MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/15/77982

DESCRIPTION	Construction of two storey detached 4 bedroom dwelling with attached garage, frontage car parking & landscaping, following demolition of existing bungalow
ADDRESS	35 Oakgrove Road, Bishopstoke, Eastleigh SO50, 6LN

SITE VISIT DATE	18/6/15, another site visit was not deemed necessary as there are no changes in site circumstances
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	• The application is proposing a 1x4 bed two storey dwelling with attached garage, frontage car parking & landscaping
SITE AREA	• 720sqm
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	• One
TOPOGRAPHY	• No noticeable changes in level
TREES	• No tpo trees
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	• Mix of 1 and 1.6 metre fence
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	• The application site contains a detached bungalow • At the front elevation there is garage which is attached • There is parking for three vehicles • The rear garden backs onto to open space/countryside • There is a very small lean to at the side adjacent

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	to number 34
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	• The immediate surrounding area contains detached bungalows which have been extended, and some of which have first floor accommodation

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/15/76112	Erection of 1no. 4 bed dwelling following demolition of existing bungalow	Refused 12/8/15
Q/14/75621	Pre app enquiry: Erection of 1no. 4 bed dwelling following demolition of existing bungalow	Likely to be supported 12/1/15

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Dr Judith Eckert, 34 Oakgrove Road	Footprint and height of the proposed 4 bedroom house are substantially larger than the existing bungalow. The proposed large dormers will collectively be covering more than half of the width of the roof (two to the rear and three to the front). Taken together, this will give an overbearing appearance to the proposed dwelling, against the character of the street. In addition, the proposed gap of 1m between no 35 and no 34 will be insufficient to allow safe access for maintenance work on side elevations and guttering for both properties. This gap is smaller than elsewhere in the street and contributes to the overbearing impression of the two dwellings being so close together. Query about the dimensions.
Thelma and Trevor Ash, 60 Oakgrove Road	Here we are again.the answer is NO NO NO .you will no doubt you have our reasons in the last letter.They are the same now. BUILDER`S LORRIES---DUST—NOISE—PRIVACY THEY would be able to see into our rooms from the upper storey. How many times is he going to try this When he converted no 34 it was dreadful.the house now stands out like a sore thumb in a

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
	road of various types of bungalows No doubt you will give in to him ,you always do .But until that time it is NO NO NO

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BST	The proposed development due to its siting, design, massing, scale, materials, would still create an unattractive and incongruous feature at odds with the appearance of the locality and detrimental to the character and pattern of development within Oakgrove Road.
ENG	No comments received
HEH	Conditions be attached requiring a scheme of works to deal with dust from the site and scheme of works detailing measures to be taken to control noise and vibration from site activities

POLICY CONTEXT

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

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) saved policies 43.ES, 44.ES, 59.BE, 104.T
Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, policy DM1, DM4, DM24, DM25 (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'

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011)
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development (2009)
Supplementary Planning Document Residential Parking Standards (2009)

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

NA

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

NA

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out twelve core principles that underpin the planning system, one of which is that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings". It goes on to say in paragraph 56 that "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."

Paragraph 53 of the NPPF also 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."

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."

Paragraph 64 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, trees, nature conservation, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Noted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Noted, the concern that the dwelling would be out of character is agreed with, however it is

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

worth noting that number 34 is a two storey dwelling. It is not quite understood the comment about the dormers being the entire width of the roof as dormers both front and rear are a common feature of the streetscene.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Required but not sought.

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 lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable. Paragraph 64 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.”
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. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, and noise and fumes. Also of relevance is Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

Layout, Design and Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Area

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) and Policy DM1 of the Revised Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality. This requirement is reiterated within the guidance contained within the Council’s adopted Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document, as well as in the NPPF which states 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” (paragraph 64).

Oakgrove Road is characterised with detached bungalows of two very distinct styles, chalet and traditional pitched roofs. The majority of the bungalows have pitched roofs with a number of them having the provision of some form of accommodation in the roofspace. Even with the alterations to the roofs which include dormers, the simplistic nature of the bungalows has been retained as well as the ridge heights which forms a consistent approach to building heights.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The proposal is intending to demolish the existing detached bungalow and to replace it with a 4 bedroom two storey dwelling, the application site was subject to pre-application advice where the design of the house was proposed to be similar to the neighbouring property; number 34. Number 34 was given planning permission for a two storey dwelling following the demolition of the existing bungalow. Having undertaken a site visit to assess the application site and wider streetscene, it was concluded that the cropped gable roof profile has created an unattractive feature owing to the resultant bulk, mass and roof form which features side dormers. Further to which the use of render draws attention to the fact that the house is out of character within the streetscene.

The outcome of the advice was based on comments made informally, on the information provided with a caveat that the guidance will not be binding on any future planning applications. It was suggested that a pitch roof would be more appropriate in order to respect the character of Oakgrove Road. In isolation the design and appearance was acceptable, the concern is the impact of a two storey dwelling in a street which is characterised with bungalows.

During the site visit the strong character of the locality was observed and how as already been mentioned the neighbouring bungalows maintain their original appearances even with the addition of dormers. Irrespective of the outcome of the pre-application, having taken a site visit, the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that allowing further two storey dwellings would be detrimental to the Oakgrove Road and would fail to respect the character and pattern of development. As a result the application was refused similar

This subsequent application has made alterations to the appearance of the dwelling which was not the issue of the refused scheme. Two dormers are proposed at the first floor of the front elevation with a pitched roof which has been cropped which in fact creates a rather bulky roof profile. At the front elevation a first floor front extension with pillars at ground floor is proposed which is considered to be an ostentatious addition completely out of character with the simplistic character of the dwellings on Oakgrove Road.

Residential Amenity

The Quality Places SPD requires proposals to take into account the relationship between neighbouring properties to ensure a reasonable level of daylight is achieved, and that a high standard of privacy is required when extending at the rear.

The level of overlooking whilst different to what is perhaps experienced is not considered to be detrimental. The occupiers of number 60 commented that the proposal would result in loss of privacy, however the application site is located 60 metres away at an angle from these occupiers.

Overall it is considered that the level of overlooking, impact upon privacy would not be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Highways

No comments have been received from the Head of Transportation and Engineering, but this is not a cause of concern as the level of parking proposed meets the requirements of

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

the Residential Parking Standards SPD.

Flood Risk

The application lies within a flood risk 2 and 3 area and as such a flood risk assessment was required. Had the proposal been considered acceptable the Environment Agency would have been notified of the submitted flood risk information. As it stands the submitted information is wholly unacceptable as it fails to assess the application site and provide for suitable mitigation measures, this was the concern that the Environment Agency had on the previous application.

Sustainability

Had the development been considered acceptable the appropriate conditions would have been attached.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance 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

(1) The proposed development due to its siting, design, massing, scale, materials, would create an unattractive and incongruous feature at odds with the appearance of the locality and detrimental to the character and pattern of development within Oakgrove Road. The proposal is contrary to saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011, policy DM1 of the 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' and Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places (2011).

(2) Insufficient information has been submitted to allow the local planning authority to make a full and proper assessment of the proposal in respect of flood risk assessment, contrary to saved policies 43.ES, 44.ES of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011, policy DM4 of the 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'