

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/22/93734

Site Address: GLEN LEA, CHURCH HILL, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3AT

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, proposed full storey extension on top and elevational alterations

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within Urban Edge Within Built-Up Residential Area Tree Preservation Order (60-H and 329-E) HRA Screening Criteria: River, SAC, SPA and Ramsar		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Reference	Description	Decision
F/14/74040 – Glen House (Mylor), Church Hill	Erection of two and three storey side extension, associated alterations, formation or garage, following demolition of existing garage	Permit – 28/04/2014
F/04/52759 – Winston, Church Hill	Construction of two storey dwelling and attached garage with access from Church Hill	Permit – 26/01/2005

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>1no. objection from Winston (summarised):</u> - Concerns additional storey will impact on privacy and cause overlooking - Some trees between Glen Lea and Winston have been removed, concerns of more potential overlooking if more trees are cleared <u>1no. comment from 64 Midland Estate (summarised):</u> - Request for 3D illustrative plans - Height concerns - Overlooking - Large amounts of glazing - Bonfire concerns <u>LPA Response</u> The concerns regarding tree clearance has been answered via the Asset Management response section in this report 3D plans were requested, however a street scene plan showing Glen Lea and Glen House were provided to show the height of the proposed development with the street scene. Neighbours were also notified of amended plans, but no further comments were received		
West End Parish Council:	No Objection		
Trees:	<u>Updated comments on Arboricultural Impact Assessment 14/03/2023:</u> The supplied arboricultural information is satisfactory, subject to the following condition:		

	The development must accord with the arboricultural report reference 23_5837_02_32. No excavation, demolition or development related works shall commence until the tree protection measures have been installed as per the tree protection plan contained within the report. Once installed, no access by vehicles or placement of goods, chemicals, fuels, soil or other materials shall take place within the protected area. Tree protection measures shall be retained in their approved form for the duration of the work and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the LPA. Reason: To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality. <u>Original comments received 18/11/2022:</u> <u>Arboricultural Documents</u> None <u>Comments</u> There are a number of significant trees in and around the existing property. Some of these trees are subject to Tree preservation Orders. Whilst it appears that there is enough space for the proposed development, there is some concern regarding existing trees and how they will be protected during construction. However, the pre-commencement submission of a suitable Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree protection Plan can help mitigate issues. Therefore, we raise no arboricultural objection to the proposals, subject to the following condition: No excavation, demolition or development related works shall take place on site until an arboricultural method statement and a scaled and referenced tree protection plan, as per British Standard 5837:2012 (Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations), are submitted and approved by the LPA. The approved arboricultural documents must be adhered to in full, and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the LPA. Reason: To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality.
Ecology:	<u>Updated Ecology comments received 02/02/2023:</u> Since the proposal is for quite large extensions I would recommend that 4 compensatory bat roosts be added to the new extensions as mitigation for these lost roosting opportunities and that additional biodiversity enhancements also be required. The type of roosts lost would determine the type of features to be added. The nearest bat record to this property did not have the species identified, and the next nearest record was for brown long-eared and serotine bats. The next nearest records were for pipistrelle bats. These species all use different types of roosts. Brown long eared bats usually roost inside loft spaces and need indoor flying space. Pipistrelle and serotine bats are crevice-roosters, usually found under tiles or slates or behind cladding. I think the best idea is to require that the applicants submit a bat roost mitigation and enhancement plan designed by a bat-licensed ecologist with the mitigation as close as possible in location and design to the original features.

	<u>Original comments received 05/10/2022:</u> There are records of bats nearby. This proposal involves extensive work to the roof and extension into the garden. A preliminary ecological assessment of the house and garden is required.
Natural England:	No comments received
Asset Management:	No official comments received; however Asset Management confirmed the land between Glen Lea and Winston is owned by EBC and there are no current plans to clear further trees from this strip of land.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 11/10/2022		

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 contains a good sized detached two storey dwelling, from the front elevation at Church Hill, the dwelling appears as a part one/two storey house, however there is a steep incline from the rear of the property and the dwelling is viewed as two storey from this perspective. The application site is set within a large plot with a shared access with Glen House from Church Hill and there is a parking area to the front of the site. The surrounding area is residential in nature and features detached properties. The adjoining neighbours Glen House and Winston are similar in that they appear as single/two storey when viewed from Church Hill and have substantial two/three storey extensions to the rear. The application seeks approval for a two storey rear extension, a part single/two storey side extension and an additional storey to the existing dwellinghouse and associated elevational alterations. There would also be a patio area leading off from the two storey rear extension with steps leading down to the rear garden. The proposals would result in a part two/three storey dwelling with a lower ground basement. Amended plans were received 24 October 2022 which shows a hipped in roof to the additional storey and a reduction in glazing to the front and side (north-west) elevation. The proposals would allow for the extensive reconfiguration of the dwellinghouse. Currently, the property is an upside down house with the bedrooms on the ground floor and living accommodation on the first floor. The development proposes living accommodation on the ground floor and bedrooms, bathrooms and a dressing room to the first and second floors. The basement would comprise a games room. <u>Principle</u>
--

The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that the development is within the urban edge of West End where the principle of development is acceptable.

Design and Layout

The design of the proposals, following the receipt of amended plans are suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance. While the proposal involves a significant amount, the extensions are considered to be appropriate for the size of the house and its large plot as well as taking into account the nearby approved planning applications (F/04/52759 and F/14/74040) with proposals of a similar scale. The property would also remain subservient to the neighbouring property, Glen House, which is a large two/three storey detached dwelling set on higher ground.

