

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/23/95242

Site Address: FLAT, 10 CORONATION PARADE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE,
SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 4JT

Case Officer: Rachael Morris

Description: Change of use of part of dwelling (Class C3) to beauty rooms (Class E).

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Eastleigh Town, District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades - Within the urban edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Z/16670/000/00 - Change of use to fish and chip shop – Permit – Dec 1975 - F/07/59475 - Construction of security shutters to front & side of existing building – Permit – May 2007		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	10 Coach Road, Hamble-le-Rice. Object. The flat could be used to house people not to beautify. There are people looking for flats.		
Parish Council:	No Comment		
Ecology:	No Comment		
Planning Policy:	No Comment		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 19/01/2024		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance
Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM11, DM14 and DM22.
Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:
The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11, DM14 and DM22 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that: <u>Principle</u> - The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable. - Policy DM22 states that within the ground floor of the core shopping zone, primary and secondary shopping frontages of Eastleigh town centre and the district centres and frontages of the local centres and neighbourhood parades, as defined on the policies map, a change of use or redevelopment involving the loss of a Class E use, community or leisure/cultural uses under Classes E and F; or sui generis uses including pubs, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways; must demonstrate that the new use retains an active ground floor frontage; it does not

adversely affect amenity of an area or the appearance of the frontage; and it does not have a negative impact on the provision of services or on the sustainability of a key shopping area. Changes of use or redevelopment to residential will not be permitted within the defined shopping frontages/centres other than in upper floors.

Change of use

- The proposed change of use from the existing residential unit to beauty rooms at the rear of ground floor and first floor would not result in any physical changes to the building, seen externally.
- The proposed change of use to beauty rooms would not be against policy DM22 that seeks to avoid residential at the ground floor and retain an active frontage. This proposal does not impact the frontage of the building as this is retained as a salon.
- A restrictive condition is to be imposed to limit the use within Class E which offers a broad spectrum of uses. The condition will include the use under Class E except for those falling within E(g)(i) (Offices to carry out any operational or administrative functions), E(g)(ii) (Research and development of products or processes) and E(g)(iii) (Industrial processes). This will help to provide sufficient flexibility for future changes of use in accordance with the intentions of Policy DM22 but also protect the vitality and viability and wider amenity of the neighbourhood parade.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site, would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards.
- The design and layout respect the character and appearance of the locality.

Other material considerations

- The development accords with guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that there will be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.
- There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention.
- There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications

Conclusion:		
Recommendation:	PERMIT ☒	REFUSE ☐
Comments ...		