REF. NO.C/14/74198

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Construction of first floor rear extension to form 1 no. one bed flat. Clarke Mews 30 High Street Botley Southampton SO30 2EA

SITE VISIT DATE	28/03/2014
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	Yes
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application is for a first floor rear extension to provide a one bedroom flat accessible via an internal staircase which also accesses an existing two bedroom first floor flat. The first floor extension will sit above an existing ground floor extension and proposes two dormer windows on the side (east) elevation (bathroom and kitchen) and one dormer window (living room) on the side (west) elevation. The roof pitch of the first floor extension is shown as 47º. The application also shows a juliette balcony on the rear elevation. No parking is proposed for the existing flat or the proposed flat.
SITE AREA	0.0286 ha
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	70 dph
TOPOGRAPHY	Level
TREES	No trees on site however there appear to be several pollarded trees immediately adjacent to the boundary and a further mature oak all within the grounds of no. 30a High Street.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.2. to 1.4m brick wall along rear side boundary (east). Trees and laurel hedging along rear boundary. No boundary treatment either side of application site other than to the rear
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site comprises a detached building which appears to have been extended at first floor hence the cat slide roof and also at single storey to the rear. Most of the site is now taken up by the buildings footprint as extended. The front of the premises is used by an estate agent and a tanning salon is located to the rear of the ground floor and accessed at the rear also. A two bedroom first floor flat is located on the first floor. There is no parking available on site.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is located in the shopping area of Botley and within Botley Conservation Area and is characterised by two storey

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	older buildings many of which are listed and some of which are attached to each other and forming typically terraced groups fronting the road. Specifically Nos. 13 to 15 the High Street and Nos. 21 to 25 the High Street and no. 29 the High Street are Grade II Listed buildings located opposite the application site and no.34 The High Street, west of the application site is a Grade II Listed Building. To the rear of the application site is no.30a High Street which is a detached chalet bungalow. To the east, no. 28 is a two storey detached building used at ground floor for retail purposes with associated offices above. That property has a large single storey rear extension. Further afield and also to the east is Warner Mews leads to a number of residential properties, closest of which to the application site is a three storey block of four flats. To the west, 32 High Street is a detached building that has recently been extended at ground and first floor to form a first floor flat.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Application Site		
A/15999/004/00	Display of non illuminated fascia sign	Consent 07/11/2001
A/15999/002/00	A/15999/002/00 display of halo illuminated fascia sign and internally illuminated projecting sign	Refuse advert consent 23/12/1998
A/38287/001/00	Display of 1 externally illuminated sign board	Consent 11/02/2002
C/15999/001/00	Single storey side extension	Permit 31/05/1996
C/38287/000/00	Change of use from office to solarium (use class d2)	Permit 27/12/2001
Z/15999/000/00	Extension of bank office	Permit 11/09/1975
C/38287/002/00	Relief of condition 1 of planning permission reference c/38287 (opening hours restricted to between 09.00 and 20.00hrs monday to saturday) to enable opening on sundays between 10.00 and 16.00hrs	Permit 26/03/2002
C/38287/002	Relief of condition 1 of planning permission reference c/38287 (opening hours restricted to between 09.00 and 20.00hrs monday to saturday) to enable opening on sundays	Permitted March 2002
C/06/56655	Construction of 1st floor rear extension to provide 2no. 1 bed flats with roof terrace	Refused 5/6/2006 (1) The scale, mass and design of the proposed development does not relate well to its historical setting, the street scene or the existing building and would not preserve or enhance the character of the Botley Conservation Area, therefore is contrary to policies 59.BE

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
		and 169.LB of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-201) 2006. (2) By virtue of the roof terrace, limited proposed amenity space and layout of the proposed development the scheme would be out of character with its locality, an over development of the site and visually dominate and over look surrounding residential properties resulting in a loss of light and privacy to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers of the development and occupiers of neighbouring properties, therefore the proposals are contrary to policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 2006 and guidance within Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh' (3) No provision has been made for car parking or cycle parking the direct need for which would be generated by the proposal, which is within a low accessibility location, therefore the development is contrary to policy 59.BE and 104.T of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 2006 and PPG 13. (4) The proposal does not make contributions towards the provision of essential off-site open space works, social and recreational facilities or offsite transportation works, the need for which will increase as a direct result of the development proposed. The proposals are therefore contrary to policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.LB of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 2006 and the provisions of Government Circular 1/97 and PPG13: Transport.
C/07/59241	First floor rear extension with roof terrace & screen wall & provision of 1no. 2 bed flat	Withdrawn – return undetermined 6/10/10
C/13/72836	Construction of first floor rear extension to form 1no. one bed flat with roof terrace & privacy screens	Refuse 23/08/2013
28 The High Street		
Z/15879/002/00	First floor office extension	Permit 05/04/1979
32 The High Street		
C/11/69376	Two storey side & rear extension & change of use of first floor office to one bedroom flat	Permit 25/10/2011

