MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/16/79733

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Erection of 2 bed dwelling, following demolition of existing hall Christian Meeting Hall Granada Road Hedge End Southampton SO30 4AL

SITE VISIT DATE	Application site inspected at time of previous application submission 15th June 2016.			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	x	Yes		Submitted drawings allow a comprehensive assessment of the development proposed.
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	x	Yes		In accordance with the Local Planning Authority's publicity of planning proposals, all relevant neighbours have been consulted.

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application proposes the erection of a two bedroom detached dwelling. The application proposes amenity space to the side of the dwelling and parking at the front of the site. The existing hall in the site would be demolished.					
TOPOGRAPHY		Level	Yes	Sloping	No	Application site flat and level.
TREES		No		No trees in the vicinity of the application site.		
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Hedging to the front of the site, close boarded fencing to the side and a wall to the rear of the site.					
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site consists of a detached single storey building previously used as a Christian Meeting Hall. The site is completely hard surfaced.					
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	This section of Granada Road generally consists of detached bungalows and chalet bungalows. The dwellings generally have hedging or low boundary walls to the front of the properties.					

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/16/78479	Erection of 2 bed dwelling, following demolition of existing hall	Refused 22/06/16 Appeal lodged January 2017
Z/14684/002/00	Outline: Construction of dwelling following demolition of existing Christian meeting room	Withdrawn (ret'd undetermined) 06/10/2004
Z/14684/001/00	Construction of a replacement roof	Granted 09/06/1982

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Occupier 10 Granada Road	Support - I feel the proposed application will enhance the area. I am concerned that if the hall is sold as it stands it could well be used commercially. The property is in keeping with the street scene.
Occupier 1D Granada Road	Support - I am writing in support of application number F/16/79733, this application site is next door to my property at 1d Granada Road. I have worked in close liaison with the agent BPS Design Consultants in order to ensure that there are no overlooking or overshadowing issues with my property and I am totally satisfied with the plans. The front elevation fits in well with the street scene and the external private space exceeds EBC's Quality Places SPD guidelines by a comfortable margin. Whilst the garden is to the side of the property, this is secluded and well screened from the road by the fence separating the side garden from the parking area to the front of the property. Both the nearby residents and myself were disappointed that the previous application number F/16/78479 was refused and were puzzled as to the reasons given. I sincerely trust that the amended plans will overcome the previous difficulty and would take the opportunity of reminding you that in 2002 outline planning application number 14684/002 was submitted and the resolution was to grant planning permission. I note that Hedge End Parish Council have raised no objection to the current application, and believe that it is in the public interest to grant permission. If this is refused, the site which is currently occupied by a disused meeting hall, could either be left to become derelict or put to some other business or community use which will be out of character and undoubtedly cause a nuisance in this quiet residential street.
Occupier 9 St Johns Road	Support. I would like to express my support for this application as I think it is a very good use of this redundant site. The meeting hall has been replaced with much better facilities in St Johns Road and it is now important for the local community that this site is returned to residential use. Some time ago one of the local congregation who has since passed away told me that he had had correspondence from one of your colleagues saying that this was the desire of the Council. Unfortunately this cannot now be substantiated, but it was subsequently proved by the council when they gave permission to the trustees in the form of a draft letter intimating their readiness to allow permission subject to 106 agreement. Again, it was unfortunate that the trustees didn't take this to the next step, but the Council's approval was clear. Besides this, the Government urgently needs to provide extra housing and the use of brownfield sites like this one is obviously preferable to using greenbelt/countryside land. We appreciate all your help with this application so far and would be very pleased to hear that permission will be granted. Rest assured that the trustees will be only too pleased to pay the 106 agreement this time.
Occupier 38 St Johns Road	Support I write in support of the application F/16/79733 on the site of the disused meeting hall as a close neighbour. The application site is to the rear of my property. I felt compelled to write in as the last application F/16/78479 was refused on what appear to be minor reasons for doing so. I studied the

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	plans in some detail for that application and was under the impression that it met the criteria for percentage of amenity space against the size of the proposed dwelling. The new proposal is smaller and is a very attractive design fitting in with the other residential properties and I feel the architect has been very considerate of the neighbours and future occupants in what has been designed. I consider that the property would suit older residents that don't require a lot of amenity space and is near to the facilities provided in the town centre including shops, banks, library and parks etc. If permission is refused for a residential property, I am concerned what alternative use may be granted on the site and its' ensuing detrimental effect to existing residents. I respectfully ask that in determining this application that the above points are given due consideration, as are the neighbours who I believe are unanimous in their support for the long term use of this site and its' associated tidying up.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hedge End Town Council	No objection
Head of Transportation & Engineering	No objection It should be acknowledged that the consultation response for planning application/16/78479 was as follows; No objection – The proposed dwelling accords to EBC Parking Standards, with an adequate access point which gives good visibility. There is also cycle parking to the rear, and adequate space upon which to store bins. No transport developer's contributions required, as the existing use would be anticipated to generate more trips than the use proposed. As such there could be a potential highway benefit.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) Saved Policies - 28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling), 34.ES (Energy and Climate Change), 59.BE (Promoting Good Design), 185.IN (Community facilities), 100.T (Transport and New Development), 101.T (Transport Contributions), 104.T (Parking), 191.IN (Infrastructure Contributions)

