

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/22/93390

Site Address: 40 SEA VIEW ESTATE, NETLEY ABBEY, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 5BQ

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: First floor rear extension, replacement of rear conservatory with a single storey rear extension, removal of chimney stack and alterations to fenestration (Amended description)

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Nature Conservation – SSSI Impact Zone & HRA Screening Criteria Aviation Safeguarding Within Urban Edge Within Built-Up Established Area Article 4 Direction – Restricting the use of land by hovercraft Tree Preservation Order(s) Nutrient Neutrality Catchment		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Reference	Proposal	Decision
Z/35669/000/00	Construction of two storey side and single storey rear extensions	Permit – 05/01/1999

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Hound Parish Council:	No Objection		
Natural England:	No Comments Received		
Trees:	There are some significant trees, offsite to the south of the application property. These trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. However, it is felt that the proposed development is suitably distant from the significant trees to warrant formal protection beyond the protection afforded by the Tree Preservation Order. Therefore, we raise no arboricultural objection to the proposal, subject to the following condition: No excavation, demolition or development related works, including placement of goods, chemicals, fuels, soil or other materials, shall take place within the calculated Root Protection Area – defined as a distance of 12 times the diameter of the stem (as measured at 1.5m) – of any tree protected under Tree Preservation Order legislation. Reason: To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality.		
Ecology:	I have reviewed the plans and the photos in the Design and Access Statement. There are records of bats in close proximity to this property. I do not see any potential bat roost features in these photos. Given the scope of the proposed works a preliminary bat roost assessment will not be necessary, however as a precautionary measure, the demolition and construction work must only be done from October through April, outside of the main active bat roosting season. If this is not possible, then a preliminary bat roost assessment would be required.		

	Biodiversity enhancements are required. A built-in bat brick/roost box/bat tube and a swift brick in the first-floor extension would be appropriate enhancements. Further information about bat boxes can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/bat-boxes. Information about swift bricks and nest boxes can be found at https://www.swift-conservation.org/OurLeaflets.htm. Please could you also add the following informative to the decision letter: This application has been flagged up as being in close proximity to a known bat roost. All bats and their roosts are protected by law in the UK. Even though the roof will not be directly affected by the extension, the noise, vibrations and dust generated during construction could affect bats sleeping during the daytime. Workers must remain vigilant of the potential presence of bats, not obstruct their roosts or do anything that could cause harm to a bat. If bats or any signs of bats are found during construction, all work must stop immediately, and Natural England must be called. The Bat Conservation Trust website (https://www.bats.org.uk/) explains why bats are protected and what to do if you find a bat at https://www.bats.org.uk/advice/im-working-on-a-building-with-bats/ive-found-a-bat-during-works.
--	--

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 04/08/2022		

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

Assessment:
<u>Site and Proposal</u> The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling located on the north-eastern side of Sea View Estate. The dwelling is finished in a combination of light render and brickwork and is served by a driveway laid to gravel at the front of the dwelling and a large rear garden. There is a ground to first floor bay window on the front elevation and a canopy porch over the front door. The property also benefits from a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension as well as a conservatory to the rear and a garage conversion, some of which was carried out under permitted development. The surrounding area is part of an established residential area, characterised by similar detached and semi-detached properties, some of which have been extended and altered including first floor rear extensions. The application seeks approval for a first floor rear extension, a single storey rear extension which would replace the existing conservatory, removal of chimney stack and alterations to fenestration.

The proposed first floor rear extension would enlarge the first floor accommodation and increase the bedrooms from three to four. The proposed ground floor extension would allow for the ground floor to be reconfigured and would provide a large open plan kitchen/dining/garden room and snug area. The existing ground floor WC would be relocated and the existing utility room would be widened. The proposals would be finished in materials to match the existing.

Principle

The development is within the urban edge of Netley 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 first floor rear extension and ground floor rear extension is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The first floor element would have a flat roof and the eaves height would match the height of the host dwelling and would project approx. 2.7m north-east and would be sited above the existing single storey rear extension and would respect the character and appearance of the locality. There are examples of similar development at first floor, including the adjoining neighbours, nos. 38 and 42. Therefore, the first floor element would be in keeping with the surrounding area and would not cause any detrimental harm to the local vicinity.
- The proposed single storey rear extension would replace the existing conservatory and would be wider than the established footprint, projecting 4m closer to the north-east and neighbouring property no. 42 but would maintain the depth (5m) and height (3m) of the existing conservatory currently in place.
- The single storey rear extension element of the proposed development would be sited to the rear of the development, it would not be visible to the public realm and as such is not considered to cause any visual harm.
- The removal of the chimney stack is acceptable and can be carried out under permitted development.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site and would retain sufficient amenity space.

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 proposed 2no. windows at first floor level on the rear elevation look mainly look into the rear garden, additionally these windows would be in the same location that is currently present on the existing rear elevation. As such the windows would not result in any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy.
- The creation of an additional side window at first floor level to the south-west elevation is not marked as obscured glazed on the proposed plans but as this would overlook a neighbouring property, a condition will be implied to ensure it would be obscured to protect the amenities of the adjoining neighbour no. 38.
- Although the proposed single storey rear extension projects closer to no. 42, there is sufficient separation distance and boundary screening in place so as not to cause any undue prominence or overbearing to the adjoining neighbour.
- The single storey extension would have two sets of bi-fold doors; located on the rear and side elevations and 2no. roof lanterns. The set of bi-fold doors to the side elevation would directly face a 1.8m close board fence between the shared boundary between nos. 38 and 40 and would be screened sufficiently. There are no concerns to the bi-fold doors to the rear elevation or roof lanterns on terms of any overlooking or loss of privacy with regards to neighbouring amenity.

Highways Safety and Parking

- As noted, the proposal would increase the bedrooms in the host dwelling from 3 to 4 and would require 3no. off-street parking spaces as set out in the Council's Residential Parking Standards SPD.
- As part of this application, a proposed site plan was submitted and demonstrates how the 3no. parking spaces would be provided within the application site which is considered acceptable.

Other Material Considerations

- There are some significant protected trees offsite to the south of the application site. Trees were consulted as part of this application have recommended no excavation, demolition or development related work shall take place within the calculated Root Protection Area of the protected trees. This will be controlled by condition.
- Due to the records of bats in close proximity to this property, Ecology were consulted. The Council's Ecologist did not see any potential bat roost features in the site visit photos and advised a preliminary bat roost assessment will not be necessary. However, as a precautionary measure, the demolition and construction work must only be done from October through April, outside of the main active bat roosting season. If this is not possible, then a preliminary bat roost assessment would be required.
- There are no likely significant impacts of 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: This application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions		
Recommendation:	PERMIT ☒	REFUSE ☐