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

REF. NO.C/14/74198

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
LOCAL GROUPS	
OTHER	
18 Warner Mews	Objection: Parking assessment not valid. Limited parking available in the reasonable vicinity which is available for visitors to local businesses. Parking is not available in Warner Mews and this will increase illegal parking there.
30A High Street	Objection: Major impact noting the extension will occupy about 75% of existing ground floor's roof. Mass, height and proximity of extension including rear windows closer to property than existing will result in a visually intrusive development. Harmful and direct overlooking onto property's 2 front bedrooms and ground floor living rooms. Concerns in respect of parking blocking driveway to no 30a.
34b High street	Objection: Insufficient parking, overlooking/loss of privacy. Overlooking 30a, 32 high street and flats of Warner Mews.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BOT	Objection: • The Parish Council objects to the use of public parking spaces for residential parking. The parking statement refers to use of the Dolphin car park as a public car park. The Parish Council advises that this element of the statement should considered within current context. The owners of the land, Greene King, have given formal notice to EBC that they intend to manage the car park privately. Changes to the access rights for public parking will have potential to affect the claims in the parking statement that Botley has is sufficient public parking spaces to justify their use for residential parking. • Members agreed that revision of the design to remove the rear balcony reduced the potential for intrusive overlooking of neighbouring properties, nonetheless by reason of the close proximity the windows of this second storey extension will overlook adjacent properties. • Despite the slight reduction of footprint size the design and mass of the new structure will make the building excessively dominant in view of the close proximity of existing buildings
HPP - Conservation	This proposal is far more in keeping than the previous suggestion with the steeper pitched roofs more akin to the front roof pitch of the host building which is a traditional pitch for plain tiling. The revised format has the added advantage of breaking up the form into more traditional sized elements which is more relevant to this situation. The extension ridges appear to be level with the existing ridge of the original building whereas they should be subservient to the original and from the side, the bulk of the extension looks big with the new dormer windows looking quite out of kilter with the existing side windows. A rough measurement on screen suggests that the window head is a good 2.2 - 2.3 metres above f.f.l. This building is a cottage where one does not

REF. NO.C/14/74198

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	expect regal window and ceiling heights; cottages are lucky to have 2 metres to window head, usually more like 1.8m. Reduction of the overall bulk would be a good idea to reduce any feeling of overpowering the spaces behind.
ENG	Objection The proposed residential dwelling does not cater for any on-site parking, preferring instead to 'claim' utilisation of a couple of parking spaces in the nearby public car parks that are primarily there for the utilisation of shoppers / users of the village facilities. Whilst surveys have been undertaken demonstrating spare capacity, and it has been the case in the recent past that other residential developments have 'got away' with this argument, this should not be a situation that continues or it could well affect the future (non-recession) vitality of the village centre. As information supplied suggests, alternative means of transport exist and so the car may not be the only option for daily travel. However, in reality it is likely that associated car ownership will still exist which has the combined potential to worsen the situation - i.e. not only does the associated car take up space in the public car parks , but they are left there throughout the day, restricting space turnover and (if left to continue with this and future like development) eventually the vitality of the village centre - i.e. nowhere to park as it is full with residential car parking. Additionally, to assist in the promotion of sustainable transport, the EBC Parking Standards stipulate a requirement for cycle parking. Whilst some are shown on floor plans, it is not clear who has use of these, and zero spaces are indicated on the application form suggesting they are not for the new flat. As such, these would be required and need to be shown on amended plans. This should be a secure storage facility measuring no less than 1.0 x 2.0m.
HEH	No objections subject to conditions

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Local Shopping Centre Within Designated Conservation Area Affects Setting of Listed Building Within Special Protection Area-recreational disturbance zone

