

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/23/94731

Site Address: 32 GUEST ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 6AQ

Case Officer: Alexandra Stone

Description: Single storey rear extension

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Within Urban Edge - Southern Water Sewers – Foul		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Z/12966/0001/00 – Permit – 20/01/1975 House as a private children's home for six boys H/17/81440 – Permit – 06/10/2017 First floor rear extension		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>34 Guest Road</u> Would like to see roof plans as previous application blocked out light. <u>Officer Comment</u> The application is for a single storey extension. The kitchen appears to be at the rear of the property as the only window to the side elevation that could have lose of light is obscured glazed, this is unlikely to be a habitable room. The rear of the dwelling which I believe to be the kitchen (likely that it would have the same internal layout as the application site), has windows to 3No. elevations which is more than sufficient so unlikely to cause any additional loss of light.		
Parish Council:	No Objection		
Southern Water:	Please see the attached extract from Southern Water records showing the approximate position of our existing foul sewer within the development site. The exact position of the public asset must be determined on site by the applicant in consultation with Southern Water before the layout of the proposed development is finalised. - The 200 mm diameter gravity sewer requires a clearance of 3 metres on either side of the gravity sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future maintenance access. - No new development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water. - No soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 metres of public or adoptable gravity sewers. - All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 03/04/2023		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 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:

The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that:

Principle

The application is for a replacement of the existing conservatory for a single storey rear extension, creation a family room to the rear of the property. It would extend approx. 0.5m further into the garden by approx. 4m.

- The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.

Design and layout

- The design of the single storey extension is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site, would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards.
- The design and layout respects the character and appearance of the 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 properties are suitably spaced. It is noted there are windows to the side elevations, as the extension is to be single storey it is unlikely to cause overlooking due to boundary treatment.
- The extension is a modest 0.5m further into the garden which is unlikely to cause harm in regard to overshadowing and outlook.

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.

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.

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 ☐

Comments ...