

# Planning, Design & Access Statement

***'White Oaks', Providence Hill,  
Bursledon, Eastleigh, SO31 8AT.***

***Proposed erection of a detached garage with a home office  
(Resubmission of application H/24/97077).***



Prepared by  
Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd  
on behalf of Mr D. House.

## 1. Introduction

This statement supports the householder planning application for erection of a detached garage with a home office at 'White Oaks' on Providence Hill, as a resubmission of refused application H/24/97077.

This statement explains the nature and extent of the proposal and how it responds to the local environment, in its built and socio-economic contexts. It has regard to key national and local planning policies relating to new domestic buildings and design and should be read in conjunction with the other supporting documents.



*The approach to the site from the northwest, on Providence Hill.*

## 2. Context



*The approach to the site from the southeast, on Providence Hill.*

This rectangular site lies on the southwest side of Providence Hill in Bursledon, within Eastleigh Borough Council's administrative area.

Regardless of whether one approaches the site from the southeast or northwest along Providence Hill, public views of the site are blocked by the frontage vegetation that faces northeast towards the road. Impressions of the site from the northeast on Providence Hill are constrained by a high frontage wall/gate combination and a tall tree on the highway verge, outside the northeast boundary. Tall vegetation beside the northwest boundary

provides a sylvan backdrop to views from the southeast. The site is contained on its southeast and northwest boundaries by timber fences between 1.8 and 2 metres in height.



*The site viewed from the northeast, on Providence Hill.*

Vehicular and pedestrian access to the site is afforded via a gated driveway near its east corner. Clear views to the southeast and northwest along Providence Hill ensure that vehicles entering and leaving the site enjoy good visibility and are themselves seen clearly by approaching drivers, riders and pedestrians.

A dropped kerb and a substantial surfaced forecourt afford access and parking for several vehicles at the front of the property and a vehicle within the integral garage.

In his 'Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth' of March 2011, Decentralisation Minister Greg Clark confirmed that the *'Government's clear expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes' except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy'*. Paragraph 11 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' 2023 ('NPPF') reiterated that principle, by generating a presumption in favour of sustainable development and the approval without delay of proposals that accord with the development plan.

Paragraph 119 of the NPPF ('Making effective use of land') states that *'Planning...decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for...other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.'* Paragraph 130 ('Achieving well-designed places') provides for the grant of planning permission for development of good design

Section 38 of the 'Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004' requires an application to be determined in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; an element of flexibility is provided which enables decisions to be made which may disagree with the development plan. The Borough Council's 'Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document' (2008) identifies the site within the southeast sector of 'Character Area: BHH 15'.

The development plan for Bursledon comprises the 'Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036)' (2022) and Supplementary Planning Documents. The policies map of the development plan shows this site within the urban edge with no special designations; it does *not* fall within a Flood Zone. Policy DM1 of the Local Plan re. 'General criteria for new development' calls for new development to satisfy eleven criteria. Strategic Policy S1 ('Delivering sustainable development') states that: *'1. To be sustainable, new development in the Borough should...7. seek opportunities to optimise density of new development...When considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework... It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.'*; and *'Planning applications that accord with the policies in the Local Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'* Strategic Policy S2 ('Approach to new development') states that *'2. The urban edge....defines the main built-up areas within which there is a presumption in favour of new development, subject to the policies of this plan.'* Those requirements are satisfied by this proposal.

Eastleigh Borough Council's 'Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document' (2011) recorded its acknowledgement that *'The provision of in-curtilage parking in garages provides the most secure form of private car accommodation.'* Further, the 'Quality Places' SPD states that: *'Garages should normally be set behind main building curtilage...The position of external garages should take account of local context...Garages built in the front of sites will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances...garages should be sympathetically related to the main dwelling, whether they are adjoined or free-standing. Pitched roofs...are normally preferable...as they are more likely to complement the existing house and locality... In normal circumstances, garages should be in line with or be behind the front of the house.'* (emphasis added). By implication, it is acknowledged that there can be exceptions to the Borough Council's preferred 'normal' practice.

Regarding 'Character Area: BHH 15', the Borough Council's 'Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document' (2008) recorded its 'Guidance' to: '*Retain the grass verges and the semi-mature/mature broadleaved tree planting along the eastern edge of Providence Hill...Maintain the importance of the views east to Providence Hill... Maintain the predominant deep building setbacks in order to retain/reinforce the existing levels of on-plot planting.*'. The provision of a modest frontage outbuilding and native landscaping in place of the present hard surface, would evidently achieve a marked environmental enhancement.

