



Appeal Statement

134 Park Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 1HQ

31 July 2023

CONTENTS

1	QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE	3
2	REFUSAL REASONS	5
3	REBUTTAL OF REASON 1	7
4	REBUTTAL OF REASON 2	12
5	OTHER MATTERS	15
6	CONCLUSION	17
7	APPENDIX 1	19
8	APPENDIX 2	20

1 QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 I hold a 2:1 Planning Studies Bachelor of Arts Honours degree and a Diploma in Urban Planning from Oxford Brookes University. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.
- 1.2 I have worked in Hampshire since 1996. From 1996 to 2014 I worked at Eastleigh Borough Council as a Senior Planning Officer and then as a Principal Planning Officer in the Major Applications Team.
- 1.3 I have practised as a planning consultant since September 2014. I established my Town Planning practice, Wessex Planning Ltd, in September 2016, specialising in small to medium scale residential development.
- 1.4 I have been instructed to appeal, by the applicants, Mr and Mrs Sharma against the LPA's refusal of planning permission H/23/94953 for a ground floor extension and loft conversion.

2 REFUSAL REASONS

REFUSAL REASONS

2.1 The LPA refused planning permission for the ground floor extension and loft conversion for the following two reasons;

2.2 Reason 1

The proposed ground floor extension, by reason of its size, scale, location, and the introduction of new materials, would result in a disproportionate, excessive, and cramped addition. It would at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling and have an adverse impact upon the street scene. 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).

2.3 Reason 2

The proposed side and rear dormers, by reason of their siting and introduction of new materials, would result in incongruous additions, at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling, and the character of the wider surroundings. 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).

3 REBUTTAL OF REASON 1

Introduction

- 3.1 Whilst personal circumstances can rarely be considered to be material to the assessment of a planning application, they can help to set the background as to why a proposal is designed in a particular manner.
- 3.2 In this case, the appellants are a young, hard-working, family with one small child and another expected in October 2023. Their circumstances are such that a once active elderly relative was expected to become and is now more vulnerable, and is due to move into their home very soon, so that they can provide the care that is required. Due to particular circumstances, (the difficult mix of a very vulnerable elderly person with small children) an annex is required that is both physically independent of, but joined to the main house. This will allow daily carers to assist in the feeding, washing and care of the relative without significant disturbance to the occupants of the main dwelling. But it will also allow care to be provided by the appellants during the parts of the day when they are available.
- 3.3 The unexpected refusal of planning permission has meant that the elderly relative is now in a very insecure position in terms of the care required to be given. This has been very upsetting for this small family, and the current uncertainty as to when planning permission will be granted is placing undue pressure upon them, particularly the expectant mother.
- 3.4 Whilst the above is not a material consideration, the care of elderly relatives within the home does release the care burden upon the state, which is a legitimate planning consideration. Also, material in planning terms is the functional need for a degree of separation within the extension between the vulnerable elderly relative and the young family.

- 3.5 At first glance it is perhaps reasonable to consider this proposal too large with an adverse impact on the host dwelling and street scene. However, there are good planning reasons why the appellants architects designed their extension in the manner proposed. An invitation to discuss the proposals was never received by the LPA, however.
- 3.6 Instead, with very little discussion, the applicants were informed that their application was to be refused.
- 3.7 The applicant then instructed Wessex Planning to liaise with the LPA in order to understand what the LPA found so harmful in the proposals.
- 3.8 The good reasons for the design were explained to the LPA just before the refusal of the planning application in a letter to the case officer (See Appendix 1). However, it appeared that, by that time, the LPA's 'minds were set' and no further discussion was encouraged.
- 3.9 The reasoning for the proposal is explained below in relation to the reasons given for the refusal of planning permission:

“Disproportionate, Excessive, Cramped, At Odds”

- 3.10 Policy DM1 of the Local Plan, amongst other things, and in particular relation to this proposal requires proposals to
- Firstly, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood
 - Secondly, to be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

