

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/22/93432

Site Address: DERRY DACY, PEEWIT HILL, BURSLEDON, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 8BL

Case Officer: Rachael Morris

Description: Erection of replacement dwelling

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Countryside - Settlement Gap		

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Parish Council:	No Comment		
Ecology:	A preliminary ecological assessment is required. There are records of bats immediately adjacent to this property (north and west). There are records of common lizards and badgers to the northwest. There are vines growing on the existing main building which could hide potential bat roost features. Bare soil, remains of a fire, tyre marks, dead vegetation and rubble provide evidence that the land has been cleared recently. Potential nesting bird and reptile habitat may have been destroyed. The sheds would provide shelter for nesting birds. The site should also be checked for signs of badgers and hedgehogs. Invasive species, such as the bamboo shown in the original photos, may have been spread. Aerial photos showed this as a vegetated plot. There is a pond to the south of the site which may provide amphibian habitat. The presence of protected species is a material consideration and must be determined before planning permission can be granted. Biodiversity enhancements can be conditioned but should be built into any new dwelling. <u>31/08/2022</u>		
Hampshire Highways:	It can be confirmed that whilst there would be no objection from HCC as Local Highway Authority, given the location of the site, it may be prudent to add a condition for a Construction Method Statement (CMS).		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 30/08/2022		

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, S2, S5 and S6; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM11, DM14, DM26, DM29 and DM30. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:

The development has been considered against policies DM1, DM2, DM11, DM14, DM26, DM29 and DM30 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that:

Principle

- Policy S5 states planning permission will be granted for new development in the countryside provided it is related to: ... residential extensions and replacement buildings...
- The site lies in the settlement gap of Hedge End and Bursledon, policy S6 states development within a Settlement Gap will be permitted provided that: it would not undermine the physical extent and/or visual separation of settlements; and it would not have an urbanising effect detrimental to the character of the countryside; or the separate identity of the adjoining settlements.
- Policy DM26 states the extension or replacement of a permanent dwelling in the countryside will be permitted subject to the general development criteria and transport policies of the Local Plan and provided: the replacement dwelling will not be disproportionate in size to the existing dwelling, neighbouring properties or in relation to its plot, or involve any extension to its curtilage; and is on the same footprint as the existing building, unless environmental and/or access benefits arise from an alternative location within the curtilage; and no additional dwellings are created.
- It is considered that the general principle of a replacement dwelling is acceptable within the countryside, dependent on its accordance with the policy set out above.

Site context

- The site lies at the end of Peewit Hill which is a no-through road. The existing bungalow is set within a generous plot and is recessed into the site which limits potential views through from the road where the property is only visible when directly outside of the site.
- The existing bungalow is a modest dwelling but has come into a state of dilapidation. Given its limited views, modest size and roadside vegetation the existing dwelling has a very limited impact on the street scene and surrounding area.

Design and layout

- The development would be an overdevelopment of the site for the context of the countryside. Within the countryside, replacement dwellings must be of the same footprint and generally similar in size to the existing dwelling on site. The proposed dwelling would create a development that is disproportionate in size to the existing dwelling and the neighbouring properties both in terms of footprint and its overall size by creating a large two-storey dwelling.
- Although a dwelling with character is an acceptable design solution in the context of this site, the design is considered to propose a grandiose structure which exacerbates the building's presence within the countryside and as such is inappropriate for the locality. The proposed Georgian style dwelling is typical in its design, with a symmetrical façade which accommodates a two-room deep interior with a winged style layout. This would be an incongruous dwelling type for the context of the area which consists of modest bungalows and semi-detached dwellings.
- In addition, the proposed dwelling's floor area would measure approx. 318sqm with the existing bungalow measuring approx. 135 sqm which represents a 136% floor space increase. Which when also taken into consideration with the increased bulk, would create an unacceptably excessive development with an adverse visual impact to the locality. As such, this would further detriment the countryside location.

- The proposed design of the dwelling would create a large bulk, vastly different in character to the existing bungalow that sits on site and as such this would be contrary to policies S5 and DM26.
- In regard to the impact on the settlement gap, whilst the proposed dwelling is larger than existing, the building would not overly compromise the settlement gap in terms of its visual or physical impact. The proposed dwelling would not erode the space between Bursledon and Hedge End to a noticeable or detrimental degree and such it is not considered overall harm would come to the settlement gap from this development.
- While the principle of a replacement dwelling is acceptable, it is considered this proposal due to its bulk and size is excessive and would create an unacceptable visual impact upon the countryside which would be of detriment to the surrounding locality.

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 first-floor windows to the side are limited to only 1.no on each side with 2.no faux bricked-up windows. This will limit overlooking in which there is only one immediate neighbour to the side of the property to the West elevation. These proposed windows would serve en-suites and therefore in the event that this application were to receive approval, they could have been conditioned as obscure glazed to ensure the privacy of the neighbouring property.
- There are no immediate neighbours to any other elevation and as such it is concluded the property would not result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy. In addition, the proposed property is suitably distanced from the westerly neighbour so would not result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of light.

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.
- The development would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards.
- No contributions are required towards the Solent Complex in regard to additional recreational pressure, nor the recreational pressure to the New Forest and neither to the additional nitrate loading to the Solent. This is due to the development being a replacement dwelling with no additional dwellings being created. The impact to these will therefore stay unchanged.
- The council's ecologist requested further information including a preliminary ecological assessment to understand the site status in regard to nesting birds, badgers, common lizard, bats and the potential for bamboo spread. This was not requested in this instance as the intention was not to permit the scheme and as such it was considered unreasonable to request this at the cost of the applicant when the scheme was to not receive support. In the event that the scheme were to reach a permit decision, then this information would have been required. Moreover, there would be a requirement to prove a biodiversity net gain, as set out in policy DM11.
- In addition, the floor layout plan would need to accord with the higher access standards that we require within our local plan under policy DM29, which states, development should meet higher national access standards as set out in Part M of the building regulations for new build residential development, specifically part M4(2). In the event this application was to receive support, this would have been conditioned.

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:

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

The proposals, owing to the combination of the ornate design, excessive massing, scale and size of the replacement dwelling would result in an unduly prominent and visually obtrusive form of development which would have an unacceptably urbanising and increased physical and visual impact upon this area of designated countryside, to the detriment of its prevailing character. The application is therefore contrary to Policies S5, DM1 and DM26 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development will not cause adverse harm to the biodiversity interests of the site and species (such as nesting birds, common lizards, badgers, and bats) which are protected by virtue of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended). The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate a Biodiversity Net Gain and as such is contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036