

1. REFUSAL REASON - Design

Whilst the principle of a flatted redevelopment scheme is accepted, the proposed development of this prominent corner site is considered to respond poorly and fails to integrate with its local surroundings by reason of its design, including flat roofed form, its relationship with the existing pattern of development along Bitterne Road West and the excessive site coverage (building and hard-standing) with a limited setting to the building. Furthermore:-

(a) The proposed building footprint and associated hard-standing results in an excessive site coverage that fails to respond to the spatial characteristics of the pattern and proportions of buildings along the Bitterne Road West frontage.

(b) The need to incorporate a flat roof form, due to the proposed proportions of the building ,including it's excessive depth , results in the design which is out keeping and character with the traditional ridged roof form of buildings in the surrounding area.

(c) Poorly located refuse and cycle storage facility; and amenity space is proposed in relation to the entrance to the residential units, whereby residents have to enter the public highway between the store/amenity space and the entrance to the flats. The poor functionality and accessibility of the arrangement is symptomatic of an overdevelopment.

In combination, these design issues result in a building that fails to respect the character of the area or the needs of its users and, as such, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to "saved" policies SDP1 (i) SDP7 (i) (iii) (iv) (v), SDP8 (i) (ii) and SDP9 (i) (iv) (v) of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) and Policy CS13 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010) as supported by the relevant sections of the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (2006).

2. REFUSAL REASON - Residential Environment

The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed residential accommodation provides an attractive and acceptable living environment for prospective residents, in particular:

(a) The proposal fails to provide adequate external space which is fit for its intended purpose to serve the on-site amenity space needs of prospective residents, including external seating and areas for drying clothes, as required by adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2006) Policy SDP1 (i) and SDP7 (v) as supported by paragraph 2.3.14 and section 4.4 of the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (2006);

(b) Failure to provide details concerning the impact of poor air quality and noise generated within close proximity to the site; and an investigation of potential mitigation measures results in a development which fails to prove that the environmental conditions for residents shall be acceptable. As such the development would be contrary to policies SDP1 (i), SP15 (ii), SDP16 (ii) and H2 (iv) of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006)

(c) Poorly located refuse and cycle storage facilities and amenity space are proposed in relation to the entrance to the residential units, whereby residents have to enter the public highway between the cycle store and the entrance to the flats. Access to the amenity space is achieved via a gated

entrance which is within the immediate proximity of a habitable room window of one of the ground floor flats. Accordingly the scheme does not comply with the Council's adopted Policy SDP1 (i) of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan (March 2006) as supported by the relevant sections of the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (2006).

(d) Lack of defensible space in front of habitable room windows and proposed entrances to the flats would unacceptably affect the amenity and sense of safety and security of the occupants of the proposed residential units, as a consequence the development would poorly integrate into the local community. Accordingly the scheme does not comply with the Council's adopted Policy SDP1 (i), SDP8 (ii) and SDP10 (iii) of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan (March 2006) as supported by the relevant sections of the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (2006).

3. REFUSAL REASON - Highway Safety

The proposed development by reason of its footprint and access arrangement, which includes door, window and gated openings which would overhang the public footpath which borders the site would give rise to highway safety concerns owing to the obstruction of the public highway. Accordingly the scheme fails to comply with "saved" policies SDP1 (i) and SDP7 (i), (iii) and (v) of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) as supported by the relevant sections of the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (2006).

4. REFUSAL REASON - Code for Sustainable Homes and Climate Change

In the absence of any commitment to the Code for Sustainable Homes, an improvement of energy and water efficiency, sustainable urban drainage and a low carbon development the application has failed to demonstrate that it can satisfy the requirements of the adopted LDF Core Strategy Policy CS20 as supported by Part 7 of the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (2006) which seek to contribute towards tackling climate change as required by the Council's Climate Change Strategy (2004) and PPS1.

5. REFUSAL REASON - Section 106

In the absence of a completed S.106 Legal Agreement the proposals fail to mitigate against their direct impact and do not, therefore, satisfy the provisions of Policy CS25 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010) as supported by the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended) in the following ways:-

A) Measures towards the relevant elements of public open space required by the development in accordance with Policies CS21 and CS25 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005) in relation of amenity open space, play space and playing field. .

B) Measures to support site specific transport contributions for highway improvements in the vicinity of the site in accordance with Policies CS18, CS19 & CS25 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document - Adopted Version (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended)

C) Measures to support strategic transport projects for transportation improvements in the wider area in accordance with Policies CS18 & CS25 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document - Adopted Version (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended);

D) The provision of affordable housing in accordance with Policies CS15, CS16 & CS25 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document - Adopted Version (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended);
(E) In the absence of a Highway Condition survey the application fails to demonstrate how the development will mitigate against its impacts during the construction phase;