MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/17/80322

DESCRIPTION ADDRESS	Change of use of ground floor retail unit (A1) to beauty salon (sui generis) (retrospective application) 9 Pirelli Way, Eastleigh, SO50 5GE

SITE VISIT	Yes
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	The plans are sufficient to determine the application
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above
SITE AREA	65m2
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Opens directly onto the pavement
SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is on the ground floor of a three storey mid terraced building. The property is in the middle of a small collection of commercial properties, including beauty salon, shops and a mortgage broker. The upper floors are in a residential use and were originally designed as live work units. There is a small amount of car parking in front of the shops.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/04711/124	FIRST PHASE OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR 214 DWELLINGS AND 6,937 SQUARE METRES OF OFFICES (B1 USE) TOGETHER WITH ANCILLARY PARKING AND ROADS WITHIN MASTER PLAN	Permit June 2002

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
None	

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Not within designated local shopping area

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

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011): 59.BE

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014: DM1 (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'

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not Within Eastleigh Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

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 AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

None

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."

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The beauty salon has been operating since 2009 and is a use that attracts customers and actively contributes to the character and appearance of the small collection of commercial premises. The beauty salon also shares many of the attributes of a retail unit, having an active shop front and operating during shopping hours. Furthermore, the use should not generate any more noise, disturbance or vehicle movements than other A1 retail uses. The site is not located within a designated shopping area and therefore the retail use of the unit is not protected by planning policies.

The building was originally designed to be part of a live work unit and permitted under Z/04711/124. However, having reviewed the planning history (and most recent permitted development enquiries) it appears that the live work unit was not restricted by a condition of the original approval and so it is not appropriate to add this condition to the current proposal.

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

The recommendation is to permit