a number of trees on and adjacent to the site
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Boundary treatment varies. At the point where the houses are proposed: Rear Boundary - 23 Upmill Close – 2m cbf and leylandii of 5/6m high Rear boundary – 24 Upmill Close – 2m cbf Rear boundary – 25 Upmill Close – 2m cbf and vegetation of 3/4m high Rear boundary – 26 Upmill Close - 2m cbf and vegetation of 3/4m high Side Boundary – 28c Upmill Close – 2m cbf and vegetation Side boundary no. 2 Romill Close hedging upto 2.5m high Side boundary no 3 Romill Close 2m cbf and hedging of between 2.5m and 5m in height Rear boundary of site 2m high fence

REF. NO.C/14/75052

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site forms includes nos 1 and 2 Romill Close which are two storey semi detached properties. The rear garden of the site is fairly substantial relative to the standard plot size in the immediate vicinity. The rear garden includes three outbuildings, two of which are connected. There is no previous consent for employment use on site and the applicant confirms the outbuildings have only ever been used ancillary to the residential use of the land. Both Nos. 1 and 2 Romill Close benefit from parking areas either side of their respective properties. Numerous modifications and extensions to no.1 including raising the roof dormer/balcony to the rear. No.2 has a rear conservatory. The frontage is relatively open. The northern half of the site is located in a Gaters Mill Conservation area however these properties are not identified as being of importance within the Conservation Area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Romill Close is a cul-de-sac comprising of semi detached and terraced dwellings. Although allocated as a conservation area the appearance of the properties are not that one would normally expect for such a designation. Some interesting detailing on some properties (not the application site) such as the window cills, window design, front doors and chimneys. These features are not currently found on nos.1 and 2. To the rear of the site of the site is residential development facing Upmill Close which comprise two storey detached dwellings.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
C/13/72356	Application for a new planning permission to replace extant planning permission to extend time limit to implement planning permission C/10/66498 for the erection of 1no. pair of semi-detached dwellings with associated car parking, following demolition of existing dwelling	Permitted 14/08/2013
D/13/72771	Conservation Area Consent for demolition of dwelling	Grant conservation area consent 14/08/2013
C/10/66498	Erection of 1 pair of semi detached dwellings with associated car parking, following demolition of existing dwelling	Permitted 16/07/2010
C/09/65968	Elevational alterations to front of 2 Romill Close & demolition of single storey rear extension & addition of new 2 bedroom dwelling to side	Withdrawn 2009
C/09/65144	Elevational alterations to front of 2 Romill Close & demolition of single storey rear	Withdrawn 2009

REF. NO.C/14/75052

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	extension & addition of new 2 bedroom dwelling to side	
C/06/57586	Construction of 2 storey dwelling	Refused – Dec 2006
C/31595/003/00	Relief of condition 1 of planning permission C/31595/002 to extend period for commencement of development of new attached dwelling to side	Permitted – Jan 2003
C/31595/002/00	Construction of 2 storey rear extension and front elevational Changes and construction of New attached dwelling to side.	Permitted – July 1996
Z/31595/001/00	Construction of two storey Dwelling	Permitted – Oct 1990
Z/31595/000/00	Outline: extension to 2 romill close to provide garage and 2 parking spaces. Erection of new terraced dwelling and garage on land adjacent	Refused 21/05/1990

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
LOCAL GROUPS	
OTHER	None received

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	No objection
Ecology	No objection subject to contribution towards Solent Mitigation
Environmental Health	No objection subject to conditions
ENG	No objections subject to conditions
Policy - conservation	Concerns raised in respect of no landscaping along driveway and consequential impact upon conservation area. Amended plan submitted noting landscaping to be put along driveway.
Trees	No objection

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within Designated Conservation Area - Gaters Mill Special Protection Area-recreational disturbance zone

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

REF. NO.C/14/75052

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), saved policies
25.NC (Biodiversity), 28.ES (Waste Collection and Recycling), 34.ES (Energy and Climate Change), 59.BE (Design), 100.T (Transport), 101.T (Highway Infrastructure), 104.T (Parking), 147.OS (Open Space Infrastructure), 169.LB (Conservation Areas), 170.LB (Demolition in Conservation Areas), 190.IN (Community Infrastructure), 191.IN (Community Infrastructure Provision) and against **Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014,** (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising:

- Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, published February 2014; and
- Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014'

DM1 (General Design), DM2 (Environmentally Sustainable Development), DM9 (Nature Conservation), DM10 (Heritage), DM23 (Transport contributions), DM24 (parking provision), DM25 (Residential Development in Urban Areas), DM29 (Internal Space Standards for residential development), DM32 (contributions open space) and DM37 (funding infrastructure)

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):
Quality Places 2011,
Environmentally Sustainable Development 2009,
Residential Parking Standards 2009,
Planning Obligations 2008.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework
Particularly of relevance is the presumption in favour of sustainable development (para 49) and the desire for local planning authorities "to resist inappropriate development" (para 53). Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development (para 56) and should respond to the local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials (para 58). The NPPF continues by advising "permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area" (para 64).