REBUTTAL OF REASON 1

- Thirdly, that where adjoining development is poor in urban design terms, new development should contribute to improving the character of the area;
- 3.11 Due consideration of the context of the site was demonstrated in the original design and access statement. This found that this suburban area consists of a combination of different styles of dwellings of noticeably differing age ranges using a mixed palettes of colours and materials including the use of timber cladding.
- 3.12 The site itself was also carefully considered within this context, particularly in the manner in which the principal elevation faces Paulson Close (a subsidiary close) rather than Park Road (a main through route). It was also noted that the elevation presented itself to Park Road includes a detached garage which is particularly domineering in the street scene, set both significantly forward of the building line and painted white.
- 3.13 The corner presentation of the dwelling has meant that the more private, albeit smaller garden area is located to the west of the dwelling. A larger area of garden is located to the east of the dwelling. However, this eastern side faces the busy Park Road, limiting this area of garden's useability.
- 3.14 The second part of the Policy DM1 requirement is perhaps the most important. It requires the single storey side extension to be well-integrated in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.
- 3.15 In terms of the size, location, massing and scale of the proposal, the 'fall-back' position is a material consideration of significant weight. For this proposal the 'fall-back' position is the extensions that could be constructed under permitted development.
- 3.16 If this appeal is dismissed, the appellants would have no choice but to use the permitted development route to achieve their requirements. However, both visually and functionally, this would result in a far inferior proposal to the appeal proposal.
- 3.17 The PD route would allow a significant single storey extension to be constructed in brick on the western elevation and on the northern elevation. However, these two extensions could not be connected in any way if PD criteria were to be fulfilled.
- 3.18 Additionally, the western element of any PD extension would have a detrimental impact upon the original character features of the attractive western elevation of the Edwardian dwelling by obscuring the existing bay window and original sash windows.
- 3.19 Furthermore, if PD rules were followed, the western extension would be located in the centre of the private garden area, leaving little useable space for the occupants to enjoy.
- 3.20 A further problem with this route is that small side entrance on the Park Road frontage could not be included within a small frontage projection. This side entrance is an essential part of the proposal as it would allow access to the dwelling adjacent to the existing parking area without having to walk around to the principal elevation through the secondary garden area.
- 3.21 If this entrance were included within a PD extension (which does not allow a frontage extension), its configuration would take up a significant part of the internal space.
- 3.22 The above does not mean that a PD extension is not a fall-back position, only that the appeal proposal is far superior in design terms.
- 3.23 Another PD route would be to construct an extension in brick on the northern side of the dwelling and a detached outbuilding in the private garden area to house the elderly relative.

REBUTTAL OF REASON 1

- 3.24 Whilst the detached outbuilding would need to be constructed for incidental residential use under PD rules, a further planning application would be required to change the use to ancillary residential use.
- 3.25 However, a fully detached outbuilding would not allow the ease of passage between the main house and the annex required to provide safe care for the vulnerable elderly relative, particularly in inclement weather.
- 3.26 The 'Tonbridge and Malling' Court of Appeal judgement confirms that the weight to be attached to any 'fall-back' position should be 'significant'. It also confirms that there does not have to be a 'probable or likely' prospect of a permitted development being implemented. There only needs to be a 'possibility.'
- 3.27 In the officer report for this application, the fall-back position was completely discounted. No confirmation of the applicants intentions in the event that the planning permission were refused was sought by the LPA. Therefore, the LPA had no evidence to substantiate a claim that the PD route was not a genuine fall-back position, as suggested in the officer report.
- 3.28 In other developments within the same LPA, where there is a fall-back position, this is always considered a significant material consideration (See Appendix 2 for example).
- 3.29 It is also contended that insufficient attention was paid to the assessment of the 'real-life' visual impact of the size, mass and scale of the proposals.
- 3.30 It is clear from a site visit that the western extent of the proposed extension would be virtually invisible from any public vantage point due to the high boundary fencing around the private amenity area to the west.
- 3.31 Furthermore, in views looking northwards along Park Road, the only element visible would be the minimal front projection of the extension.
- 3.32 Looking along Park Road in a southerly direction, the rear of the host dwelling is more visible.
- 3.33 However, the flat roof of the extension would be only marginally visible above the timber boundary fence between No 134 and 136 Park Road neighbour. It would also be lower than the highest points of the existing garage, existing rear extension and existing conservatory, all of which are more visible in this view.
- 3.34 Replacing the combination of the existing pitch-roofed garage (which sits significantly more forward of the building line than the proposal), the pitched-roof rear extension and the pitch-roofed conservatory can only be said to represent a rationalisation and improvement over the existing situation.
- 3.35 Currently this incohesive collection of separate structures dilute the architectural integrity of this characterful property from this viewpoint.
- 3.36 It is contended that the LPA has been overcautious in considering material planning harm. When compared against the existing situation, and the fall-back position, there is no measurable or materially harmful impact upon the character of the area or the host dwelling.
- 3.37 Neither is the extension disproportionate to the host dwelling. No 134 is an imposing Edwardian character property whose dominance in any street scene would be little altered in any public view (or even private view) by the proposed single storey extension.
- 3.38 The LPA has not explained why it considers the extension to be 'excessive'. It is not unlike other single-storey side extensions that

