

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/22/94266

Site Address: 68 TELEGRAPH ROAD, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3EY

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Single storey rear extension and roof alterations incorporating 1no. rear juliet balcony, 1no. front and 1no. side dormers to provide first floor habitable accommodation and alterations to fenestration (Amended Description and Plans)

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within Urban Edge On the edge of the countryside TPO 60-H Adjacent to Telegraph Woods County Sites of Archaeological Importance – Red Buffer HRA Screening Criteria – SAC, SPA, Ramsar and River		

Planning History	Yes ☐	No ☒
The site appears to have no relevant planning history		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>1no. objection on amended plans from 66 Telegraph Road:</u> 1. The Amended Proposed Site Layout Plan (A104 Rev 3) shows that the side wall of the rear ground floor extension will be built very close (or on the boundary) to the side wall of our garage. We believe that this will impact on our ability to conduct any future repair work which needs to be undertaken. When a trench is excavated close to the side of our garage wall in order to lay concrete footings for the rear extension we are also concerned of the impact/damage this may have upon our garage. 2. The noise, dust, bonfires and prolonged general building work at No. 68 will no doubt have a negative impact on our wellbeing. 3. The Amended Proposed Elevations Plan (A202 Rev E) still shows that it is the intention to build a Juliet balcony on the upper rear wall of No. 68 which will overlook our rear garden thus impacting on our privacy. The removal of previously screening trees by the current owners has just exacerbated the matter . <u>1no. comment on amended plans from Deerhurst:</u> I am somewhat concerned at the size of the new window in the rear gable. I feel there will be a certain lack of privacy in my property which did not exist when the site contained only a single storey dwelling. The ecology report notes that the site had been cleared before the application was made. Several large trees were removed from the site before the report was made so there is no longer any vegetation to mitigate overlooking. <u>1no. objection on original submitted plans from 66 Telegraph Road:</u> 1. External Design and Appearance. Visually intrusive. 2. Being overlooked in the back garden / patio resulting in loss of		

	privacy. 3. Having been exposed to noise nuisance and building dust in the past by the previous occupants of N.64 we are well aware of the negative impact building work at No 68 could have on our health and well being. 4. Access to perform the work being proposed in the current plan could be problematic without access to our property. 5. The length of time it will take to complete all of the work that is approved by the Planning Department. The new owner of No.68 has indicated to us that they are hoping for a September 2023 finish.
West End Parish Council:	No objection No further comments were received on amended plans
Trees:	Despite a TPO showing on our system, there are no significant trees within the proposed development area. We raise no arboricultural objection to the proposal.
Ecology:	<u>Comments on the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey received 14/03/2023:</u> I have reviewed the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey by AEWC Ltd (2023). I have no further objections based on the findings of this report. The report states that the previous site clearance was done sensitively and when birds and hedgehogs were not likely to be using the site. The house ceiling was removed in November 2022 due to structural damage, but the ecologist did not see any evidence of bats or potential access points. The building was assessed as having negligible bat roost potential. Cotoneaster, which is an invasive species (Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act) is still on site. It can be grown in domestic gardens but should be removed to prevent spreading into the wild. There was bamboo on site prior to clearance and if this re-grows it can also be invasive. Laurel (cherry laurel?) and butterfly bush were also recorded. These can be invasive if not managed, but there are no regulations to prevent these from growing in domestic gardens. The report recommends biodiversity enhancements for hedgehogs, bats and nesting birds, which are appropriate. Mitigation for loss of hedgehog, invertebrate and nesting bird habitat should also include having some areas of dense vegetation in the garden and planting a wide range of flowering plants that provide flowers for pollinators, and fruit and seeds for birds and wildlife. Night scented flowering plants provide food for moths which are eaten by bats. The RHS plants for pollinators website can be used to select plants that will provide these valuable ecosystem services https://www.rhs.org.uk/science/conservationbiodiversity/wildlife/plants-for-pollinators). Hedgehog holes can be cut into the baseboards of closed board fencing and should be a minimum of 13 x 13 cm. <u>Comments on site photos 06/02/2023</u> I have reviewed the site visit photos taken on 10/1/23. It is obvious from the large puddles and mud at the rear of the house that the existing surface water drainage system is not working. This must be addressed before further damage is caused. It is also obvious that the site has been cleared to bare ground (now mud) before these photos were taken. Aerial imagery from Google Maps and Google Earth, both dated 2023 (seen on 6/2/23) shows a vegetated garden with grass trees and shrubs. The Environment Act and BS42020 are both clear that any site where the habitats have been recently cleared in advance of a planning application shall be assessed at the ecological value they

