

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/23/94991

Site Address: 7 SCOTLAND CLOSE, FAIR OAK, EASTLEIGH, SO50 7BQ

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Demolition of the existing rear extension. New single and two storey rear extensions. Internal alterations. Alterations to fenestration. New terrace (Amended description)

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

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒
There does not appear to be any planning history relating to the site.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	No comments received		
Parish Council:	No objection		
Asset Management:	No response is required		
Ecologist:	A preliminary bat roost assessment is needed		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 8 th June 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 Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath (BIFOHH 23)

Assessment:
The application property is a 3-bedroom brick built semi-detached dwellinghouse with a tile roof, located in the residential area of East Fair Oak. The property's footprint is T-shaped as there is an existing utility room beyond the rear wall. There is also a detached garage to the side. The front garden of the property has undergone significant modifications, presenting a footpath, a paved driveway, and a low maintenance garden area. Positioned in a corner plot, the property fronts Scotland Close and its side abutting Mortimers Lane. The existing boundary treatment comprises a combination of fence

panels and a low brick wall. The surrounding area predominantly comprises inter-war and immediate post-war bungalows and semi-detached pairs, contributing to a strong and well-defined residential character. The planning application involves the removal of the existing rear extension (utility room) and the addition of a new single and two-storey rear extension, creating a combined kitchen, dining, and living area on the ground floor, along with a master bedroom suite on the first floor. It is worth noting that revised plans were submitted on 9th July, which led to the omission of the previously proposed new open oak framed porch from the application. While this change has been acknowledged as an improvement, this application is still not considered supportable in its current form. Further details outlining the specific reasons for this decision will be provided in the subsequent paragraphs.

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.
- The site is part of the character area of Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath (BIFOHH 23) which provides the following guidance on developments and that they should ensure that:
 - i) Maintain the formal building compositions around the central open space and cul-de-sacs
 - ii) Retain the wide grass verges and semi-mature broadleaved tree planting on central open green space.
 - iii) Maintain the importance of the central open green space in any new development.
 - iv) Ensure that new development relates effectively with the building features and materials prominent in existing development.

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 proposed contemporary design of the extensions significantly deviates from the surrounding area's architectural style and fails to show due respect to the existing host dwellinghouse.

Firstly, the excessive size of the proposed extensions, representing a significant 58% increase in footprint. The single storey rear extension will extend up to the common boundary and protrude 0.9m beyond the existing side wall, while the two-storey rear extension is overly deep, stretching almost 7m from the original rear elevation. Such a substantial expansion, protruding beyond the existing side wall, not only disrupts the well-proportioned nature of the semi-detached pair but also disrupts the seamless flow and visual coherence of the original structure, resulting in an unpleasing and unbalanced appearance.

Moreover, the design of the extensions does not harmonise with the prevailing architectural character of the area. The contemporary style chosen for the extensions will create a stark contrast with the surrounding residential properties. The use of unsympathetic materials and the oversized two-storey extension that extends beyond the existing side wall will also create a visually imposing structure. This results in a jarring contrast with the traditional and cohesive street scene dominated by inter-war and post-

war bungalows and semi-detached pairs. As a result, the proposed design will appear incongruous and out of place, drawing undue attention to itself and detracting from the overall appeal of the street scene.

Furthermore, the modern approach is considered to fail to show due respect to the host dwellinghouse, resulting in a jarring juxtaposition of architectural styles, thereby detracts from the simplicity of the original property.

Lastly, despite being positioned at the rear of the property, the proposed extension's visibility from the public realm will remain high due to its corner positioning. Its excessive size and incongruent design elements further distinguish it from the surrounding properties.

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 documents. In conclusion, the excessive size, unsympathetic design, and incongruent materials of the proposed extensions combine to create a harmful impact on the host dwellinghouse, street scene and the surrounding area's character.

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.

Despite the two-storey extension not reaching the common boundary, its height, size, and scale can create an overbearing presence, making neighbouring properties feel surrounded and enclosed. The considerable increase in the property's footprint, especially with the two-storey extension, will also result in a sense of visual dominance over the adjacent houses.

In addition to this, the proposed side facing windows on the first-floor level can lead to potential issues related to loss of privacy for neighbouring properties as the windows can overlook directly into the private garden of adjacent neighbour (8 Scotland Close). This intrusion on privacy can potentially impact their enjoyment in the rear garden.

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 advised that there are records of bats very close to this property and the proposed two storey extension would affect the roof, so a preliminary bat roost assessment would be required, this should also include biodiversity enhancements. Had the application have been considered acceptable in other regards this information would have been requested, and biodiversity enhancements could have been secured via condition.

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.

The proposed extensions which include a first floor ensuite will result in the application property being converted into a 4-bedroom dwelling. This would require a minimum of 3 parking spaces. However, during the site visit, it was noted that the existing driveway is sufficiently large to accommodate up to 3 cars.

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

The combination of the proposed single-storey and two-storey rear extensions, by reason of their substantial size, scale, position, and unsympathetic design, would result a disproportionate, excessive, and visually prominent addition. The proposed rear extensions would at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling and have an adverse impact upon the street scene and the character of the surrounding area. 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