

## Appendix 3

- Application 14/00048/OUT

### Relevant Planning History

**1298/P11** - Erection of 12 flats with 12 garages to the rear of the building – Conditionally approved.

**1357/23R1** - Erection of 12 flats with 12 garages to the rear of the building used – REFUSED

**1363/36** - Erection of 6 garages to the rear of the building – Conditionally approved.

**1357/23R2** - Erection of 6 garages to the rear of the building (resubmission of 1357/23R1) – Conditionally approved.

**1396/46** - Erection of 5 garages and 1 double garage to the rear of the building – Conditionally approved.

**12/00279/OUT** - Demolition Of Existing 30 Garages And Erection Of 4 X 2-Storey Dwellings (2 X Two-Bed, 1 X Three-Bed And 1 X Four-Bed) (Outline Application Seeking Approval For Access, Appearance, Layout And Scale) (Affects A Public Right Of Way).

Refusal Reason, Over-development of the site.  
Refusal Reason, Insufficient Information – Trees.

**12/01289/OUT** - Demolition of existing 30 garages and erection of 4 x 2-storey dwellings (2 x two bed and 2 x three bed) with associated parking and cycle/refuse storage (outline application seeking approval for access, appearance, layout and scale) (affects public right of way). Refused. 13.05.2013

Refusal Reason, Over-development of the site.

The proposed development by reason of its quantum of development, layout and orientation of the site represents an inappropriate form of development which would:

- (i) Result in an excess of 50% hard-standing on the site.
- (ii) The close proximity of the rear elevation and habitable room windows serving dwellings 1 and 2 to the eastern boundary of the site results in an unreasonable relationship, due to overlooking potential, which would prejudice the future development of the land currently used of the vehicular parking associated with the nearby social club.
- (iii) Result in poor natural surveillance of the vehicular access from within dwellings 1 and 2.
- (iv) Poor privacy will be experienced by the occupants of dwelling when using their kitchen which does not include defensible space in-front of it.
- (v) Result in insufficient and uncharacteristic private gardens (not achieving suitable rear depth) allocated to dwellings 1 and 2.

Taken together, these factors are considered to be symptomatic of a cramped and overdeveloped site which is out of character with the existing pattern of development in the neighbourhood. As such, the development would prove contrary to the provisions of saved policies SDP1(i), and the guidance as set out in the Council's approved Residential

Design Guide SPD (September 2006) (namely, sections 2.3.14, 3.2.2, 3.8.8, 3.9.2, 3.10.22, 3.10.23, 4.4.1, 4.4.3, 4.4.4 ).

### Reason For Refusal, Insufficient Information - Trees

The applicant has failed to complete question 15 correctly as there are nearby trees on land adjacent to the site which could influence the development. Owing to the proximity of the development, in particular dwelling 4, to the protected tree adjacent to the site, which is covered by tree preservation order: Elizabeth Court, Aberdeen Road, Order (No 561) 2012; the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development would not result in pressure to prune or remove this tree. Due to the position of the development the tree are likely to cause excessive shading, continual nuisance from falling debris and anxiety to residents concerned by the potential of falling branches and the tree itself falling during storm events. The applicant has also failed to provide adequate supporting information (arboriculture report) to enable the Local Planning Authority to be satisfied that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the protected tree which makes an important contribution to the visual amenity and character of the area. Accordingly the proposal, is not therefore, in accordance with the provisions of policies SDP1 (i) and SDP12 (i) (ii) and (iii) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) and Policies CS13 and CS22 of the adopted LDF Core Strategy (January 2010).

The above decision was appealed and subsequently dismissed. It is noted that the Inspector broadly agreed with the Council on both reasons for refusal listed above.

**14/00048/OUT** - Redevelopment of the site. Erection of 2 x detached 3 bedroom dwellings with associated parking, refuse and cycle storage following the demolition of existing garages [Outline application seeking approval for Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale] – Conditionally approved, 14/04/2014.