	had before the site clearance. Photo 6.2 in the DAS by ATP Architectural Design (dated 29.11.22) shows a pond within a planting bed, shrubs and grass in the rear garden nearest to the house. Site clearance to facilitate a development may be a criminal offense if it is identified that habitat of a protected species has been destroyed. The tree officer's response of 8/12/2022 states that "despite a TPO showing on our system, there are no significant trees within the proposed development area." When comparing the site photos with the aerial photos it appears that a very a large tree is now missing from this garden. It may not have been within the development area for the proposed extensions, but it would represent a loss of habitat. The site photos show an opening from a missing vent in a rear window of the house where bats and birds could enter the building. There are also numerous crevices in the exterior which could support roosting bats. A Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) is required. This must also consider the potential for the original state of the garden to have supported protected species and make recommendations for compensation for habitats lost, mitigation for any habitats that would be lost as a result of the proposals and biodiversity enhancements that would be appropriate for this property. A surface water drainage plan will also be required before determination. <u>Original comments received 16/01/2023:</u> There are records of bats and hedgehogs very close to this site and the proposal involves works to the roof and loft space. I cannot see all aspects of the roof from the photos in the DAS or on Google maps. Please could you send close-up photos of the entire roof, the soffits, fascia and flashings for review to determine whether further survey may be needed.
Hampshire County Council Highways:	In regard to application H/22/94266, having reviewed the information contained within the application pack, there is no objection to the proposals, subject to condition outlined below being applied. Access is achievable via a widening to the existing vehicle crossover (5.4m wide on plans), and this is acceptable with transition kerbs separating it from the drop kerb of the neighbouring property. The applicants should however be made aware that subsequent to any planning permission that may be forthcoming from EBC as Local Planning Authority, a secondary permission will be required from HCC (as Local Highway Authority) to actually undertake the drop kerb works. Details of this process can be found via the following link: https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/parking/droppedkerbs CONDITION: ACCESS CONSTRUCTION PROVISION No development shall start on site until the access, including the footway and/or verge crossing shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans. Reason - To provide satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety. PARKING PROVISION

	No development shall start on site until the provision for three parking spaces has been made within the site in accordance with the approved plans and shall be retained thereafter. Reason - To ensure adequate on-site car parking provision for the approved development.
Hampshire County Council Archaeologist:	No objection

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 10/01/2023		

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:

Site and Proposal

The application site contains a modest detached bungalow situated in a linear plot on the western side of Telegraph Road. The property is set back from the highway by a hardstanding driveway, front garden and low level boundary with side access to the rear garden. The surrounding area is residential in nature and features detached bungalows some of which have been similarly altered to provide first floor accommodation and with extensions to the rear. Telegraph Woods lies directly east of the site and forms part of designated countryside.

This application seeks approval for a single storey rear extension, roof alterations which would comprise 1no. front gabled and 1no. side flat roof dormer, 4no. rooflights to the northern roof slope and 1no. Juliet balcony with a glass balustrade to the rear, the widening of the existing dropped kerb and new 0.60m high boundary wall. Amended plans were received on 09 March 2023 which omitted an additional side dormer to the northern roof slope and shows the rear extension would be set in slightly from the boundary shared with no. 66 Telegraph Road.

The single storey extension would have an overall depth of 6.2m and would comprise of a part pitched roof with a gable end and Juliet balcony which would maintain the ridge height of the host dwelling (5.5m), this element of the extension would have a depth of 4.4m, the remaining 1.8m of the extension would have flat roof and would have a lower height of 3m.

The proposals would be finished in white render to all elevations, the side dormer and gable end to the rear extension would have grey composite cladding and there would also be grey fenestration and grey concrete roof tiles.

