REF. NO. F/11/69416

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Erection of 3 bedroom detached dwelling with parking, cycle & refuse store Land to the front of Astons 131A Satchell Lane Hamble-Le-Rice Southampton SO31 4HP

SITE VISIT DATE November 2011

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Proposed dwelling will sit on land to the front of No131a Satchell Lane, utilising the existing access for 131a,131B & 131. The proposal includes parking provision to the front, which requires minor engineering works to accommodate the change in levels, and amenity space to the rear.
SITE AREA	0.030ha
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	
TOPOGRAPHY	The application site sits on higher ground than the existing driveway, with a height difference of up to 700mm. The site itself also comprises a change in levels with the rear section being higher than the remaining site.
TREES	None to be affected.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Mature hedging along front boundary, low level hedging along southern boundary shared with No129 and hedging/vegetation along the rear (west boundary) which separates the application site from the plot of No131a. Open along the eastern boundary.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Small parcel of land currently forming part of the front garden of No131a Satchell Lane, although is visually and phsycially separate. Site occupies a prominent position on the frontage, immediately adjacent to the driveway shared by Nos 131, 131a & 131b and has various level changes.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential – group of three dwellings sharing an access driveway. One has been built fairly recently (No131b) on the frontage of No131.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/27762/001/00	erection of dwelling and 2 garages	Permit outline 1984
F/06/58756	Construction of 1no. 4 bed detached	Permitted 2007

REF. NO. F/11/69416

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	dwelling with detached garage	

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
Mr Brook 'Easterly' 129 Satchell Lane	• Objection on grounds of light impact, highway safety, design, siting, • Details of side facing windows submitted
131 & 131b Satchell Lane (via agent)	• Objection on grounds of site area, design, access, parking, drainage, loss of privacy, lighting, noise, landscaping, bin storage and light impact. • Principle acceptable but proposal must relate to existing context

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Hamble Parish Council	**The Council OBJECT with the following reasons.** (1) The proposed development, by reason of its design, massing and siting, would introduce an unwelcome and incongruous feature to the detriment of the surounding dwellings. As such the development is contrary to Policy 59.BE(i) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011. (2) The proposed development would result in an excessive building bulk, adversely affecting the outlook from, privacy and light available to the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties. As such the development is contrary to Policy 59.BE(vii) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011. 3) The proposed development would result in an inappropriate use of the land for the locality. As such the development is contrary to Policy 59.BE(vii) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011. 4) The proposed development would result in an excess of noise, fumes and dust. As such the development is contrary to Policy 59.BE(vii) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011.

REF. NO. F/11/69416

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Southern Water	Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent: "A formal application for any new connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, please contact *Atkins Ltd, Anglo St James House, 39A Southgate Street, Winchester, SO23 9EH (Tel 01962 858688), or www.southernwater.co.uk".* The Council's Building Control officers/technical staff or Environment Agency should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development.
Environmental Health	I have reviewed the information provided and note that the application site is: • Located on a formerly excavated site, as shown on historical Ordnance Survey mapping. We recommend that the applicant is advised that: The application site lies on a formerly excavated site. The presence of 'made ground' and / or contaminants in the ground cannot be ruled out and therefore we would recommend that the risks to the development be considered; including the design of the floor construction and the number / location of service penetrations. The applicant should also be advised to contact Environmental Health to discuss the above. In addition, we would recommend that this is brought to the attention of the Building Control officer. Should any information come to light during the demolition or construction works that indicates the presence, or the possible presence of, 'made ground' or of contaminated soils, then this should be brought to the attention of the Environmental Health Service. Any excavated material is to be disposed in the appropriate manner and not to be reused on site, unless proven to be 'free' from chemical contamination. We recommend that the following conditions are imposed for amenity protection reasons. **NS05 HOURS OF WORK** No construction or demolition work must take place except between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays or 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. **NS21 DUST** Developments shall not begin until a scheme of works to deal with dust from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall then be implemented and retained to the satisfaction of the local Planning Authority **NS18 NO BURNING** The burning of materials obtained by site clearance or from any other source must not take place without the prior written consent of the local Planning Authority.
GPSS	Our client's apparatus, the Government Pipelines and Storage System, is not located within the vicinity of the above and we therefore have no further comments to make.