REBUTTAL OF REASON 1

- extend into the rear garden area, or the cumulative impact of the existing extensions.
- 3.39 The officer report suggests that any extension should respect the scale and form of the host property. It is contended that the proposed single storey flat roof extension both respects the scale and form of the host property, especially from any public vantage point, but also through the juxtaposition of old and new.
- 3.40 The contemporary design of the proposals would retain the architectural integrity of the host building. The current incohesive combination of the existing conservatory, rear extension and garage building visually detract from the architecture of the host dwelling.
- 3.41 Furthermore, the proposed floor area of the new extension is similar to the combined existing structures that would be demolished.
- 3.42 Indeed, where it is even more important to retain the architectural integrity of a building, perhaps with listed buildings, a contemporary extension is an often-used solution.
- 3.43 The LPA does not seem to have explained why it considers the extension to be 'cramped'. A suggestion is made in the officer report that the proposed extension will use up the open space between 134 and 136 Park Road. However, with existing structures that already fill this gap in the street scene, it is difficult to understand this criticism. The situation will not be any different as a result of the proposal.
- 3.44 Finally, the reason for refusal considers the proposal to be 'at odds' with the host dwelling. It is contended that there is no policy or supplementary guidance that requires extensions to match the architecture of the original building. Indeed, for more characterful buildings, it is important not to present a pastiche of what has gone before but to provide a contemporary addition that allows the passer-by to understand the sequence of any additions to a building.
- 3.45 Buildings with strong architectural character have nothing to fear from well-designed contemporary additions. The extension is both subservient in scale and character to the large Edwardian dwelling. It will do nothing to detract from its strong architectural character.

4 REBUTTAL OF REASON 2

REBUTTAL OF REASON 2

- 4.1 The LPA contends that the proposed dormer windows, by reason of their siting and introduction of new materials, would result in incongruous additions, at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling, and the character of the wider surroundings.
- 4.2 As above, the fall-back position has, again, been entirely discounted by the LPA as a significant material consideration.
- 4.3 The dormers are proposed to be zinc coated with white window frames.
- 4.4 The LPA considers that the materials used would not 'match' the materials used for the host dwelling and therefore not benefit from permitted development rights.
- 4.5 It is contended, however, that the dark grey of the zinc would emulate the slate grey of the roof tiles whilst the white painted window frames would be the same as those in the ground and first floor.
- 4.6 As such it is the appellants case that the dormer windows do benefit from Class B permitted development rights and will be constructed despite the outcome of this appeal.
- 4.7 Whilst the Inspector is not required to establish whether or not the dormers benefit from permitted development rights, such rights exist because the structures to which they pertain would generally not have a harmful impact upon either the dwellings to which they have been added or the amenity of neighbours.
- 4.8 The architecture of detached Edwardian properties is characterised, amongst other things, by deep pitched roofs. Their proportions are such that their depth usually represents a whole third of the overall height of such dwellings. As such, the roofs of such properties are often dominant features and help create the strong character of Edwardian properties in any street scene.
- 4.9 Adding a single dormer to each roof slope is common in such properties as the large roof cavity lends itself to residential conversion.
- 4.10 The appeal proposal includes a small dormer to the front and two side elevations – three in total. None of these dormers would individually overwhelm any roof slope, nor cumulatively increase the overall bulk of the roof to any materially harmful extent. With rooflines below the main ridge of the host dwelling the dormers would remain, both individually and cumulatively, subservient to the deep main roof of the dwelling.
- 4.11 In addition, in any view from public vantage points, only two of these dormers would be visible.
- 4.12 The officer report suggests that because there are few other dwellings with dormers in the area, the proposals would be out of character with the wider surroundings.
- 4.13 However, this does not take into account the fact that any occupant is able to insert a dormer to their non-principal roof slopes without recourse to the LPA. Neither does it take into account the fact that dormers do exist in the local area, which means that this proposal cannot be considered out of character.
- 4.14 The officer states that because the proposal includes both side and rear dormers, rather than dormers on just one roof slope, it would introduce an alien feature into the area. However, the report does not examine how exactly that would be harmful to the character of the area.
- 4.15 Many of the properties in Park Road display individual, 'alien', features which are not shared by any other property. In Park Road this includes green cladding, light brown timber cladding, projecting front garages, a side conservatory, green tile-hanging, a first floor front balcony, a two-storey flat roof extension. It is exactly as a result

of this diversity within the suburban street scene that a harmonious whole is created. Harmony is not the result of a perceived common type or design of property, nor a set palette of materials, nor a common roof shape or treatment.

