

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/22/93024

Site Address: 63 MISSENDEN ACRES, HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2RD

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Single storey side extension, conversion of garage to garden room and loft conversion

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Nature Conservation – SSSI Impact Zone & HRA Screening Criteria Aviation Safeguarding Tree Preservation Order(s) Southern Water Sewers 2m Buffer Environment Agency Surface Water Flooding – 1000 year extent Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area Appraisals		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Reference	Description	Decision
Z/28343/000/00	Residential open space, roads and footpaths with community centre and school (amended proposals)	Grant Outline Permission – April 1987
Z/29622/000/00	Erection of 41 detached houses and garages with access roads (outline permission ref.no. 28343)	Approve The Reserved Matters – October 1987
F/05/53561	Two storey side extension to provide annexe accommodation	Permit 12/05/2005

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	1no. objection – 61 Missenden Acres (Summarised): - Noise concerns regarding the proposed garden room - Proposed movement of boundary fence is out of context with the rest of Missenden Acres - Open plan gardens was a condition of the original planning permission Z/28343/000/00 - Adjoining neighbour on the garage and shared boundary line and not in agreement for the works sets out under The Party Wall Act 1996 - Loss of line of sight and reduced visibility due to movement of fence and exiting the driveway. - Loss of light - Overbearing - Removal of parking space - Overdevelopment - Design in not in keeping with the scale, character or appearance of the area LPA Response: With regards to placement of the fence on the shared boundary line, this would be a civil matter and the applicant will be advised of the Party Wall Act 1996. The other points raised are responded to in the report below.		
Hedge End Town Council:	No Objection		
Ecology:	I have no ecological objections to this proposal. Biodiversity enhancement will be required. The addition of swift nest boxes or bat boxes on one of the gable ends of the house would be the most		

	appropriate. If this is not possible then adding plants for pollinators into a garden bed in the rear garden would also be acceptable. Please could you add the following informative to the decision letter: In the unlikely event of any bats being found during demolition or construction, all work must stop immediately, and Natural England must be informed. Additional information is available on the Bat Conservation Trust website at https://www.bats.org.uk/advice/im-working-on-a-building-with-bats/ive-found-a-bat-during-works.
Southern Water Services:	It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.
Trees:	There are no trees in the proximity of the proposal. A TPO does exist on the land, but it would appear the subject oak tree was historically removed and no records of its removal can be found on our system. We raise no arboricultural objection to the proposal.
Hampshire Highways:	In regard to the application, having reviewed plans it is noted that there remains the required 3 vehicle parking spaces available on site, and works do not reduce visibility splays any further than the existing 6 foot fence when exiting the local cul-de-sac area within which No. 63 is located.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 30/06/2022		

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, DM2, DM11 and DM14. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:
<u>Site and Proposal</u> The application site is located to the eastern side of Missenden Acres, sited on a corner plot, on the entrance of a cul-de-sac. The surrounding area is a residential 1990s estate with similar style properties, some of which have been altered/extended. No. 63 Missenden Acres is a detached two-storey dwelling with a small area of driveway/hardstanding to the front (south), hardstanding to the side (west) and a garden to the rear of the property. The garden is enclosed by 1.8m close timber board fencing. There is a single detached garage sited behind fence line, within the residential curtilage of the property, to the north-east. It is set back from the highway, served by an additional driveway. The application proposes a pitched roof single storey side extension, a loft and garage conversion and the re-positioning of the garden fence to enclose the garage and driveway.

The side extension would allow for the internal reconfiguration of the ground floor; an internal wall would be removed allowing for a large open plan kitchen/diner with the side extension serving as a utility room with a door facing the rear garden. The existing utility room would become an office/study. The extension proposes materials to match the host dwelling.

The loft conversion would not result in the roof changing in height or form. The conversion would allow for an additional bedroom with an ensuite. There would be 6no. rooflights inserted into the roof space (3no. to the front elevation and 3no. to the rear).

The garage conversion proposes a garden room which would be ancillary to the host dwelling. The existing garage door would be replaced with a set of patio doors and 2no. small windows on the north-west elevation, facing the driveway. The garage and driveway would be enclosed with 1.8m close board fencing and vehicular access gates of the same height as a means of access.

Principle

The development is within the urban edge of Hedge End where the principle of development is acceptable provided it complies with policies DM1, DM2, DM11 and DM14 of the Development Plan.

Design and Layout

- The design of the single storey side extension, loft and garage conversion are suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The single storey extension is a modest addition, projecting approx. 2.9m to the north-east with neighbouring properties at a sufficient separation distance.
- The extension reflects the pitched roof of the host dwelling and subsequent two-storey side extension, respecting the original dwellinghouse and the character and appearance of the locality.
- The proposed additional boundary fencing is to remain the same height as the existing fencing and follows the same line, therefore appearing modest.
- While there is a significant amount of development proposed on the application site, the proposals would mainly utilise the existing space and would not be an overdevelopment of the site.

Impact Upon Residential Amenity

- 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.
- The movement of the boundary fence would not negatively impact the openness of the street scene as it was noted on the site visit, the view in this location is already dominated by fence line. The re-positioning would not change this view and would not be overbearing or cause harm to the character of the area.
- The rooflights to the proposed loft conversion are low key in nature and inserted into the roofspace and would not result in any unacceptable overlooking regarding the neighbouring properties to the north-east and south-west.
- The proposed side extension is single storey in nature and projects onto existing unused hardstanding near the highway, is it considered the side extension would not be overbearing with regards to residential amenity.
- The nearby neighbouring properties are sufficiently distanced from the application site. There would be 1no. window inserted into the front (south-west) elevation of the proposed extension directly facing the public realm where there is an anticipated level of acceptable overlooking.
- In order to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring residential properties, the use of the garage will be conditioned as such that it shall not be used for any business, commercial or industrial use or as independent unit of accommodation.

Highways Safety and Parking

- The proposals will increase the bedrooms within the property from 4 to 5 bedrooms and result in the loss of the existing garage as off-street parking. The Residential Parking Standards SPD stipulates 3no. off street-parking spaces would be required for a 4+ bedroom dwelling. The proposed site plan submitted with the application demonstrates how the 3no. parking spaces would be provided on site. Hampshire Highways were consulted and confirmed the off-street parking arrangements are acceptable.
- Hampshire Highways also confirmed the proposed works do not reduce visibility splays any further than the existing 6 foot (1.8m) fence when exiting the local cul-de-sac area within which No. 63 is located and is acceptable in terms of highway safety.

Other Materials Considerations

- There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention. Historically, a TPO oak tree was in close proximity to the site but this has removed.
- 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.

The NPPF aims for the need for housing to be met, and policy S2 of the Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. The NPPF, Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Local Plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change and is expected to reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

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: This application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