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

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 Policies DM1 (Development Criteria), DM2 (Environmentally Sustainable Development), DM24 (Parking), DM25 (Residential Development in urban areas), DM29 (Internal space standards for residential development), DM37 (Funding infrastructure)

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development
Supplementary Planning Document Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area

- Maintain the importance of the recreation ground and the associated semi-mature/mature broadleaved tree planting.
- Maintain the importance of the views to the Church of St. John the Evangelist.
- Mitigate the effects of the heavy vehicular traffic on St John's Road and Bursledon Road in new development using measures such as boundary planting, set backs, transition spaces

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site is not located within a special policy area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework;
Of particular relevance to this proposal are: paragraph 6 which states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; paragraph 14 which sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and paragraph 49 which states that housing applications should be considered in the context of this presumption; paragraph 53 which states that local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area; and section 7 (promoting good design) which stipulates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning, and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	See below	X	The no objection forwarded by the Head of Transportation and Engineering is acknowledged.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	See below	X	The four letters of support from nearby residents is acknowledged.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

The changes to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) have increased the threshold for when tariff based planning obligations can be required by new development. This means that developments of ten units or less (and which have a maximum combined floor space of no more than 1000 square metres) will be exempt from the need to provide tariff based planning obligations or affordable housing. The proposed development in this instance falls within this threshold and as such no planning obligations can be requested.

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."

Development Plan Policies

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011):

Saved Policy 28.ES requires that provision should be made in the design and layout of housing developments for the storage and collection of domestic waste and recyclable materials and that these must be sited in locations that would not give rise to disturbance to the occupiers of residential property.

Saved Policy 34.ES requires that development makes an appropriate contribution towards the Government's target to reduce levels of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Saved 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 both in relation to themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, natural features and trees worthy of retention. 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.

Saved Policy 100.T states *inter alia* that development which accords with other relevant policies of this Plan will be permitted provided it is, or could be well served by public transport, cycling and walking; and it includes measures that minimizes its impact on the existing transport network.

Saved Policy 101.T states that development which results in additional traffic on the local road network greater will: only be permitted if the Council is satisfied that there is a proven need for the development in the location proposed and; be the subject of the provision of contributions towards the implementation of the Local Transport Plan and/or other transport proposals set out in the Local Plan.

Saved Policy 104.T requires that adequate off-highway parking is provided to serve new development.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Saved Policies 147.OS and 191.IN respectively state that where development involves a net increase in residential units, the Council will seek agreements for a contribution towards open space provision in the locality as well as for the provision of infrastructure, services, facilities and amenities directly made necessary by the development.

Saved Policy 185.IN aims to prevent the loss of established community facilities.

Principle

The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to acceptable, with any formal planning approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of that proposed being considered appropriate and in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies and supplementary planning documents and guidance.

Planning history

The application follows the previously refused application F/16/78479 the application was refused for the following reason:

The proposed development due to the size and nature of the plot and insufficient amenity space would give rise to a cramped development and poor quality living environment detrimental to the amenity of their future occupiers and out of character with development in the locality. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2011-2011, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 and the Supplementary Planning Document Quality Places.

The current application has been amended to remove the single storey extension to the side of the dwelling.

Pre-application discussions were held prior to the submission of application F/16/78479 where these concerns were raised. No changes to the proposal were made from the pre-application discussion and the application was subsequently refused. Following the refusal of the application further discussion where held regarding changes to the dwelling. Concerns were raised that the site was not a viable development site due to its restricted size and location.

Loss of community use

No objection was raised under application F/16/78479 to the loss of the community use.

The existing building on the site was previously used as a Christian Meeting Hall and is therefore deemed to be a community facility. Saved Policy 185.IN of the adopted Local Plan states that the Borough Council will not permit development proposals which would result in the removal or loss of an established community facility unless suitable alternative provision is made which is of an acceptable quality and siting or is more appropriate to the needs of the community, or the existing facility can be shown to be surplus to local needs.

The site was previously used by the Itchen Gospel Hall Trust, due to the size of the building planning permission was granted under application F/06/57800 for a new Gospel Hall in St Johns Road. The building is therefore surplus to requirements and is not currently used by the Gospel Hall Trust. No details have been submitted with the application regarding any alternative uses for the hall and

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

whether the site has been marketed for different uses. However, a supporting statement has been submitted with the application explaining that the hall does not comply with the DDA within the existing building envelope. It is acknowledged that this would limit the viability of alternative uses. In addition due to the size and scale of the site there is limit space on the site for parking.

In addition is it noted that there are existing community facilities in close proximity to the site including the village hall and community centre on St.Johns Road. It is therefore considered that due to the alternative provision provided for the users of the Gospel Hall in a nearby location, the existing community facility within close proximity to the site and the limited suitability of the site for alternative community uses, no objection is raised to the loss of the community uses in this instance and the proposal is considered to comply with policy 185.IN of the Local Plan.