- 4.16 As such, as well as benefitting from permitted development, these dormers would not detract from the very mixed character and individual treatments applied to many of the dwellings in Park Road. It is therefore contended that no material harm would be caused as a result of the dormers in the street scene.

5 OTHER MATTERS

OTHER MATTERS

- 5.1 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was required by the LPA at application stage, but not provided.
- 5.2 In order to address this, one has now been completed.
- 5.3 Whilst this showed low potential for bats, a single bat emergence survey is to be carried out.
- 5.4 The results will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as soon as they are available with, if bats are present, a recommendation for an EPS licence for any works to the roof.

6 CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The paragraphs above provide further explanation and justification for the proposals.
- 6.2 Rather than simply use permitted development rights to extend the property in an inferior manner, the appellants approach was to engage a RIBA qualified architect to design the highest quality contemporary single storey extension together with appropriate dormer windows to make the most of the space available for this rapidly growing family.
- 6.3 Understanding that the fall-back position should have been a material consideration of significant weight, the appellants assumed that the LPA would take a reasonable and proactive approach to their much higher quality proposals.
- 6.4 The appellants also assumed that the LPA would engage with them if further justification or explanation was required.
- 6.5 Unfortunately, neither a consideration of the fall-back position nor a reasonable or proactive approach were engaged.
- 6.6 Additionally, the impact of the existing structures in the street scene were not properly compared to the resulting impact of the proposal, nor any improvement that the proposal might bring to the street scene.
- 6.7 Overall, it is contended that the proposals provide high quality contemporary additions to the host dwelling, of a type that are not unexpected in a suburban area.
- 6.8 As such, it is respectfully requested that the Inspector allows the appeal.

7 APPENDIX 1

From: [Harriet Sharma](#)
To: [Louise Cutts](#)
Subject: Fwd: H/23/94953 134 PARK ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1HQ
Date: 31 July 2023 09:36:02
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image214689.png](#)
[image166168.png](#)
[image183978.png](#)
[image515971.png](#)
[image592802.png](#)
[image574911.png](#)

Case officer's response to Architect's letter.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Hei-Tung-Hoh, Dorothy** <Dorothy.Hei-Tung-Hoh@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Date: Fri, 26 May 2023 at 18:32
Subject: RE: H/23/94953 134 PARK ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1HQ
To: Simon Drayson <simon@georgeandjames.co.uk>
Cc: Dominic Hart <dominic@georgeandjames.co.uk>, Customer Service Centre <CustomerServiceCentre@eastleigh.gov.uk>, Harriet Sharma


Hi Simon,

Thank you for your reply, my response is as below:

I appreciate that the locality comprises houses of varying sizes, ages, styles and designs. However, the appearance of other houses would be a neutral consideration in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.

Situated on a corner plot, the proposed developments would be clearly visible from the public domain and the surrounding curtilages of other properties in the vicinity. As such, we have to ensure that the various elements of the design work together harmoniously. In my view, the extent of development would not be sympathetic to the relatively modest scale of the surrounding properties. It was noted from the site visit that there are lack of dormers in the area, thereby the resulting substantially extended roof form would dominate the dwelling and be at odds with the more modest roof forms of the majority of the dwellings in the area. The proposed ground floor extension is also excessively large and would stand completely out of place with the surrounding street scene. This incongruity would be further exacerbated by the used of new materials and its contemporary design.

I acknowledge those other matters that have been advanced in support of the development;

the desire to maximise space and retain a good-sized of amenity space. I am also aware that the proposed additions would result in improvements to the layout of the dwelling to meet living requirements. However, none of these points could justify the harm I have identified above.

Please also be aware that the proposed dormers and ground floor extension/outbuilding could not be constructed under Permitted Development as they need to be material match and cannot exceed certain size limits.

I consider that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), which seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance. It would also be inconsistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

As previously advised, the alterations required to make the application supportable are likely to result in a materially different scheme, and therefore amendments would not be accepted within this current application. I would strongly recommend to withdraw the current application and seek for the pre-application advice. The LPA would then be able to advise whether they are acceptable, and if so which would be preferable.

