

## **Relevant Planning History**

### **1 Beechmount Road**

00/01323/FUL

Conditionally approved 3.02.2001

Construction of a two storey side extension, conversion of roof space with dormer windows, erection of a conservatory to rear and car port to west elevation. (Constructed).

08/01081/FUL

Refused 18/09/2008 and  
dismissed at Appeal  
(Public Inquiry) 13/05/2009

Re-development of the site by the erection of a four-storey block of 8 x 3 bed flats with associated bin, cycle stores and car parking

Refused for the following reasons:-

#### **01. Poor design**

The development by reason of its four-storey massing, its use of materials and the positioning on the site represents an incongruous addition to the south side of Beechmount Road and exhibits the following poor design features:-

(a) A large amount of the site is given over to vehicular access and movement, which is at variance with placing the needs, safety and comfort of pedestrians first in a new high quality residential environment.

(b) Poor separation distances between habitable room windows in the development and habitable rooms in 134 & 136 Bassett Avenue and Beechmount House, Beechmount Road.

(c) Poorly located cycle storage facilities, with insufficient detail of the quality of the facility in terms of its security and lighting.

(d) Poorly located refuse storage exhibiting excessive carry distances both for refuse operatives and those residing in the development.

(e) Notwithstanding the assessment by Barrell Tree Consultancy, would result in later pressure by occupiers to thin the adjoining tree cover, thereby reducing the amenity of trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

(f) Exhibits a level of car parking in excess of the City Council's maximum car parking standards.

As such the proposed development is considered to be harmful to the character of the area and unlikely to promote sustainable forms of travel contrary to Policies SDP 1 (i)/(ii - particularly the guidance of the following paragraphs of the Residential Design Guide [September 2006]:- 2.1.6, 2.2.1, 2.2.3-2.2.4, 2.2.18-2.2.19, 3.2.2, 3.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.6.8, 3.7.7, 3.7.8, 3.9.5, 3.10.3, 3.10.4, 3.10.6-3.10.7, 3.10.14, 3.10.18, 3.10.24 - 3.10.25, 3.13.1-3.13.2, 3.13.4, 4.4.1-4.1.2, 4.7.2, 5.5.1-5.1.3, 5.1.7-5.1.11, 5.2.2, 5.2.12-5.2.13, 5.3.4, 9.2.4-9.3.3), SDP4, SPD5 (i), SDP7 (i)/ (ii)/(iv)/(v), SDP8 (i), SDP9 (i)/(iii)/(iv)/(v), SDP10 (ii)/(iv), SDP12 (iii), NE6 (as supported by the character appraisal part of the Bassett Avenue Development Control Brief [1982]), H2 (i)/(iii) and H7 (i)/(ii)/(iii) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006).

#### **02. Resource conservation**

The design statement does not address policy SDP13 Resource Conservation in sufficient detail. It is stated that "no special measures relating for instance to alternative energy or

water harvesting are proposed due to the relatively small size of the scheme." Policy SDP13 Resource Conservation applies to all developments. It is also stated that the building will be "constructed to a standard that complies with or exceeds Part L of the Building Regulations... therefore complies with Policy SDP13." Complying with statutory Building Regulations does not demonstrate that resource conservation has been maximised. As such the proposed development is considered to be contrary to Policy SDP13 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) and Part 7 of the Residential Design Guide (September 2006).

### 03. Lack of bat survey

A bat survey has not been undertaken. The applicant should demonstrate that demolition of existing buildings on the site would not displace or harm bats potentially roosting on the application site. As such, the applicant is potentially placing at risk a protected species contrary to Policy SDP12 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) and paragraphs 4.81-4.82 of the Residential Design Guide (September 2006).

### 04. Fails to secure S.106 measures

In the absence of a completed S.106 legal agreement to mitigate against the scheme's direct impacts the proposal fails to satisfy the provisions of Policy IMP1 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Planning Obligations (August 2005 - as amended) in the following areas:

- a) measures to support sustainable modes of transport such as necessary improvements to public transport facilities and footways within the vicinity of the site;
- b) measures to support strategic transport initiatives;
- c) the provision of public open space and children's play space to serve the needs of the development as required by Policies CLT5 and CLT6 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006); and,
- d) a highways condition survey to make good any possible damage to the public highway in the course of construction.