Aside from the second floor element, much of the proposed development would be sited to the rear of the property. The house itself is set well back from Church Hill with high dense trees and vegetation lining the majority of the front boundary. As such, the proposals would have little impact on the street scene.

As well as there being extensive natural screening to the front boundary, the majority of the site is enclosed with dense mature trees and vegetation, providing good screening from the surrounding neighbouring properties and serve as good amenity value. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment submitted with this application states no trees will be removed as a result of the works ensuring the site will continue to be well screened with the development in place as well as the trees providing visual amenity to the surrounding area.

The dwelling itself is tired, in a state of disrepair and in need of renovation. The proposals will rejuvenate and modernise the dwelling. Full details on the materials have not been submitted with this application, however from the plans shown the building would be rendered on the first, ground and lower ground floor and the second floor would be vertically clad. The pitched roof to the first floor would have grey zinc tiles and the flat roof to the two storey rear and side extension would have a grey rubber roof. The proposed fenestration would be grey aluminium framed. Due to the introduction of new materials to the dwelling, a condition will be applied to ensure good quality materials will be used so the finished result would fit comfortably and respect the character area.

Residential Amenity

The neighbours most impacted by the proposals would be the adjoining neighbours Glen House and Winston and nos. 63 and 64 Midlands Estate, north-west of the application site.

The proposal would project 2.35m approx. closer to Glen House, however a 2.75m approx. separation distance would be retained with the development in place. Due to this separation distance and existing relationship, the proposed development is not considered to result in an adversely harmful impact upon the amenities of this neighbouring property. Additionally, the development proposes no side facing windows that would directly face Glen House and as such there are no overlooking or privacy concerns.

Turning to the other adjoining neighbour Winston, the side facing windows proposed on the ground and first floor would not cause any concern as there are already existing windows in a similar location. Winston has raised concerns with regards to the second floor element and potential overlooking and loss of privacy. The separation distance between first floor windows from Glen Lea to Winston with the development in place would be 27m, which is the recommended separation guidance as set out in the Quality Places SPD. However, it is acknowledged that Glen Lea sits on higher ground than Winston and there are currently dense non-protected trees acting as a natural screen between the properties, however as they are non-protected, they could be removed in the future. Owing to these factors, all windows to the side elevation to the north-west facing Winston on the

second floor serving the master bedroom, dressing room and ensuite will be conditioned to be obscurely glazed in order to safeguard this neighbour's privacy and prevent any unacceptable overlooking.

The rear elevation proposes a large amount of glazing, however this is mainly to the ground and lower floor with the majority of the doors and windows directly facing the rear garden with some views into the neighbouring gardens of no. 63 and 64 Midlands Estate. However, the application site has substantial boundary treatment in the form of trees, hedging and vegetation to the side and rear boundaries which would mostly screen this glazing from nos. 63 and 64. The first and second floor windows would have a separation distance of more than 30m from these neighbours, along with the application site being angled away from these neighbours and the extensive boundary treatment, the windows are considered to be acceptable and as such, would not create any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to these neighbours.

As noted, a patio area would lead off from the two storey rear/side extension which has potential to generate overlooking and loss of privacy concerns for Glen House and nos. 63 and 63 Midlands Estate. In this instance due to the extensive rear boundary treatment, the proposed patio area would be screened and as such, this element of the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact to the nearby neighbouring amenities with regards to loss of privacy concerns.

In response to the neighbour's comments regarding bonfires, the applicant will be advised of the 'Considerate Builders Advice Note' whereby building and associated works will be carried out considerately to minimise disruption by way of informative.

To conclude, while this is considered substantial, the proposals accord 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.

Highways Safety and Parking

The dwellinghouse is currently a 3no. bed dwellinghouse. The proposal would 2no, additional bedrooms, resulting in a 5no. bed property. This would require 3no. parking spaces as set out in the Residential Parking Standards SPD. The plans submitted show there would be 4no. off-street parking spaces provided within a parking area to the front of the site.

Ecology

Owed to the extensive works proposed particularly to the roof, Ecology were consulted upon. The Council's Ecologist requested a preliminary bat assessment.

The Enims – Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment – Glen Lea House, Church Hill, West End, Southampton, SO30 3AT was received 22 February 2023. The Council's Ecologist has reviewed this and has stated that an initial assessment was carried out in November where 4no. potential bat roosts were found and the report recommended two further bat surveys were to be carried out. An updated assessment was carried out in February which found these bat roosts had been blocked. The Council's Ecologist has advised this action has contravened the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended) and has requested a pre-commencement condition be applied to include 4no. compensatory bat roosts which must be added to the development and this should be designed by a bat-licensed Ecologist, this has been agreed by the Agent. In addition, biodiversity enhancements are recommended to be included by way of informative.

Trees

Trees were consulted upon due to the protected trees within the site. The Council's Tree Officer initially requested an arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan as a

pre-commencement condition. During the planning process, the Roavr Group – Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment was received 09 March 2023. The Tree Officer has reviewed this assessment and is content with the measures set out. They have recommended the development must accord with this assessment and no works should begin until a tree protection plan as referenced in the assessment is installed, this will be secured via condition.

Other Matters

There are no likely significant impacts on 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.

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:

Although the proposed development is sizeable, the site is large, it would be well screened from the street scene and neighbouring properties and complied with the

requirements of Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan (2016-2036).
The application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