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) saved policies:
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), 105.T (Parking Standards within Shopping Centres, 133.TC (District and Local Shopping Centres), 141.TC (Upper Floors in Shopping Areas), 147.OS (Open Space Infrastructure),169.LB (Criteria for development in Conservation Areas), 171.LB (The Setting of Listed Buildings), 190.IN (Community Infrastructure),191.IN (Community Infrastructure Provision)
Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029:
DM1 (Design), DM2 (Environmentally Sustainable Development), DM8 (contributions public utilities), DM10 (Heritage Assets), DM23 (Transport contributions), DM24 (parking provision), DM25 (Residential Development in Urban Areas), DM29 (Internal Space Standards for residential

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

development), DM32 (contributions open space) and DM37 (funding infrastructure),
Also of relevant are Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document 2012, Environmentally Sustainable Development 2009, Residential Parking Standards 2009 and Supplementary Planning Document Planning Obligations 2008, Botley Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2005

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraph 23 requires that planning policies should support the viability and vitality of town centres and set out policies for their management and growth.

Paragraph 131 requires that in determining planning applications local planning authorities should

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

National Planning Policy Guidance states under the heading *'Ensuring the vitality of town centres':*
'This positive approach should include seeking to improve the quality of parking in town centres (in line with the National Planning Policy Framework) and, where it is necessary to ensure the vitality of town centres, the quantity too. Local planning authorities should set appropriate parking charges that do not undermine the vitality of town centres and parking enforcement should be proportionate, avoiding unfairly penalising drivers.'

National Planning Policy Guidance states under the heading 'What is the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account?'
'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation.'

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 and appearance of the conservation Area, setting of listed buildings, residential amenities, highway safety and sustainable development.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

No comments

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

No comments

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATION

In accordance with the provisions of the NPPF saved policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011, policies DM23, DM32, DM35 and DM37 of the revised draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and supplementary planning document planning obligation contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Highways infrastructure, Community Infrastructure and Public Open Space. The application is recommended for refusal and as such this matter has not been progressed.

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."
Section 74(3) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that Section 66(1) of the Act applies. This indicates that in considering whether to grant Conservation Area consent:
"The Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

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

Saved policy 59.BE of the Local Plan and DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Pre Submission (2011 - 2029) 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.

Saved policy 133.TC is relevant which requires amongst other things, that development does not undermine the commercial coherence of the existing centre.

Saved policy 141.TC of the Local Plan (2001-2011) permits the use of upper floors in shopping areas provided the amenity of the upper floor use would not be adversely affected by the ground floor use and provided that adequate provision is made for the disposal, storage and collection of waste.

Saved policy 169.LB of the Local Plan (2001-2011) permits extensions to buildings within conservation areas subject to a number of criteria including that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is either preserved or enhanced and the extension does not detract from its character and that architectural details of the building are retained where possible.

Saved policy 171.LB of the Local Plan (2001-2011) permits development provided the quality of townscape features in Conservation Areas are retained. Policy DM10 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Pre Submission (2011 - 2029) reflects the content of saved policies 169.LB and 174.LB.

The proposal is considered to conflict with these criteria as set out below:

REF. NO.C/14/74198

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Background

A similar application was submitted in 2013 for a first floor extension to provide a one bedroom flat. That application reasons for refusal included that it was considered the extension would result in a cramped form of development, harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The balcony was also considered to cause unacceptable levels of overlooking onto no. 30a High Street. The current application has made a number of changes to the previously refused application which include removal of a large balcony area to the rear, reduction of bulk of roof through creation of two hipped roof elements on extension and increased roof pitch all of which seek to address concerns raised in respect of the refused application.

Principle

The site is located within the settlement and as such the principle of development is acceptable subject to other relevant local plan policy.

Impact on Conservation Area

The application site is located in Botley Conservation Area and the Conservation Area Appraisal 2005 appraisal describes the High Street as comprising buildings that are 'spaced and set back from the road with boundary treatments of railings, hedges and low walls.' The building in question has all the appearance of a small 'cottage' style building which despite extensions at both first and ground floor still remains the case. Several of the properties within the immediate locality including neighbouring sites are similar in that they appear as small cottage style buildings, some with narrow fronts facing the road. In several cases these smaller buildings have been built immediately adjacent to each other creating a terrace however because of their differing design, form and materials they still are clearly visible as individual buildings and retain their cottage style character.