REF. NO. F/11/69416

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Planning Policy & Design	**Policy Officer:** **Comments:** The site lies within the urban edge where residential development is acceptable subject to other policies of the local plan. The most relevant policy is 59.BE. The Design Officer's comments below relate to that policy. There are some detailed concerns that need to be addressed through modification of the design, and for this reason a holding objection is raised pending resolution of these concerns. **Design Officer:** Tim J S Dyer **Comments:** 12.09.11. 1. This is a tight site formed from the front garden of no 131a. Satchell Lane. A similar exercise has been carried out in front of no.131 to create 131b but the site is longer going back closer to the original house. That approach would benefit this site which could be achieved by rebuilding the detached double garage closer to the house of 131a. 2. Although every effort has been made in the design to minimise the overall height, the starting point is some 600mm above the drive level which helps to give a more crowded enclosed feeling. 3. The rendered exterior walls will fit in well with the three other houses in this enclave and with a form of slate in lieu of tiles on the roof will provide variation which together with the dark grey plinth and windows will give a crisp looking building. 4. The design is what one might call 'modern traditional' some traditional elements with a modern twist but there is no indication of what material the dormers are finished in. The rear elevation looks directly to the front of no. 131a. but the view is somewhat interupted by the garage roof and I can see no indication of the boundary treatment. The ground floor rear windows are taller than usual because the floor level to that space is lower than the entrance/kitchen level by approximately 300mm giving an appearance of vehicle doors rather than sitting room ones. 5. The house numbered 129, to the south of the site will suffer the most by the construction of this dwelling as it has a clear uninterupted view across the front garden of no 131a at present. This proposal has at least been set as far away from that boundary as reasonably possible but will still be a considerable change to the side windows of no.129.
Engineers	**Transport Policy Officer:** **TPol Comments:** No objection. Whilst visibility is poor at this location, and an additional dwelling would increase vehicle movement and also risk of accident, the application is for a single dwelling and so additional risk should be minimal. It would appear achievable that vehicles can access and egress site in a forward gear due to the shared driveway, and this should reduce these risks further. In regard to developer contributions, as a new three-bed dwelling, a contribution of £3,745 is required. **DC Engineer:** Eric Reed **DC Engineer Comments:** Condition GN15

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) 59.BE, 147.OS, 101.T, 104.T, 191.IN.
Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations

REF. NO. F/11/69416

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

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, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Comments noted – the issues raised regarding design, residential amenity & highway safety will be discussed below.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Comments noted – the issues raised by third parties are material considerations and will be discussed below.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of Circular 05/05 saved policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and SPD: Planning Obligations, developer 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. There is no agreement in place to secure these contributions.

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 fall within the urban edge where residential development is acceptable subject to other policies within the Local Plan. The most relevant policy in this case is 59.BE which 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.

Also of relevance is the National Planning Policy Framework which states that, “good design is a

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people" (section 7, para.56). It also 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…" (section 7, para.64).

Design and layout

A new property has already been approved and built on the land to the front of 131 Satchell Lane and is now known as No131b. That plot of land is materially different to the area to the front of No131a in that it is a different shape and is able to maintain the existing ground levels. It is also able to accommodate the property closer to the northern boundary due to the pattern of development and relationship to adjacent dwellings.

Whilst the principle of building a new dwelling is both acceptable with a recent precedent set in very close proximity, the design and layout both give rise to significant concerns.

The application site has some significant constraints; the land is raised approximately 0.6m higher than the access drive and the plot accommodating No131b, as well as the land to the rear, accommodating Nos131 & 131a, which slopes down further still. This will result in any new dwelling appearing as very prominent within the street scene, despite attempts at minimising the overall height, and particularly so when compared to the other three properties within the group.

The site itself is also fairly small and to accommodate a house of this scale results in development that would appear as very cramped and congested.

