MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/10/67975

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Construction of detached chalet bungalow with new access, following demolition of side extension 67 Hobb Lane, Hedge End, Southampton, SO30 0GQ

SITE VISIT DATE	24th Nov 2010			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Application seeks permission for construction of detached 2/3 bed chalet bungalow, on an area of land which is currently the side garden area to No 67. The existing single storey side extension to No 67 is to be demolished to allow for the new property. A new access will be created onto Hobb Lane.					
SITE AREA	480 sqm					
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	Equates to 21 dwg/ha					
TOPOGRAPHY	X	Level		Sloping …..		Other …
TREES	X	No		Yes, …..		
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Low block wall along front boundary with timber posts at entrance to existing driveway. 1.8m fencing to side boundary along footpath into school site, with planting. 1.8m fencing to rear.					
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached bungalow on large corner plot. Small side extension. Gravelled parking area to side of property. Small tree in front garden, to front of bungalow.					
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Established residential area – predominantly detached bungalows, some with large side/front dormers and there are nearby chalet style bungalows/two-storey properties within immediate street scene. Two-storey properties to rear and school site adjacent to application site.					

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Q/10/67339	Enquiry: Proposed new dwelling	Detailed comments provided – July 2010

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
2 Mapleton Road	Object:

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	Further to the above application, we are not happy with a second storey bungalow being built right opposite our property. The upstairs bedroom window will overlook us completely. This is also not in line with other properties around this area as we are single storey only. The entrance right by Freegrounds Infant and Junior Schools surely is not suitable – it is chaos in Hobb Lane at school times now. If the application does go ahead, whilst the new property is being built there will be the added menace of lorries, vans and delivery vehicles all probably at peak times. The entrance way will be right in line where the School Crossing Patrol lady stands to see all the children safely to school and surely this is a Council priority to avoid loss of life or injury.
60 Hobb Lane	Did he have permission to fell all the trees on this site as I thought most trees in and around this area have a preservation order on them. We live right opposite this site at No 60, in a single storey bungalow. Being that this new construction will be a chalet type bungalow with a window facing directly into both our front bedrooms, this will take all our privacy away. I have told him this and all he said was he will not look in. This could be unsafe with a new access because this will be right on the corner of the school road where children cross with the Lolly Pop Lady.
73 Hobb Lane	Observation: As we haven't been notified of this planning application, we can only assume that the proposed dwelling won't overlook our gardens or affect us in any other way. At first, we were concerned that the proposed dwelling might be as tall as the absurd twin towers being erected opposite No's 79 and 79a, a few doors away the other side of us which overlook an enormous number of small bungalows and gardens far below in an extremely intrusive way – are you sure the Council realised the height of these properties when planning was approved? Can you please confirm that they are not building them to twice the original proposed height? We can understand planning approval of reasonably sized properties on the site but surely nothing on this scale. In comparison, the application at no 67 doesn't appear anything like as ridiculous.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Botley Parish Council	No objection subject to the following comment: Members requested a planning condition to control contractors' vehicles parking in the road at the school opening and closing times in order to

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	prevent congestion.
Head of Engineering & Transportation	<u>Transport Policy:</u> No objection to the proposals. In regard to visibility and access, the development proposals offer an improvement on the existing situation as the vehicle access is to move further away from the school access junction. Vehicle parking is accepted for both the existing and proposed sites and on the proposed plot, the garage is of sufficient size, 6m x 3m, to accommodate cycle parking. However, the existing dwelling has insufficient space to accommodate the cycle parking in the garage, 3m x 2.8m, and so a cycle storage shed should be provided. Visibility is acceptable as is access for emergency and service vehicles. As a new development, the proposed 3-bed dwelling will be liable for developer contributions in accordance with the HCC Transport Contributions Policy. A standard 3-bed dwelling figure of £3,745 towards Sustainable Transport should be applied. **Amended plans** – happy with the cycle shelter proposed in terms of style and location. <u>DC Engineer:</u> The design as shown is satisfactory in principle but at frontage, it shows the areas between the existing footway and new set back walls infilled with tarmac and an edging to define site demise. This could create problems for the residents having effectively a widened area of footway used by the public within their ownership. I would suggest that the edgings are set in line against the face of the new wall pillars and all the widened areas are dedicated as part of the public highway, as marked on plan attached. Also, it is a pinch point on the footway at the school site entrance. As part of the 'Safe Routes to School' and 'Borough Walking Strategy Initiatives', it would be desirable to widen a little further into the corner of the plot as marked by cranking back the front wall. Please take up with applicants. **Amended plans** - That is pretty much ok, the concrete edging should extend across each access way outside the front boundary wall, to separate the private drive areas from the widened footway.
Head of Housing & Environmental Health	No comments received

