

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT:**Application Ref:** F/23/95227**Site Address:** 10 DRUMMOND WAY, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1TX**Case Officer:** Clare Martin**Description:** Roof alterations and extensions to create first floor living accommodation with 2no. front and rear dormer windows, front porch and garage conversion (Resubmission H/23/94738)

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☐	No ☒
Details:		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/16805/007 – Siting and design of 60 dwellings with garages – Permitted (Nov 1979) • Z/32152/1 – Single storey side extension – Permitted (August 1993) • Z/32152/2 – Erection of rear conservatory – Permitted (May 2003) • H/23/94738 - Roof alterations and extensions to create first floor living accommodation with 2no. front dormer windows, front porch, garage conversion and elevational alterations – Refused (April 2023)		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>7 letters of objection and 1 comment letter</u> <i>Principle</i> • Loss of bungalow – fails to maintain the mixed stock of housing and so would not accord with Policy DM24. None of the other bungalows have added a second storey. • Overdevelopment – the size of the dwelling is too big for the plot • The approval of the planning application would set a precedent for the extension of bungalows within the locality. <i>Character and Appearance</i> • Colour, style and design of extension more in keeping with the locality than the previous application • Proposal will change the aesthetics of the close. Adding a two storey property at the entrance will make it feel more enclosed. The properties at 6 Albury Place, 1 Albury Place and 10 Drummond Road form a cohesive set of bungalows, which contribute to the street scene. • Proposal would be out of keeping as there are no chalet properties in the immediate vicinity. Design, roof pitch and dormer windows are incongruous to neighbouring properties. • Inevitable erosion of the residential character of the street scene by the removal of hedging and fencing along the front boundary to provide more manoeuvring space. <i>Residential Amenity</i> • Overlooking of neighbouring properties and blocking out light, which will impact on the privacy and enjoyment of existing residents living spaces. • Overbearing – proposal will dominate views from the neighbouring houses.		

	<i>Access and Car Parking</i> • Increase in cars from the enlarged dwelling would result in additional on road parking. There is very limited parking in Drummond Way and visitor spaces are taken up most of the time. • Risks to highway safety due to the oblique manoeuvring of vehicles on and off the drive in an area where there is no dedicated pedestrian footpath. • The car parking spaces shown are tight and would be difficult to access. The access road to the close is limited. <i>Other</i> • Noise, dust and disruption during the construction period • Any permission should restrict contractor parking, limit working hours and ensure restoration of any damage to verges. Residents should be informed of when the road will be blocked for deliveries. • Potential damage to underground services • Request Environmental Health are consulted on the application. <u>Officers Response</u> • Comments are noted and the principle, appearance of the dwelling, car parking requirements, residential amenity and amount of development are considered in the assessment section. • It is acknowledged that building work is often disruptive for neighbouring residents and the applicant's attention would have been drawn to the considerate contractor's guidance. It should be noted that vehicles are allowed to park on the public highway and it is not reasonable to prevent contractors from doing this. • The loss of the bungalow, future precedent and potential damage to drainage are not material planning considerations and so cannot be assessed as part of the application. • Policy DM24 (creating a mix of housing) is aimed at applications for new residential housing schemes and does not provide sufficient justification to prevent the conversion of a single bungalow into a larger property.
Parish Council:	We note the particularly contentious nature of the previous refused application, and numerous neighbours' objections. This revised application does not appear to address many of the concerns, and we ask that all concerns regarding the previous application are considered when deciding this one.
Ecology Officer	There are records of bats and hedgehogs nearby. I have reviewed the Phase 1 Bat Survey report by Vesper Conservation and Ecology Limited (submitted under the previous application) and I am satisfied that the bat roost potential is negligible, and no further surveys will be required.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Undertaken in April as part of previous application H/23/94738		

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 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM11 and DM14. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisal (North Millars Dale Character Area)

Assessment:
Principle The site is located within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the details complying with the relevant planning policies Character and Appearance The site contains a gable ended detached bungalow, which although extended to the side and rear has mostly retained its original character. The bungalow is of a of a standard design, which is replicated at intervals throughout the residential area pepper potted between the prevailing two storey houses. The bungalow sits on a corner plot, at the entrance to the cul-de-sac, where it occupies a prominent position within the street scene. The proposal is a resubmission of a previous application, which was refused due to the poor design of the chalet bungalow which contained a long and unattractive flat roof two storey projection at the rear. It was considered that the design of the chalet bungalow (along with the choice of external materials) would detract from the appearance of the dwelling and appear incongruous within the street scene. The proposal has now been redesigned without the two storey rear projection and instead uses two small pitched roof dormer windows on the front and rear roof slope. The result is a pleasant chalet bungalow with a more modest amount of accommodation contained within the roof slope. The external materials will mostly use pantiles and bricks to match those on the existing bungalow and the timber cladding will be restricted to a smaller section along the side of the property. While it is recognised that the design of the current property replicates the other nearby bungalows, there is considered to be enough variation of houses types within the estate so that the proposal would fit within the street scene. The roofline of the chalet bungalow will be lower than the neighbouring houses and so allow some visual space to be maintained around the building at the entrance to the cul-de-sac.

Car Parking

The previous planning application was also refused as the development involved converting the existing garage and the properties restricted frontage did not appear adequate to accommodate the required two cars. As such any overflow car parking could have a detrimental impact on the free flow of the vehicles within the adjoining roads given the very limited designated on road parking provision.

However, it is recognised that the internal measurement of the existing garage (at 2.3m by 4.8m) is less than the required 3m by 6m and as such would not count as an existing parking space. Therefore, the total number of spaces on site will not alter as a result of the proposal. The site plan shows two spaces on the property's frontage, which although very tight would just about provide enough room for the residents to get into and out of, particularly if they choose a smaller car. There is also a hedge along the front of the property which is not protected and so could be slightly trimmed back to allow easier access to the property and greater visibility if necessary. On balance it is considered that the parking provision is acceptable.

Other Considerations

- While the enlarged chalet bungalow will be visible from the neighbouring dwellings, the development is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on their amenity (by way of a loss of privacy, light or outlook). A reasonable distance is provided between the new first floor rear dormer windows and the ground floor windows in the bungalow behind (1 Albury Place). The development accords with the residential amenity guidance set out in the Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document.
- The proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the plot and is considered to be a reasonable sized garden.
- A Phase 1 Bat Survey report was carried out as part of the previous application and assessed the property as having negligible bat roost potential. No further surveys were required, and no objection raised by the Ecology Officer.
- There will be no adverse impact upon TPO trees or other natural features worthy of retention.
- There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.
- While the Ecology Officer has provided sustainable drainage advice, Policy DM6 does not require SUD's details to be approved for householder developments.

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 ...		