## **1 Beechmount Road and 134 Bassett Avenue**

09/01313/FUL

Refused 22.02.2010 and  
dismissed at Appeal  
(Public Inquiry) 04.08.2010

Re-development of the site. Erection of three-storey and four-storey buildings to provide 14 x three-bedroom flats with associated access and parking, following demolition of the existing buildings

Refused for the following reasons:-

### 01. Harm to the character of the area

The proposed development is considered to be harmful to the spatial characteristics of the area, symptomatic by reason of the scale, height and massing of the proposed residential blocks, the distance between blocks (relative to their height) and roof terraces, which would adversely affect the privacy of their neighbours. If such proposals were allowed to

proceed, this would be likely to place further pressure to re-develop housing immediately adjoining to the south, thus further eroding the strong visual character of this part of the street. As such, the proposals are considered to be contrary to the following Policies of the Development Plan for Southampton and supporting paragraphs of supplementary planning guidance:-

The South East Plan: Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East of England (May 2009)

SP3 (iii), CC6 and BE1 (v).

City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2006)

SDP1 (i)/(ii), SDP7 (ii)/(iv)/(v), SDP9 (i)/(v), H2 (i)/(iii) and H7 (i)/(iii).

City of Southampton Core Strategy (January 2010)

CS13 (Points 1 and 11).

Residential Design Guide (September 2006)

2.2.1-2.2.2, 2.2.18, 3.2.4-3.2.5, 3.7.7-3.7.8, 3.9.5 and 4.1.1-4.1.2

## 02. REFUSAL REASON - Failure to enter into a Section 106 Agreement

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 the following Policies of the Development Plan for the City of Southampton:- Policies CC7, H3 and SH6 of The South East Plan: Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East of England (May 2009) and Policy CS25 of the City of Southampton Core Strategy (January 2010) as supported by the principles set out in DCLG Circular 05/2005 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Planning Obligations (August 2005, as amended and undergoing review) in the following ways:-

A) Financial contributions towards site specific transport contributions for highway improvements in the vicinity of the site in accordance with policies CS18, CS19 & CS25 of the City of Southampton Core Strategy (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended), including an investigation as to whether a Traffic Regulation Order is warranted barring right turn movements into Bassett Avenue from Beechmount Road;

B) A financial contribution towards strategic transport projects for highway network improvements in the wider area in accordance with policies CS18 & CS25 of the City of Southampton Core Strategy (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended);

C) Financial contributions towards the relevant elements of public open space required by the development in accordance with policies CS21 & CS25 of the City of Southampton Core Strategy (January 2010) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended) with regard to:-

- Amenity Open Space ("open space")
- Play Space
- Playing field;



## 01. REFUSAL REASON - Design

The additional fourth storey element, by reason of its height, scale and resulting bulk, would adversely erode the existing building's architectural qualities, which satisfactorily achieve an articulation with increased height and scale towards the junction of Beechmount Road and Bassett Avenue. These positive design aspects were accepted in Appeal reference APP/D17880/A/05/1194944 (18 April 2007) and also remarked upon in a later Appeal decision in respect of 1 Beechmount Road (APP/D17880/A/08/2088525 [13 May 2009]). Proposals for a wholly 4 storey block were also previously dismissed under Appeal reference APP/D17880/A/05/1196597 (18 April 2007). The additional bulk proposed is considered to be harmful to the existing design and the wider street scene in Beechmount Road and has, therefore, been assessed as being out of keeping with the existing pattern of development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies SDP1 (ii - particularly the guidance of paragraphs 3.7.9-3.7.10 and 3.9.5, of the Residential Design Guide [September 2006]), SDP7 (iii)/(iv)/(v), SDP9 (i) and H7 (i)/(iii) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2006).