The proposal involves a large first floor extension that would span the width of the building. The eaves and ridge height of the extension would match that of the existing building. The application proposes two hipped roofs which would reduce the massing of the roof from that shown in the previously refused application. The depth of the extension has been part reduced, adjacent to the side (west) elevation by 1.2m and part increased in depth adjacent to side (east) elevation by an additional 1.1m. The reduction in depth of the building is not considered sufficient to address the concerns raised in respect of massing from that shown in the previously refused application. It is noted that the reduction in roof bulk through the introduction of two hipped roofs is only perceived as viewed from the rear and as the proposed eaves and ridge height match existing as shown the previously refused application, the effective reduction in bulk of the extension as viewed from the road is the slight 1.2m reduction in depth.

As with the previously refused application, the resultant building as extended will significantly increase the size of the building and change its character from a small cottage style property into a much larger property that would be disproportionally large to the site is relates to and in respect of smaller neighbouring buildings. The extension would be visible in the street scene particularly as viewed through the driveway to no. 30a the High Street and also from Warner Mews. The building as extended would result in a cramped and congested form of development and would, in terms of its design and massing, detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area at this point and would therefore be contrary to saved policies 59.BE and 169.LB of the Local Plan (2001-2011) and policies DM1 and DM10 of the Revised Draft Local Plan (2011 - 2029).

In addition the positioning of the proposed dormer windows, in terms of their heights, has little regard to the existing first floor windows. The dormer windows would be much higher and this would be apparent as viewed from the road. The mismatch fenestration represents a poorly designed

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

development which neither preserves of enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area at this point. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to saved policies 59.BE and 169.LB of the Local Plan (2001-2011) and policies DM1 and DM10 of the Revised Draft Local Plan (2011 - 2029).

Setting of Listed Buildings

There are several listed buildings opposite and near the application site located along the High Street as noted in the 'Character of Locality' section earlier. The proposed extension, located to the rear of the application building, although visible in the street scene, would not interrupt important views of the listed buildings or harmfully affect their setting. The application is considered acceptable in this respect.

Impact upon Residential Amenities

The proposal results in formation of three dormer windows at first floor on the side elevations and a first floor Juliette balcony located to the rear. In terms of the west elevation, which looks onto no. 32 High Street, a dormer window is proposed to a living room. Noting the approved, and now built, extension at no. 32 to form a first floor flat, the proposed living room window will look directly into a first floor bedroom window of the flat at no. 32.

Proposed living room window on side elevation (west) would be positioned in a manner that would look directly into a first floor side elevation bedroom window of the first floor flat of no 32 High Street. The distance between the windows would be approximately 6.9m. The two dormer windows on the other side elevation (east) will be located so that the look onto the roof of no. 28 High Street however their position is such that they will be close to the existing first floor office windows of no. 28 and this is also considered an unacceptable relationship. Although there is no residential at first floor of no 28 the proximity of the proposed to existing windows is such that could allow clear views to an unacceptable level.

The proposed side elevation bedroom window would be roughly in a direct line to the rear amenity space at no. 32 High Street however there would be a distance of 12.11m between proposed window and the side boundary to the rear amenity area. This is considered sufficient to ensure that there would not be a harmful degree of overlooking arising from this window onto the amenity space at no. 32 High Street.

Finally the Juliette balcony to the rear would be located 6.1m from the rear boundary to no. 30a High Street. The rear boundary treatment within the grounds of 30a High Street in the form of vegetation and small trees rise to approximately 4m most of which is evergreen with some gaps of deciduous plants. Taking a line from 1.7m above the floor level and extending it to the rear boundary at 4m in height it is clear to see that the extent of actual garden area that would been visible by an average height person from the sole rear window noting the height of the rear boundary treatment would be limited and certainly not harmful. The habitable rooms of the house at no. 30a High Street are considered too far removed to be harmfully overlooked by the proposed rear window (20m approximately).

Other residential properties in the vicinity of the application site such as 34b High Street and properties at Warner Mews are considered too removed from the application site for the proposed extension to have a direct and harmful impact in terms of outlook, overlooking, daylighting or any other residential amenity.

Future Residential Amenity

The proposed flat would have no private residential amenity area. 'Quality Spaces' SPD 2011 states that flats should provide an amenity area of has an area of 25m^2. The guidance states '*The amount of communal space provided with flats and accommodation for older people should be determined*

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

by the local context, but as a guide, a minimum of 25 sqm of amenity space per dwelling should be provided. If the flatted development is directly adjacent to a useable recreation space or within an area of very good local facilities, such as a town centre, in which case this requirement may be waived.' A recreational ground is located approximately 280m west the site accessed off the High Street. Whilst this recreational facility is not directly adjacent, the site is located in a district centre with access to reasonably good local facilities and that the guidance allows the requirement to reflect the local context and to be waived in such circumstances. Therefore the application is not considered unacceptable in this respect despite no provision of private amenity space.

