

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/22/93320

Site Address: 10 SPRUCE DRIVE, THORNHILL, SOUTHAMPTON, SO19 6DU

Case Officer: Alexandra Stone

Description: Two storey side extension and a front porch extension.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☐	No ☒
- Within Urban Edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Z/15788/000/00 – Refuse Planning Permission		
Construction of new streets, services and layout of 47 building plots		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations: 14 Objections	<u>2 Larkspur Chase- Objection (summarised):</u> - Out of character for the area, losing Georgian style which every house has in the close. House already caused flooding due to outbuildings. Natural water course has been disturb/alterd. The block and location plan submitted is false - it does not reflect the true state of the proposers property. <u>17 Spruce Drive - Objection (summarised):</u> - I see no reason to spoil the unique symmetry and chirps lines of the bow fronted dwellings for the sake of a few feet of entrance hall with a modern style wrap around porch, the fencing alone is a blight on the road <u>13 Spruce Drive- Objection (Summarised):</u> - Will completely look out of place in Spruce Drive, not suitable for area. Can see will take light away from number 8. No one in street has built on driveway between houses. <u>15 Spruce Drive – Objection (summarised) :</u> - Not in keeping with the current kerb appeal of the area. Sympathise with the neighbouring and garden bordering premises who would have daylight and sightlines impacted by the proposed structure. <u>5 Spruce Drive – Objection (summarised):</u> - Proposed extra building will be visually intrusive, will change the appearance of the cul de sac and the external design change the whole feel of the area we live. If the number of rooms are being extended for more people this will bring possibility of more traffic. <u>8 Spruce Drive- Objection (summarised):</u>		

- The block plans are not up to date and don't represent the changes that have already been made. No other residents have built on the joint driveways the proposed extension will unbalance the look of the street and is out of character from the rest of the property's in the street. It will also have a huge impact on my house and overshadow my kitchen diner and rear garden. It will change the look of the whole cul-de-sac no one has extended like this. Our house would be overshadowed and dominated by it, it would be visually intrusive and unbalance the whole look of our property. The proposed extension would have a huge impact on the amount of light that we get to our home and back garden. Our kitchen diner window would be completely overshadowed and we will lose most of the natural light and sunlight that we get to the 2nd bedroom at the back of the house. Most of the natural light and sunlight we get to our home comes from the windows at the side of the house. loose a lot of light in the back garden and from our private patio area as nearly all of the light and sunlight we get comes from the space on the driveways in-between. doesn't take into account the fencing N°10 have already put on their side of the driveway, we thought the gap had to be a minimum of 1meter, 3ft 3in, there won't be enough room for the average adult to walk through. The proposed extension will totally dominate our house and the rest of the street and unbalance the whole look of the street. The external design of the extension is modern and not in keeping with the Georgian style of the rest of the street it. If this build is permitted it will set a president for other residents to extend like this and totally destroy the whole look and character of our street.

4 Larkspur Chase- Objection (summarised):

- The primary concern is the potential impact on the existing drainage network and surface water the overdevelopment of the property may cause.

21 Ellis Road- Objection (summarised):

- It looks to be completely out of keeping with the style and character of the other properties in close proximity.

14 Spruce Drive- Objection (summarised):

- This house already has an extension to the rear of the property also a large building covering the whole width of the garden and into the garage. If this extension goes ahead it will change the whole appearance of the road, this property is already overdeveloped and another extension would be visually intrusive.

5 Copse View- Objection (summarised):

- The BRE STANDARD right of light will be obstructed with this design. The design is also not in character with the surrounding houses and the street. There are no structures built on any other joint driveway between the houses's. The proposed "porch" is not a porch, but is masquerading under the term porch. In fact this is a front and side wrap around extension. Also not in keeping with the design of the other four

	roads which make up Pinewood Park Estate. The house in questions already is developed at over fifty percent of its outdoor space. This means there can not be anymore development taking place. Please check the ratio. Also building control have not signed off on the current outbuild which has foul water drainage and is a garage made into a bungalow. <u>2 Three Oaks- Objection (summarised):</u> - It is not in keeping with the rest of the street which is a small cul-de-sac consisting of sixteen semi-detached houses, 8 either side of the street with joint driveways leading to semi detached garages. Out of place as all of the houses in this street are Georgian style. No one has built on the driveways or the front of the house. Proposed plans, it states a porch to the front of the house, this is not a porch, it is a large extension to the front of the property that wraps round to join the proposed side extension. Even a single storey extension would look out of place, It also says grey roof tiles, every house on Pinewood park has red/brown tiles this is only a few of the misleading details given. If this build is permitted, it will totally destroy the look and character of Spruce Drive. <u>8 Larkspur Chase- Objection (summarised):</u> - Disagree with the stress and worry the constant development of the property is causing to the neighbouring residents. <u>12 Spruce Drive- Objection (summarised):</u> - I have seen the plans for this property and it would completely change the appearance and character of the cul-de-sac. This property is already over developed and would become visually intrusive. <u>10 Larkspur Chase- Objection (summarised):</u> - Too many alterations and buildings are being made which are out of context with the rest of the houses on the estate. Owner has already built a substantial building in his garden which overlooks 4 other owner's houses which he maintains is an office and a gym. The large extension proposed on the side of the house may affect light and sunlight to our garden and house.
Parish Council:	No Comments received

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 16/08/2022		

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, DM11 and DM14.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:

The development has been assessed against policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that:

Principle

- The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.
- The character of the area is Georgian style frontage, with bay and sash windows. The semi-detached dwellings within the street scene are predominately uniform with adequate spacing between each dwelling for parking within the driveways to the side of each property.

Design and layout

- The design and layout does not respect the character and appearance of the locality and this is clarified below.
- The design of the two-storey side extension and porch is not suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance in that the street has a Georgian style frontage, and the size and style of the proposed porch is not in keeping with its roof formation and size. It is more akin to an extension to the front than a porch due to its size and scale and as such an unacceptable addition to the frontage.
- Furthermore the two-storey side extension is not symmetrical to the dwelling and out of character for the area. This is accentuated by the asymmetrical windows to the front and rear which do not align with the existing openings.
- In addition the roof of the proposed two storey extension is not subservient to the main dwelling as it does not sit below the main ridge. The two-storey extension does not sit back from the existing front wall which further adds to its unsympathetic and dominant nature.
- Although not included within the application, there are substantial outbuildings and raised patio to rear of the dwelling, which are not included within this application. It is unclear from the lack of information supplied on these developments if planning permission is needed and as such no comment is made on these elements.

Residential amenity

- The development does accord in part 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 neighbouring property ground floor window facing the dwelling is for a kitchen. The kitchen also has a rear window and glass door, which has sufficient light and outlook.
- The first-floor window for the neighbouring property serves the landing which would not be classed as a main habitable room.
- The separation distance between the property to the rear and the proposed extension would be approx. 24m which would not cause an adverse impact on residential amenity and therefore is compliant with the SPD in this regard.

Other material considerations

- There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention.

- 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.

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: The proposed extension and porch would introduce an incongruous feature, at odds with the street scene and they would represent a subservient and un-sympathetic addition to the host dwelling.

Recommendation:	PERMIT ☐	REFUSE ☒
-----------------	--	---

The proposed development would be at odds with the appearance of neighbouring properties and detrimental to the character and pattern of development within the locality.