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): 28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling), 59.BE (Development Criteria), 72.H (Density), 75.H (Density), 100.T (Minimise Travelling), 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions), 104.T. (Parking), 147.OS (Public Open Space), 191.IN (Social Infrastructure).
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh
Supplementary Planning Guidance:Storage and Collection of Domestic Waste & Recyclable Materials
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Biodiversity
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area – HEWEB 30 – strength of character moderate.
- maintain predominant plot widths and continuity in building line, maintain a uniformity in building heights within each street.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE / STATEMENT

PPG - 13 Transport
PPS - 1 Delivering Sustainability
- 1 Planning and Climate Change Supplement
- 3 Housing
- 9 Nature Conservation

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, nature conservation, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

X	See below		Other…….

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	See below		Other…….

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of Circular 05/05, Policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and the Council's SPD, 'Planning Obligations', adopted 2009, contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development, contributions are sought towards Community Infrastructure,

Sustainable Transport and Public Open Space and Play Provision.

The applicant has indicated that he wishes to secure the contributions via a Unilateral Undertaking. The completed and signed UU has now been received – 2nd Feb 2011.

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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

The site is located within the urban edge and is bound by residential properties.

The recent changes to PPS3 have removed any references to density and also removed gardens from the category of 'previously developed land'. However, the main aims of PPS3 of providing mixed sustainable development have not changed.

Policy 72.H of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 seeks to maximise development potential on accessible urban sites through encouraging up to 50 dph, but only supporting densities of less than 30 dph in exceptional circumstances. The density of this proposal is approx 21 dwg/ha, which is considered appropriate in relation to the character and pattern of development in the surrounding street scene.

The principle of additional residential development in this location is therefore considered acceptable – there is ample space to the side of the existing property to accommodate the proposed dwelling and it is in keeping with the established rhythm of the street scene and spacing between properties. The use of garden area in this instance is therefore supported, as it is not considered that it would result in any detrimental impact to the character of the surrounding area.

Layout & Design

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.

The proposed dwelling would be positioned adjacent to No 67, following the demolition of the existing single storey extension to No 67. It would measure 13.5m in depth, slightly longer than No 67, and would maintain the same building line to the front. It would measure approx 7.8m in width and incorporates an integral garage.

In terms of design, the proposed chalet dwelling would be gable fronted, which is a feature of properties in this section of the street scene, and would measure 6.3m in height – this is higher than No 67, which measures approx 4.7m at ridge height. However, as the new dwelling would be positioned on a corner plot, rather than interrupting a row of bungalows, the additional height is considered acceptable. There are other examples of chalet-style properties and two-storey properties in the immediate area, so the proposals are not considered out of keeping with the established street scene.

A condition is recommended requiring details of materials to be submitted for approval, to ensure an appropriate match to the neighbouring properties.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Adequate amenity space is provided to the rear of the property, with a generous rear garden area. Cycle storage is provided within the integral garage and a bin storage area to the side of the property. A condition is recommended requiring a detailed landscaping scheme and details of site boundaries, to ensure a high quality finish to the development.

Residential amenity

To assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh has been produced which gives guidance on over looking, loss of light and amenity space for new dwellings.

With regards to No 67, it is not considered that the new dwelling would result in any detrimental impact in terms of amenity. There is a side dormer window proposed which would face the roof area of No 67 – these windows would serve bathrooms and as such, can be obscure glazed to ensure privacy. There would be no undue impact in terms of overshadowing or loss of light.

The comments received from the occupants of No's 60 Hobb Lane and 2 Mapleton Road regarding overlooking and loss of privacy are noted. In terms of these properties, there would be at least 13m separation between the new dwelling and the front/side elevations of No's 60 and No 2 – this is in keeping with the pattern of development along the road and distances between other single storey/chalet properties within the road. The front first floor window serves a bedroom and it is therefore not considered to pose an undue risk of overlooking and whilst sympathetic to the concerns of the residents, it is not considered that a refusal of permission could be justified on these grounds.

Highway matters

Policy 100.T expects development to be sited close to, or well served by, public transport, cycling and walking. Policy 104.T states permission will only be granted for development that provides adequate off-highway parking provision.

The proposals provide adequate on-site parking for the existing and proposed dwelling and with the amended plans, satisfactory cycle storage is also provided.

The concerns raised by residents in relation to the new access and the entrance to the school are noted. The amended plans have widened the footpath area at this corner, improving the situation for parents/children walking to school. As such Engineers have raised no objection in terms of highway safety or visibility grounds.

Trees

A fruit tree is to be removed from the front garden area which does not in itself require permission. It is not considered that there would be any detrimental impact to any other trees as a result of these proposals.

Nature Conservation

There are no issues in relation to nature conservation for this proposal.

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 permit, subject to conditions.