

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT:**Application Ref:** O/22/94180**Site Address:** 12 UNDERWOOD ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 6FW**Case Officer:** Clare Martin**Description:** Erection of a pair of semi detached 2 bedroom houses in land to the rear of No. 12 Underwood Road, Bishopstoke.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☐	No ☒
Within the urban edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒
No relevant planning applications at the site.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations: (summarised)	<u>8 letters of objection</u> • Overdevelopment. • Visually intrusive and loss of light to neighbouring properties. • Loss of a view • Additional light pollution • Proposal would result in more vehicles using the alleyway and existing limited parking area. Lack of visibility for cars and impact on safety of pedestrians. • The property already has a two storey side extension. • If allowed will set a precedent for future development.		
Highways Officer (HCC):	No objection in principle, subject to additional/ amended information: <u>Access:</u> Access to the proposed dwellings would be via Summers Place, accessed from either East Drive or underwood Road, which is acceptable. Onwards, adequate space appears to be afforded to actually turn in and out of the proposed parking spaces. <u>Parking:</u> Each of the two proposed dwellings are only provided with one vehicle parking space, and for two-bedroom dwellings, the minimum is two parking spaces each if the EBC Parking Standards SPD is to be adhered to. Onwards, there is no information in regard to the vehicle parking to be provided for the existing dwelling, which would again require two vehicle parking spaces. It would appear that this has previously been provided by garage parking to the rear (now removed), but no re-provision is outlined. Additional parking for the proposed dwellings could be given through the widening of the proposed driveways, and parking could be provided for the existing dwelling through front garden conversion to a driveway (with appropriate drop kerb) as with neighbouring properties. However, this should be shown on revised plans.		

	Cycle parking should also be provided via a storage / cycle shed capable of housing 2 cycles per dwellings, and given the constraints of the site, it would also be suggested that bin storage is also shown.
Ecology Officer:	<u>Objection</u> I object to this application due to lack of information on protected species and biodiversity net gain. It is clear from brown patches on site photos that some vegetation has been cleared from this site however there is still potential for protected species to be using part of the site, and there may be invasive non-native species present. There are records of bats very close to this property and records of slow worms to the north and east. There may also be hedgehogs in the area. The proposals would result in a net loss of biodiversity and green infrastructure which is against local and national planning policies and not provide any area for biodiversity enhancement, which is required. <u>Surface water drainage</u> A surface water drainage plan will be required.
Southern Water:	General advise provided.
Parish Council:	Objection, in the grounds of overdevelopment, insufficient parking for the proposed dwellings, and it will result in both a loss of light and a loss of privacy for the near neighbours.
Environmental Health:	No response provided
Direct Services:	No response provided

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details:		

Pre-commencement Conditions:	Yes ☐	No ☒
Details:		

Legislation:
Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:- <i>"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."</i>

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 & S3; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM3, DM6, DM10, DM11, DM13, DM14, DM23, DM29 & DM30.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Proposal:

The proposal is an outline planning application considering layout and access for a pair of semi-detached two storey house in the rear garden of 12 Underwood Road. The proposal includes a small garden and one on site car parking space for each dwelling with access of the existing alley.

Assessment:**Principle:**

The site is located within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to compliance with the relevant planning policies.

Character and Appearance:

The proposal is to create a pair of two storey semi-detached houses in the rear garden of 12 Underwood Road. The prevailing character of the locality is two storey semi-detached and terraced houses with large rear gardens and the existing site follows this pattern. The proposal would be out of character with the locality in that it would split the existing garden into three, thus creating small plots which are much smaller than the neighbouring properties. Furthermore, in order to squeeze the pair of semi detached houses onto the size they have been designed with narrow, deep, footprints, which would be out of keeping with the wider footprints and proportions of the surrounding two storey houses.

As such the proposed development is not considered to fit in with the prevailing pattern of development within the locality.

Amount of development:

The site is not considered to be of sufficient size to accommodate a pair of two storey semi-detached houses. The position of the single car parking space at the rear of each house would leave limited room for an outdoor amenity area, with the garden of the eastern house would be significantly under 60% of the dwellings floor space as required by the Council's quality places supplementary planning document.

It is also unclear whether the two bedroomed dwelling would accord with the nationally described spaces standards as required by Policy DM30.

Car Parking:

The proposal includes one on site car parking space for each of the proposed dwellings, which is accessed off the existing service road running alongside the site. While adequate room is provided for vehicular access, the car parking provision is below the two on site car parking spaces per dwelling required by the Council's residential parking standards supplementary planning document. Without the required number of on site car parking spaces, the development is likely to result in an increase in vehicles parking on the adjacent service alley and public roads and therefore causing a hazard for road users and pedestrians.

The proposal also fails to provide two on site car parking spaces for the existing house, although it is noted that this could potentially be accommodated on the property's frontage.

Residential amenity:

The pair of two storey houses would be sited approximately 10m from the rear of the existing house and as such would have a severe detrimental effect on the outlook of the existing house and its garden. Furthermore, the proposed two storey building would be sited to the south of the existing property and so would also significantly reduce the amount of sunlight currently received into the existing dwelling. Thus, making the rear of the existing house and its garden feel cramped and overshadowed detrimental to the amenity of its residents.

There is also the potential for the proposed pair of semi-detached houses to create unacceptable levels of overlooking into the existing dwelling if any of its main windows were to be positioned on its northern elevation. In this case, the proposal would only provide a separation distance of 10m between facing first floor windows in the existing and proposed dwellings, which is less than half the minimum 22m separation distance required by the Council's quality places supplementary planning document.

The residential amenity of the other surrounding dwellings has also been considered, but as the new two storey houses are further away from the site they would have less of an impact on other dwellings.

Ecology:

There are records of bats very close to this property; records of slow worms to the north and east; and there may also be hedgehogs in the area. It is clear from brown patches on site photos that some vegetation has been cleared from this site however there is still potential for protected species to be using part of the site, and there may be invasive non-native species present. Insufficient information has been provided with the submission to demonstrate whether the site has potential habitat for protected species and if so to consider the types of mitigation that could be put in place. Furthermore, no information has been submitted to show how biodiversity net gain and green infrastructure would be achieved by the development.

Impact of SPA:

The site is not within the buffer for recreation impact on the New Forest SPA or the Solent and Southampton Water SPA.

The site is within the impact zone for nitrogen and phosphorus, which has been shown to have a determinantal impact on the water quality of the River Itchen SPA. A nutrient budget has not been submitted for the development (which would likely have a positive output for both nitrogen and phosphorous) nor provide any mitigation for the increase in nutrients caused by the housing development.

As such the proposal is likely to have a detrimental impact on the Special Protection Area.

Equalities Act:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty.

Section 149 (1) 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.

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 emerging 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 emerging plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Emerging 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 Adopted Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. The NPPF, Saved, Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Adopted 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.

Conclusion:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒

Comments ...