

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/22/93740

Site Address: 15 WALKER GARDENS, HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2RH

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Two storey side and rear extension. Single storey rear extension

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within Established Residential Area • Within Built-up Area Boundary		

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒
There does not appear to be any planning history relating to the site.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	Four objection letters were received to the application. The neighbours raised the following issues and concerns: • Loss of light • Overshadowing • Parking provisions • Overdevelopment • Environmental noise issues • Not be in keeping with the surrounding street scene		
Parish Council:	Object on the basis of overdevelopment and not enough parking.		
Ecologist:	Do not see any potential bat roost features on the building.		
Highways:	Whilst there is no objection in principle to the application proposals, it is noted that the parking proposed does not meet the EBC Parking Standards SPD for a 4+ bedroom dwelling.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 23 rd September 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 Appraisal for Hedge End, West End and Botley (HEWEB 64)

Assessment:

The application site contains a detached, two-storey dwelling with brick walls located on the northern edge of Wildern. The property has a front garden amenity space and driveway parking leading to a detached garage. To the rear of the property is an enclosed garden, mainly laid to lawn with small patio area. The wider surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and made up of 1980s to present day terraced/detached development on a series of multi-headed cul-de-sacs. The application seeks approval to erect a two-storey side extension, a two-storey rear extension and a single storey rear extension. The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that:

Principle

- The application site lies within an established residential area where the basic principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being based upon the exact nature, design, and impact of that proposed being considered acceptable and in accordance with the relevant policies within the adopted local plan and supplementary planning guidance.

Character and Design

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of urban areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design, and siting.
- The guidance provided within the Quality Places SPD (2011) advises that the side extensions should take account of the spaces between houses and whether this is an important feature through the street. From a site visit, it was noted that the application property forms one of 2 similarly designed, detached houses fronting the road. Whilst they are not completely identical, they present a regular rhythm of development fronting this part of Walker Gardens. This stems from their similar roof forms, materials, fenestration positioning and dwelling orientation. Built structures to the sides of the houses are also limited to single storey detached garages set far back behind the front building line. As such, the detached garage and driveway appear subsidiary to the main dwellings and enable the retention of distinct gaps to the side of the house. These gaps make a positive contribution to the spacious character of built development along this part of the road. From the submitted drawings, it is understood that the proposed two-storey side extension would sit over an existing driveway area, which would remove the gap to the side of the application property, thereby undermining the spacious siting arrangement of this group of houses.
- Due to the dwelling's skewed angle to the road, in which its front and side elevations are both visible from the road; any alteration would be highly prominent and visible from public vantage points along Walker Gardens. Attempts have been made to reduce its visual impact by stepping the first-floor element back from the front elevation and altering the roof form. However, these small changes do not address the substantial bulk of the proposed two-storey side extension. The juncture at which the two-storey side/rear extension adjoins the roof of the host dwelling would still appear awkward and would not relate well to the roof of the main dwelling, either to the front or to the rear. In addition to this, whilst matching materials are proposed, there is no design interest to the side elevation; the large amount of blank wall would add to its visually apparent bulk. Overall, the proposed two-storey side extension would be out of keeping with the character and context of the surrounding area.
- The agent brought attention to some two-storey side extension developments within Walker Gardens. However, after reviewing the planning history and

associated documents, none of the examples referred to by the agent can be directly comparable with the proposed scheme, including in respect of their detailed design and dwelling position. This is also reinforced by the date of the permissions, as other schemes have not been assessed against the Adopted Local Plan, nor the NPPF. In any case, each application must be determined on its own merit.

- Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states 'development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance documents. To conclude, the proposed two-storey side extension, by reason of its location, combined with its roof design, would result in an incongruous addition, at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling, and character of the wider surroundings, contrary to the abovementioned policies, and SPD. In accordance with Paragraph 134 of the NPPF, this development is not considered well designed, nor does it reflect local design policies of the surrounding vicinity, thus warranting refusal.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulate that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.
- Due to the detached nature of the application property and the position of the proposed extensions, the proposal is unlikely to impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties with regards to overshadowing and harmful loss of light or outlook.
- With regards to overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, whilst there will be some additional overlooking from the upper floor window on the rear elevation, the new rear window will serve an en-suite and therefore it can be expected to be obscure glazed to protect the privacy of the occupants and neighbours. Further, no windows are proposed to the side extension and as such it is considered that the proposal would not harmfully affect the neighbouring properties in terms of their privacy.

Ecology

- Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough.
- There are bats in the vicinity of this site but not very close to the property. However, it is confirmed by the Council's Ecologist that potential bat roost features on the building. As such, no further survey is required.
- Biodiversity enhancements are required. A built-in bat brick/box or a swift brick/nest box might be appropriate for this extension.

Trees and landscaping

- The site does not contain any trees offered protection by a tree preservation order. Furthermore, the proposal has been deemed not to be in conflict with any trees or landscape features of particular amenity to the area. There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

Highways and Parking

- Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires residential development to provide off-highway parking which is adequate in terms of highway safety/traffic management.
- As a property with 4+ bedrooms which must provide 3 off-highway parking spaces. Currently there are 2 to 3 parking spaces made available to the occupants through 2 driveway parking spaces and 1 garage space, though it is acknowledged that the existing garage is below current internal dimensions to be classed as parking. If the proposed extension were to proceed, then only 1 vehicle parking space would be available on the existing driveway, with the garage again below the 3.0 x 6.0m dimensions required to be considered viable for parking. As such it is concluded that the proposal does not accord with the relevant SPD and is therefore unacceptable with respect to parking. If the parking provision could not be met, which can form a reason for refusal.
- Whilst the applicant considers converting the front garden space in order to provide additional parking spaces, it appears not practical and may potentially be unsafe. If the application has been acceptable, it may onwards require additional drop kerb width and an updated HCC Highways consultation response.

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, 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.

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:

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed two-storey side extension, by reason of its location, combined with its roof design, would result in an incongruous addition, at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling, and character of the wider surroundings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), Quality Places SPD (2011), Character Area Appraisal for Hedge End, West End and Botley (2008), and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
2. The proposal would result in the loss of existing on-site parking and the new integral garage is not of sufficient size to count towards on-site parking provision. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), and the Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒

Comments