Principle

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 single storey extension, roof alterations including the front and side dormer, Juliet balcony, dropped kerb extension and front boundary wall is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- Aside from the front and side dormer, the majority of the development would be sited to the rear and not overly visible to the public realm.
- It was noted on the site visit, there are examples of bungalows along this section of Telegraph Road that have front and side dormers to their southern roof slopes. Therefore, the proposed dormers would blend in with the street scene and would be in keeping with the surrounding area.
- The proposed rear extension would not extend beyond the rear-built line of the neighbouring property's rear extension at no. 70. Additionally, the proposed part pitched and flat roof combination would reduce the massing and bulk to the roof form and is not considered to be overly prominent.
- The application also proposes the introduction of a variance of new materials, as noted. From the site visit, white rendering could be found within the vicinity; the host dwelling currently has off-white pebble dash to all elevations. It is considered the change in materials to the elevations would not cause material harm to the character of property nor the wider surroundings. Cladding was also seen in the local area; grey cladding is proposed to the side and rear gable end, while this colour is not a common feature, on balance the small expanse of cladding seen within the public realm would not be significant to cause adverse harm. Additionally, the proposed grey concrete tiles and fenestration is considered to be an acceptable material.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site and sufficient amenity space would be retained.

Residential Amenity

- The neighbours most impacted by the proposals would be the neighbours to the north and south, nos. 66 and 70 Telegraph Road.
- The proposed side dormer would face the northern roof slope to no. 70 which does have 2no. roof lights, however the 2no. dormer windows would serve bathrooms and are marked as obscured glazed on the submitted plans. As such, a condition will be applied to ensure the privacy for both the occupants to no. 68 and 70 are retained.
- As noted, the proposed rear extension would project no further than the rear extension to no. 70, due to this and the boundary treatment between the application site and this neighbour, it is considered the development would not impact upon the amenities of this neighbour.
- It is acknowledged the rear extension would be sited close to the shared boundary and garage to no. 66 and the neighbour has raised concerns about potential damage to their garage and access to the garden during construction and once the development is in place. Ultimately, these concerns are considered to be a civil matter as the extension would not encroach on or over this neighbour's boundary. The applicant will be advised of their duty to undertake a party wall agreement and a considerate builder's note will be added by way of informative to request any building works are carried out with minimal disruption.
- Additionally, the neighbour's garage located within the rear garden would screen a good proportion of the proposed rear extension and as a result the development is not considered to significantly impact the outlook or light of this neighbour.
- Concerns have been raised from no. 66 and Deerhurst and noted with regards to the Juliet balcony to the rear gable at first floor level. From a planning perspective, Juliet balconies are viewed in the same manner as windows. The proposed Juliet

balcony would mainly look into the rear garden of the application site with some views into neighbouring gardens but this mutual overlooking into neighbouring rear garden is to be expected in urban areas. Furthermore, there is a separation distance in excess of over 30m between the proposed Juliet balcony and Deerhurst, the neighbour to the west. The Quality Places SPD recommends a minimum distance of 22m between first floor windows, therefore the proposed Juliet balcony complies with this guidance.

- It is also noted from the neighbour comments and the site visit that the landscaping to the rear garden has been mainly cleared, including a large non-protected ornamental tree which provided natural screening. The agent has confirmed the rear garden will be landscaped once building works are complete, however, it is considered that along with the smaller retained trees and shrubs, the adequate boundary treatment to the site and the good separation distances between neighbouring plots, additional tree/hedgerow planting would not be required as part of this application.
- Therefore, to conclude with the above points, 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.

Highways Safety and Parking

- The proposals would result in the property becoming a 4no. bedroom dwelling, which would require 3no. off-street parking space as set out in the Residential Parking Standards SPD.
- Due to the proposed dropped kerb extension, Hampshire Highway were consulted upon. They advised they have no objections to this extension subject to conditions which will be applied.
- The proposed extended dropped kerb and boundary wall would allow for wider vehicular access onto the site and would provide the required 3no off-street parking spaces and as such the new parking arrangements accord with the current parking standards.

Ecology

- Owing to the nature of the development, Ecology were consulted upon, following the submission of site photos, the Council's Ecologist requested a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
- The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was received 13 March 2023. The Council's Ecologist has reviewed this and is content with the measures and recommendations set out. As such, this will be secured via condition.

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.
- Subsequent to any permission that may be forthcoming from EBC as the Local Planning Authority, a further permission will be required from HCC as the Local Highway Authority to actually undertake the drop kerb works.

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: This application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