In terms of the design, the proposed dwelling is not considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the other properties, to the detriment of the street scene. The proposed materials; white render with artificial slate, could work nicely but the overall style of the property is not considered to be appropriate for the context of the site. The design is quite boxy, with the elevation fronting Satchell Lane appearing uninteresting with no defining features. The adjacent properties fronting Satchell Lane , whilst not particularly similar in style, do both have gable features and other detailing which provide interest and character.

The roof design is also considered to appear awkward. It is acknowledged that this design has largely been to minimise the height and bulk but this is not considered to be

Residential Amenity

The proposal is considered to result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in terms of having an overbearing visual impact and loss of outlook, loss of privacy and loss of light.

Privacy – There are three adjacent properties to the proposed dwelling. At ground floor level, No131b has two small sitting room windows facing the northern elevation of the property, which contains a large lounge window. Despite being on higher ground, and at a distance of only 11m, it is difficult to argue that the occupiers privacy will be adversely affected due to the size of the windows on No131b and the angle of the relationship. There are no other issues related to ground floor windows. At first floor level, the rooflights which directly overlook No131b appear to be at high level and if not, could be conditioned that way. It would therefore be unreasonable to assess this relationship as unacceptable. There are two dormer windows proposed on the rear elevation which will directly look onto No131a. The properties sit at some 25m apart, with 22m being the acceptable distance stated within the Council's Quality Places SPD. At this distance, there is not felt to be an unacceptable level of overlooking, even taking into account the changes in levels. There are no windows proposed on the south elevation and the privacy of No129 will therefore not be affected.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Overbearing impact/loss of outlook – Due to the resulting relationships between the proposed dwelling and Nos131, 131a & 131b, there is not considered to be any adverse impact on this regard. The open view to the front currently enjoyed by No131a will be affected, but case law dictates that loss of a private view does not constitute a material consideration. Due to the distance between these two properties, the proposal is not considered to materially harm the existing outlook. The property immediately to the south, No129 does have several windows which will directly face the new dwelling. At a distance of between 4-5m (the siting is not straight within the plot) the two storey property will severely affect the outlook from these windows. Although some are for non-habitable rooms such as the wc and utility room, the main kitchen window is on this elevation.

Loss of light – With regard to properties No131, No131a and No131b, the proposal accords with the light tests set out in the Council's SPD: Quality Places. The relationship between the proposed dwelling, however, and No129, does not accord and is likely to result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of the occupiers of this property. No129 has several windows on the north facing side elevation. Several of them are not habitable rooms, such as the wc, utlity room, landing etc. One window is the main window serving the kitchen/dining room and this room is likely to be significantly affected. The impact is considered significant to warrant a reason for refusal.

Sustainability

In accordance with the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development, there are essential requirements (ESD 1-7) that new residential dwellings need to achieve. Applications should be supported by a Sustainability Statement that details how each of the essential requirements will be achieved. A Sustainability Statement has been submitted with this application, and it appears to address, in principle, all the requirements. If the recommendation was to approve this application, any further details required could be secured by planning conditions. On this basis, there is no objection on sustainability grounds.

Highway impact

The Council's Engineers have raised no formal objection to the proposal. They comment that whilst visibility is poor at this location, and an additional dwelling would increase vehicle movement and also risk of accident, the application is for a single dwelling and so additional risk should be minimal. It would appear achievable that vehicles can access and egress site in a forward gear due to the shared driveway, and this should reduce these risks further. On balance, there is no objection on grounds of highway safety.

Trees

No trees will be adversely affected by the proposal.

Drainage

Much of the site is proposed to be hard surfaced. The parking area will be tarmac with acco drainage with paving slabs immediate surrounding the property, also utilising acco drainage. The agent has specified that further detailed information can be submitted to ensure the soakaways are effective and to the required standards. In the event of an approval, this information, along with details of appropriate materials, would have been secured by planning condition. On this basis, it is considered unreasonable for this issue to form a reason for refusing the scheme.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other/other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

Recommendation is to refuse for the reasons stated above.