Highways

The proposed residential dwelling does not provide any on-site parking, and relies on the nearby public car parks that are there for the utilisation of shoppers / users of the village facilities.
Whilst surveys have been undertaken demonstrating spare capacity, and it has been the case in the recent past that other residential developments have used with this argument, this should not be a situation that continues or it could well affect the future (non-recession) vitality of the village centre. It is noted that whilst the supporting information relies on the two public car parks being a) free and b) no time restrictions in the evening, there is no guarantee that this will remain the case at all. Furthermore and to emphasise this point the owners of the Dolphin Car Park have recently given formally given notice of their intention to manage the car park privately where currently managed by the Council. The implication is that parking charges may be introduced and time restrictions increased. The use of these car parks as a solution to provide support to residential development in the area is not realistic in that it will undermine the availability of parking for shoppers and local businesses and this would be contrary to saved policy 133.TC of the Local Plan which requires amongst other things, that development does not undermine the commercial coherence of the existing shopping centre and also contrary to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Guidance which seeks to improve the quality of parking in shopping centres in order to support viability and vitality of shopping centres.

Supporting information supplied with the application suggests alternative means of transport exist and so the car may not be the only option for daily travel. However the frequency of bus/rail services is not sufficiently frequent to support car free development. In reality it is likely that associated car ownership will still exist which has the combined potential to worsen the situation. Saved policy 105.T of the Local Plan (2001-2011) does allow in some circumstances development that does not meet parking standards on site in shopping centres. Where this is permitted financial contributions would be made towards on street parking management proposals designed to prevent the incidence of overspill parking occurring on local streets. In this instance contributions would be put towards making all car parks pay and display and this would effectively undermine the use of the local car parks to support the proposed development. In this instance the highway officers consider that contributions suggested by saved policy 105.T and the reliance on public car parks unacceptable and setting of a harmful precedent.

Additionally, to assist in the promotion of sustainable transport, the EBC Parking Standards stipulate a requirement for cycle parking. Whilst some are shown on floor plans, it is not clear who has use of these, and zero spaces are indicated on the application form suggesting they are not for the new flat. As such, these would be required and need to be shown on amended plans however this has not been progressed noting that the application is recommended for refusal.

Sustainable Development

Saved policy 34.ES of the Local Plan, policy DM2 of the Revised Draft Local Plan (2011 - 2029) and

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

supplementary planning document Environmentally Sustainable Development 2009 require the submission of the sustainability statement to demonstrate how Code 4 will be achieved. A statement has been submitted however it only shows the development will meet code 3 and a 10% carbon emission reduction as opposed to the required 15% carbon emission reduction. The application is therefore contrary to these policies in this respect.

Impact upon provision of services and infrastructure

The proposed development would create additional burden upon the infrastructure and services within the area and upon the provision of public open space. A contribution of £4295.53, not including legal and administrative fees, would be required to support and maintain services and infrastructure. As the application is recommended for refusal, no legal agreement has been progressed and as such the requirements of policies 101.T, 147.OS, 190.IN and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan have not been met.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft Local Plan (2011 - 2029). 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 proposed development would result in a form of building that would appear cramped in relation to the site area and would, in terms of its design and massing, detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area at this point. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to saved policies 59.BE and 169.LB of the Local Plan (2001-2011) and policy DM1 and DM10 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan Pre Submission (2011 - 2029).

In addition, the proposed side dormer windows are considered to result in overlooking which would significantly and detrimentally impact upon the amenities and residential amenities of neighbouring properties contrary to saved policy 59.BE of the Local Plan (2001-2011) and policy DM1 of Revised draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029.

The proposed development would fail to meet the parking standards set out in Residential Parking Standards 2009. The additional residential unit would use public car parks which would reduce their capacity and undermine their ability to support Botley's shopping centre function. The application is therefore considered contrary to saved policies 104.T and 133.TC of the Local Plan (2001-2011) and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance.

The proposed development would fail to meet code 4 and would therefore be contrary to saved policy 34.ES of the Local Plan, policy DM2 of the Revised Draft Local Plan (2011 - 2029) and supplementary planning document Environmentally Sustainable Development 2009.