

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/22/94314

Site Address: 1 PRECOSA ROAD, BOTLEY, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2NW

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: First floor rear extension

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

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/18698/001/00 - single storey rear extension - Permit - 12/02/1980 • Z/18698/002/00 - erection of a garage - Permit - 13/12/1982 • Z/18698/003/00 - construction of two storey side and rear extension. - Refuse Planning Permission For - 24/05/1993 • H/21/90706 - First floor rear extension - Closed - 12/10/2021		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	No comments received		
Parish Council:	No comments or objections		
Ecologist:	A preliminary bat roost assessment will be required		
SGN:	Damage to our pipes can be extremely dangerous for your employees and the general public. The cost to repair our pipelines following direct or consequential damage will be charged to your organisation.		
SSEN:	No objection		
Esso Petroleum Co Ltd:	No objection		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 20 th January 2023		

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 77)

Assessment:

The application site contains a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the eastern edge of Hedge End, partly within the parish of Botley. The property is set back from the road by a front garden, side driveway, and a low-level boundary wall. The property also has an attached garage which is linked to the adjoining neighbour (3 Precosa Road)'s attached garage. The surrounding area is residential in nature, predominately made up of semi-detached and chalet bungalow style dwellings. The application proposes the addition of a first-floor rear extension.

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 addition of a 3.0m (d) X 5.0m (w) X 2.5m (h) flat roofed extension above the existing single storey rear extension would result in a bulky and boxy building, which would be visually obtrusive and appear as a two-storey extension when viewed from the rear. The incongruity would be exacerbated by the introduction of new materials. The addition of coloured cladding is not considered to respect the yellow/brown brick of the host dwellinghouse, which would result in discordant side/rear elevations. Overall, it is considered that the proposed box-style extension is not a high-quality design that respects or enhances the character or appearance of the host dwelling and the locality.
- Furthermore, the application property has already been extended to the side, rear, and the loft space and therefore the resulting design proposed is considered to be an excessive built form out of scale and unsympathetic to the character of the application property and its neighbours. The proposal would harmfully unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses and appear at odds with the existing grain of development.
- With regards to the proposal's likely impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding SPA, although the proposed development would be situated to the rear of the dwellinghouse and would not be highly prominent from public vantage points, this does not negate the necessity to strive for good design. It was noted on the site visit that it would be highly visible and dominating from adjoining rear gardens due to the arrangement of the surrounding plots.
- 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 on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents'. To conclude, the proposed first-floor rear extension, by reason of its siting, scale, and design, would appear as a bulky and boxy structure, failing to relate appropriately to the host dwelling and wider surrounding street scene. In accordance with Paragraph 134 of the NPPF, this development is not considered well designed, nor does it reflect local design

policies, 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.
- The proposed rear extension would extend rearwards approximately 3.0m at first floor level. Given that the application property is a semi-detached dwelling, this means that all the side elevation of the proposed extension would project past the neighbouring dwelling (47 Sovereign Drive), it would then form a large and obtrusive feature when viewed from the neighbouring property. It is considered that the development would be unduly overbearing for the occupiers of 47 Sovereign Drive, and it would adversely and unacceptably impinge upon the level of outlook from their rear windows. Owing to its height, depth, and siting, it is also considered that the proposed development would reduce the light received into the habitable room of 47 Sovereign Drive, to the notable detriment of the amenity of its occupiers. Overall, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 47 Sovereign Drive, and it conflicts with Policy DM1, which seek to ensure new development does not unduly interfere with neighbouring properties in terms of loss of outlook or loss of daylight.

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.
- The Council's Ecologist has been consulted upon as part of this application, who advised that it is not possible to determine the condition of hanging tiles from the site photos. Therefore, a preliminary bat roost assessment is required. Should the proposals have been considered acceptable, this assessment would have been requested.

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.
- It is unclear from the submission as to the total number of bedrooms contained within the property, and the proposed first-floor rear extension can easily be used as a bedroom - meaning that the application property may require three off-road spaces to meet standards. As this parking has not been demonstrated the proposal is not considered to comply with the relevant criteria.

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 first-floor rear extension, by reason of its location, combined with its size and design, and introduction of new materials, 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 proposed first-floor rear extension, by reason of its location, size, and design, would create an unacceptable and overbearing impact upon the amenities of the neighbouring property. It also has potential harm with regards to loss of light and outlook. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough

Local Plan (2016-2036), Quality Places SPD (2011), and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒

Comments