The locality is characterised by family dwellings in a wide variety of dwelling styles, formats and plot sizes (see aerial photograph on cover page) and, notably, includes several properties that stand close to Providence Hill eg. the two pairs of semi-detached houses of nos.3/4 'Laurel Villas' and 'Belmont'/'Glenelg' (to the southeast of the application site), which stand **3.3 metres** to the southwest of Providence Hill; and 'Claremont'/'Avondale', that stand **0.5 metres** to the southwest).

'White Oaks' is a detached that is finished in light render and dark tile-hanging beneath a hipped roof of red concrete interlocking tiles. Planning permission (H/24/97077) was refused by Eastleigh Borough Council in April 2024 for the erection of a detached garage (with a home office) on its frontage, with a high (ie **4.99 metres**) hipped-roof, close to the northeast and northwest boundaries of the site. The Borough Council's decision notice recorded these three reasons for withholding consent:

*'1 The proposed development due to its siting would create an incongruous feature at odds with the appearance of the house and neighbouring properties, and detrimental to the character and pattern of development within the locality. As such the proposed development is contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 and the Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document and Character Area Appraisals (BHH15) Supplementary Planning Document.*

*2 Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate sufficient surface water drainage can be achieved on site and as such is contrary to Policy DM6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036.*

*3 Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate a Biodiversity Net Gain and as such is contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036.'*

It is submitted that this reduced proposal would address Reason for Refusal 1 of the earlier decision. Provision of surface water and biodiversity measures would address Reasons for Refusal 2 and 3.

It is submitted that the erection of a detached garage on this under-used urban site would accord with the character of its surroundings and not compromise *any* key sustainable development principles of national or local planning policy.

### **3. Consultation**

The reasons given by Eastleigh Borough Council for its refusal of the earlier planning application have been given careful and detailed attention in the formulation of this proposal, so further consultations have not been considered necessary.

#### **4. Amount, Layout, Scale & Appearance**

In light of the character of the area and the favourable presumption set down in the development plan, it is proposed that a detached garage (with a home office) be erected near the north corner of the site, set away from the northeast and northwest boundaries.

The proposed garage is so sited as to reiterate the general front building-line of properties to the southeast of the application site. Although the site is largely screened from Providence Hill, it is proposed that native trees and hedges be planted along the inside of the northeast and northwest boundaries, to further soften the appearance of the development.

In this configuration and finished in dark brick with a low (**3.6 metres** in height – ie < 4.99 metres) hipped roof of red concrete interlocking tiles, the proposed garage would make more efficient use of this site in a manner that accords with the character of its surroundings and would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbours.

#### **5. Trees & Ecology**

No trees or protected species would be harmed by this proposal. It is however proposed that provision be afforded for a bat box on the northeast elevation of the garage, together with a bird box on the southwest elevation.

#### **6. Access**

The site would continue to be served by the existing access arrangement.

#### **7. Noise**

There would be no significant loss of amenity caused by noise.

#### **8. Site Waste Management**

Timber will be salvaged and inert waste material would be disposed of to a licensed Hampshire County Council site. Any other waste will be segregated into skips and removed by licensed collectors.

#### **9. Working Practice**

To protect the amenities of neighbours, the operation of construction machinery on the site will be restricted to 8.00am-6.00pm Monday-Friday, 8.30am-1.00pm on Saturday, with no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays. All materials and plant would be kept within the curtilage of the application site and any trees are to have protective fencing around.

#### **10. Crime & Anti-social behaviour**

No special measures are considered necessary for the prevention of crime or anti-social behaviour.

#### **11. Conclusion**

It is submitted that the requirements of the development plan are *satisfied* by this proposal since it: would not detract from the existing street-scene; would be in keeping with the character of its surroundings; is of a high standard of design; incorporates materials and

design elements sympathetic to local character; provides safe access for vehicular traffic; provides satisfactory cycle and car parking; respects privacy, outlook and sunlight; and takes into account the prospect of criminal activity and anti-social behaviour.

Development of this site in the manner proposed would achieve more efficient use of this urban land without harm to the character or appearance of the locality or the amenities of neighbours. It is contended that this proposal comprises an acceptable form of development that accords with the development plan and no other material considerations suggest otherwise.

**Niall Tutton BSc (Hons), MA**

*Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd*

3 October 2024