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to the character of the conservation area, neighbouring residential amenity, future residential amenity, highway issues, trees, ecology and infrastructure.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Following concerns raised by the Conservation Officer regarding the lack of landscaping along the proposed driveway, amended plans have been received to confirm landscaping will be placed along the fence and a condition is proposed to ensure this. It is pointed out that this was not a requirement of previous applications which show an access road to rear parking for the approved two dwellings at no. 2 Romill Close, noted in the history section.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

No comments

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATION

Following amendments to the NPPG on the 28th November 2014, proposals of 10 or less dwellings are now exempt from affordable housing and tariff-style contributions. As such, developer's

contributions are no longer required for this development.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

> *"In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a 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 proposal is considered to comply with these criteria as set out below.

Principle

The proposed development is located in a settlement area, in a reasonably sustainable location and as such the principle of new residential development on such a site is acceptable in principle subject to matter discussed below, and being in accordance with relevant saved policies contained within the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan, the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan relates to the 'Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, comprising:
- Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, published February 2014; and
- Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014'"
and supporting SPDs.

Impact upon character of the conservation area

Part of the site is located in a conservation area and the element of the scheme that would sit within the conservation area would be the proposed driveway. As noted in the history section above there have been several consents of the application site which include the removal of no. 2 Romill Close and its replacement with two attached dwellings that would ultimately form a terrace with no. 1 Romill Close. The latest approval for that site was in 2013 (C/13/72356) and that permission shows the same driveway as shown in the current plan but leading to four parking spaces only rather than the nine parking spaces and two dwellings proposed as part of this application. Despite previous consents the conservation officer raised concerns regarding the lack of landscaping along the fence. It is considered appropriate that new development comprise a mix of soft and hard landscaping to provide a balanced development that preserves the character and appearance of the conservation. Amended plans have therefore been submitted to show an element of soft landscaping along the side boundary fence. It is considered that would provide a balance to the hard standing area, ensuring that the proposed driveway preserved the character of the conservation area at this point and also addressing the concerns raised by the conservation officer.

The creation of the new access would allow views into the site from the road, albeit limited views. There may also be limited views available down the driveway of no. 1 Romill Close. The distance from Romill Close to the closest point of the dwelling at plot 1 is approximately 48m. As such the dwellings themselves are considered sufficiently removed not to affect the character of the conservation area. This is particularly noting that the bulk of the house of plot 2 is lesser than that of the house at plot 1 which reduces the massing to site respective to boundaries and allows for a sufficient sense of space on site to prevent a feeling of congestion. The design of the houses is well thought out and varied in nature and will not detract from the character of the area, or conservation area.

Neighbouring residential amenity

The site is surrounded by residential dwellings and their associated gardens. The proposed dwellings will be visible from those dwellings. There are a number of aspects to note in considering the impact of the dwellings on neighbouring residential amenity. The first is existing outbuildings on site, two of which are fairly substantial single storey structures. Existing elevations show the larger of the outbuildings as having an eaves of 3.3m and ridge height of 4.9m and that outbuilding is located where plot 1 is proposed, its footprint slightly further back that the proposed footprint at plot 1. The

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

proposed eaves and ridge height are 4.7m and 7.3m respectively at plot 1. There is therefore an increase in height from that existing. Despite the increase in height, the dwelling at plot 1 is considered to be sited in a manner that would not harm neighbouring residential amenity of no. 28c Upmill Close.

Plot 1 shows a distance of 12.5m to 13.8 to the rear boundaries of no. 26 and 27 Upmill Close and a back to back distance to no. 26 Upmill Close of just under 21m at first floor level. This spacing is sufficient to protect the privacy of nos. 26 and 27 and prevent the proposed development appearing visually overbearing. The dwelling at plot 1 would be located 1m from the mutual side boundary to no. 28c Upmill Close and 3m from the side elevation of that property. The flank wall of the proposed dwelling would roughly sit adjacent to part of the flank wall of no. 28C. As the footprint of 28c is an L shape its side elevation continues along most of the side boundary of plot 1. The side elevation of 28c Upmill Close has one side elevation window to a staircase and a ground floor side door (facing onto the site). The window is positioned so that it would face in the direction of the rear garden of plot 1 at a distance of 3.7m from the side boundary to the site. The window currently looks onto the existing outbuildings on the application site. Therefore the outlook as viewed from this window at no. 28c is considered to be improved. Impact upon future residential amenity of occupants of plot 1 is discussed below.

The proposed layout shows the parking area for plots 1 and 2 partly located adjacent to part of the side boundary of no. 28c at the point of their rear garden. There would be a degree of noise associated with car movements for the two properties however it is considered that the degree of noise or the number of vehicle movements would be so great as to cause harm to the residential amenity of no. 28C. Parking is also shown 2.2m to 3.2m from the rear boundary of no. 24 Upmill Close and for the same reasons noted above the proposed parking area is not considered to harm the residential amenity of no. 24 Upmill Close.