Layout, design and impact on the character of the area

The surrounding area consists of dwellings that are mixed in terms of their form and design. The street generally consists of bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings. The site is considered to be a small plot with a modest sized single storey building located within the corner of the site.

The application proposes a dwelling in a similar position to the existing building on the site with parking to the front of the property and an amenity space to the side of the dwelling.

Whilst the design of the dwelling in itself is considered to be acceptable concerns are raised regarding the size of the application site and the proposed dwelling. It is considered that due to the restrictive size and nature of the site the proposal would appear cramped on the site, with the dwelling being located in close proximity to three of the boundaries on the site and amenity space provision only at the side of the dwelling. It is therefore considered that the proposal would result in a cramped development on the site and would not accord with policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan.

The supporting statement refers to outline permission for a dwelling on the site. The agent has detailed that the application was recommended for approval but permission was never granted as the contributions were not paid. Having reviewed the planning history for the site permission was not granted under application Z/14684/002/00 and the recommendation remained undetermined. The details of this application have also been reviewed, the application was for outline permission with the means of access to be considered only. It is therefore considered that this application does not justify the current proposed dwelling on the site.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

With regards to impact on amenity, consideration needs to be given to the impact on the existing neighbouring properties and the amenity of any future occupier of the site.

The proposed dwelling would be located at the rear of the neighbouring properties (no.1d) private amenity space and would adjoin a large outbuilding in this neighbouring properties garden. It is considered that due to the separation distance from the neighbouring properties main amenity area and the design of the roof, sloping away from the boundary of the site, the proposal is not considered to cause material harm in terms of over dominance to the amenity of the neighbouring property.

A roof light is proposed in the rear elevation of the building, this would serve a bathroom and is proposed to be obscurely glazed and non opening. The proposal is therefore not considered to cause

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

material harm in terms of overlooking to this neighbouring property.

Due to the separation distance and sloping roof design, the proposal is not considered to cause material harm to the amenities of the neighbouring property 1b.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan in relation to the impact on the existing neighbouring properties.

With regards to future occupiers of the site, concerns where previously raised regarding the size and the quality of the proposed external amenity space. The agent has stated that the DMPO states that floor space is the total floor space in a building or buildings and therefore only the internal measurements of the building have been provide in the amenity space calculation. This requirement is detailed in the quality spaces SPD which does not provide details of whether the internal or external floor space should be taken. However, following the reduction in the size of the proposed dwelling by removing the single storey side extension the proposal is considered to meet the 60% amenity space requirement. As detailed in the previous officers report the area to the rear and south west side of the dwelling has not been included in the calculation, as it is considered that due to the size of this garden area with a depth of less than 1.5m it would not provide a useable area of amenity space, especially due to its proximity to the boundary screening.

However, as raised in the previous application concerns are raised regarding the value of the garden space provided. Concerns are raised that the amenity space would have minimal privacy and would be affected by noise due to its location between the road and the neighbouring properties. In addition the boundaries of the site would be adjoined by dwellings and an outbuilding on three sides of the site, it is considered that this relationship would enclose the site.

Having regard to the comments above the proposal is not considered to provide a suitable level of amenity for the future occupiers of the dwelling and the proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan.

<u>Highway matters</u>

In accordance with the requirements of Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) of the adopted Local Plan, the development should provide a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles on the site. In support of this policy requirement, the Council has adopted a Supplementary Planning Document entitled 'Residential Parking Standards' which sets out the level of parking necessitated for different sized dwellings, with this being related to the number of bedrooms contained within the property. For a 2 bedroom dwelling 2 spaces would be required. The submitted plans show space at the front of the site for at least two cars. As detailed in the previous report, following consultation with the Councils Head of Transportation and Engineering no objection has been raised, the proposal has an adequate access point which gives good visibility.

In addition to suitable parking and access arrangements, any new residential development should also make appropriate provision within the curtilage of the site for secure storage of bicycles (as required by Saved Policy 59.BE (vi.)) as well as for the storage and collection of domestic waste and recyclable materials in a location that would not give rise to disturbance to the occupiers of residential properties (as required by Saved Policy 28.ES). The submitted plans show a bin storage area and provision could be provided within the shed in the garden and therefore no objection is raised on these grounds.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy 59.BE on these grounds.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Environmental Sustainability

The Council's 'Environmentally Sustainable Development' SPD requires all new dwellings to meet a minimum of code level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes together with a number of other mandatory requirements on water and energy conservation. However, the code has now been revoked with the intension that these requirements will be assessed by Building Regulations. Notwithstanding this, it is Council policy that any new dwellings must meet the equivalent of Code Level 4 with regards to water and energy conservation. If permission were to be granted, this would be secured via a planning condition.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011-2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

It is considered that the proposed changes to the dwelling have not overcome the previous reasons for refusal. The recommendation is to refuse.