In respect of plot 2, this plot is the smaller of the two and shape of the site is such that the side boundary of plot 2 tapers in towards its rear boundary. Three properties would back onto the side boundary of plot 2, those being nos. 24, 25 and 26 Upmill Close. Back to back distances between rear elevations are 12m to 19m at no. 24, 13.4m at no. 25 and 21m at no. 26. The distances to no. 26 is considered acceptable and therefore the residential amenities of no. 26 would not be harmed. The distances to nos. 24 and 25 are however quite close. Furthermore the footprint of plot 2 is located 1m from the rear boundary of no. 25 Upmill Close. This was raised as a concern at pre application stage as a result the bulk of building proposed at plot 2 has been reduced. The rear elevation of plot 2 has an eaves at single storey level rising to a ridge height of 6.2m. A two storey front elevation projection forms part of the design of plot 2 however this is located towards the centre of the plot with just a small dormer window at first floor closer to the mutual side boundary to nos 24 and 25 Upmill Close. Even though the footprint of plot 2 is close to the rear boundary to no. 25 Upmill Close, this distance is to the corner of the building, ie the pinch point, the building at plot 2 moving away from the rear boundary along both its side and rear elevation. Furthermore with the low eaves level, on the proposed rear elevation as the height of the roof increases it moves away from the rear boundary of no. 25. There would still be a distance of 2m between the rear boundary of no. 25 and the highest part of the roof at plot 2 (6.2m) however the portion of the garden at no. 25 that this would directly affect would be a small corner of their rear garden.

A distance of 2.5m is shown between the proposed side elevation of plot 2 and the rear boundary of no. 24 Upmill Close however, the building would sit along side only a small portion of no. 24's rear boundary and again the degree of visual impact is not considered to be to an extent that would harm the residential amenities of no. 24. Therefore on the whole, whilst the development is considered to sit tightly to the boundaries of nos 24 and 25 Upmill Close, the bulk of building proposed at plot 2 is

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

sufficiently small to be capable of supporting the proximity without harm. It is considered however that the massing of the building at plot 2 could not be increased or its position to these boundaries could not reduced as either or both could cross over the line between acceptable impact and harmful impact.

The side elevation of plot 2 shows no side windows and the side elevation of plot 1 shows no first floor side windows. The rear elevation windows of plot 1 would look over its own rear garden with no direct overlooking onto neighbouring properties. The rear elevation of plot 2 has been carefully designed to show three skylights all of which are shown with their bottom cill height set at 1.7m above the finished first floor level. As such the proposed development is not considered to give rise to harmful overlooking onto neighbouring properties.

The proposed dwelling at plot 1 would project at two storey 2m beyond the rear elevation of no. 28c Upmill Close. It is considered that this degree of projection beyond the rear wall of no. 28c Upmill Close is not substantial and would not therefore harm the outlook of occupants at 28 C. Plot 1's front elevation would be located approximately 29m from the rear elevation of no. 2 Romill Close and 18m from the revised rear boundary of that property. These distances are sufficient in order to protect the residential amenities of occupants of that property.

Amenities of future residents
The Quality Places 2011 SPD requires that the private useable amenity area per dwelling be a minimum of 60% its total floor space. Both plots achieve this. Policy DM29 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (July 2014) sets out internal space standards for residential development and requires that a 2 bedroom dwelling have an internal floor area of 77m2 and a 3 bed dwelling have an internal floor area of 93m2. The proposed development achieves this standard.

As noted earlier, the side elevation of 28c Upmill Close has one side elevation window to a staircase and a ground floor side door (facing onto the site). The window is positioned so that it would face in the direction of the proposed rear garden of plot 1 at a distance of 3.7m from the side boundary to the site. Whilst not ideal, it is considered that as the window relates to a staircase it is unlikely to result in prolonged levels of overlooking. Furthermore, once built, assuming permission is granted, potential occupants will be fully aware of the existing window at no. 28c as they view the property. The nature of the room to which the window relates is unlikely to change and therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not represent harmful overlooking for future occupants of plot 1.

Trees
There are a mature trees on and adjacent to the site and of those on site some would be removed as part of the application however the loss of these trees are not considered unacceptable and the tree officer has not objected to the application in this respect.

Highways
The development is accessed via a proposed driveway from Romill Close using the side and rear garden of no. 2 Romill Close. As noted in the history section, previous consents for the site have permitted this driveway albeit that those consents showed it leading to four parking spaces associated with the approved two new dwellings facing Romill Close (those dwellings positioned in place of no. 2 Romill Close). The driveway will run alongside the revised garden area associated with no. 2 Romill Close and lead to four parking spaces associated with two dwellings approved pursuant to planning permission C/13/72356 and an additional five parking spaces associated with the proposed dwellings. Each dwelling shows a cycle store in the rear garden and a bin collection point is shown adjacent to Romill Close.

REF. NO.C/14/75052

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The highways officers have no objection to the application subject to conditions.

Ecology
The development involves the loss of three outbuildings. No objection has been raised by the ecology officer.

Environmentally Sustainable Development
The SPD for Environmentally Sustainable Development sets out all the essential requirements that need to be met for a new dwelling. Policy ESD1 which requires all new housing to meet a minimum Level 4 under the Code for Sustainable Homes assessment. The application is accompanied by a Sustainability Assessment which shows that code 4 will be achieved.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to permit.