I note your clients are away until 31st May, I will extend the deadline by 2 weeks from 06/06/2023 to 20/06/2023. I would ask that you discuss these issues with your clients and let me know how they wish to proceed. I will proceed with a refusal unless your clients indicate that they wish to withdraw the application by midday Friday 09/06/2023.

I hope the above is of assistance. Please note all comments are given informally and without prejudice.

Kind regards,

Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh
Planning Officer

Planning & Environment - Planning/Development Management
023 8068 8314



From: Simon Drayson <simon@georgeandjames.co.uk>
Sent: 24 May 2023 13:05
To: Hei-Tung-Hoh, Dorothy <Dorothy.Hei-Tung-Hoh@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Cc: Dominic Hart <dominic@georgeandjames.co.uk>; Customer Service Centre <CustomerServiceCentre@eastleigh.gov.uk>; Harriet Sharma <harriettturner@gmail.com>; sanjeev sharma <sanjs28@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: H/23/94953 134 PARK ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1HQ

Dear Ms Hei-Tung-Hoh,

Please find attached for your attention.

Kind Regards,

Simon Drayson
Director

07538 420 849

George and James Architects Ltd

telephone 0173 088 7287
www.georgeandjames.co.uk

Follow us on: [Instagram](#) [Facebook](#) [Linkedin](#) [Pinterest](#)



Please consider the environment before printing this email

The content of this message is confidential. If you have received it by mistake, please inform us by an email reply and then delete this message. It is forbidden to copy, forward, or in any way reveal the contents of this message to anyone. The integrity and security of this email cannot be guaranteed over the Internet. Therefore, the sender will not be held liable for any damage caused by the message.

On Fri, May 19, 2023 at 6:44 PM Hei-Tung-Hoh, Dorothy <Dorothy.Hei-Tung-Hoh@eastleigh.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Dominic,

Following discussion with the senior officers, we all share an opinion that the size and design of the proposed developments are not considered to be sympathetic to the existing property and the character of the locality. In particular, the application property is one of the most historic building in Chandler's Ford and sits within a corner plot that the front and side elevations are highly visible from the road. As such, the contemporary design of the extended dwelling would appear out of place and harm the street scene.

Also, it is noted that each of the elements will cumulatively contribute to what is a fairly sizeable increase in floorspace and therefore we are not entirely convinced of the property can still maintain a good sized area of private amenity space. It might not accord with the Council's standard for a private amenity area of a minimum size equivalent to 60% of the floor area of the dwellinghouse.

The alterations required to make the application supportable are likely to result in a materially different scheme, and therefore amendments would not be accepted within this current application. In terms of moving forward, I would strongly recommend to withdraw the current application and apply for pre-application advice or a new application. Where a previous application has been withdrawn, no fee is payable for a single revised application as long as it is of the same character and on the same site as the earlier application, submitted by the same applicant, and it is submitted within 12 months of the original application received date. If you choose to withdraw and resubmit, the resubmission can be made via the planning portal and at the fee payment stage you can choose a fee exemption option for resubmissions.

The application determination deadline is currently due 06/06/2023. I would appreciate if you could advise whether you wish to receive a refusal, or alternatively, you may wish to withdraw the application by midday Friday 26/05/2023. If I do not hear from you I will proceed with a refusal.

Kind regards,

Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Planning Officer

Planning & Environment - Planning/Development Management

023 8068 [8314](tel:02380688314)



Eastleigh Borough Council | Eastleigh House | Upper Market Street | Eastleigh | SO50 9YN

From: Hei-Tung-Hoh, Dorothy <Dorothy.Hei-Tung-Hoh@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 May 2023 15:20
To: Dominic Hart <dominic@georgeandjames.co.uk>
Cc: Simon Drayson <simon@georgeandjames.co.uk>; Customer Service Centre <CustomerServiceCentre@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: H/23/94953

Hi Dominic,

Thank you for your email.

I will give you an update once the consultation period is over.

Regards,

Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Planning Officer

Planning & Environment - Planning/Development Management

023 8068 [8314](tel:02380688314)



Eastleigh Borough Council | Eastleigh House | Upper Market Street | Eastleigh | SO50 9YN

This email is subject to recording and/or monitoring. Any content or attachments are for the person to whom it is addressed and may be confidential.

If you get it by mistake, please email us back as soon as possible, and then delete it from your system; please do not pass it on to anyone else or use the information in it.

We do our best to guard against viruses. If you get a virus, we cannot accept liability for any damage.

You should carry out your own virus check before you open attachments.

Eastleigh Borough Council

From: Dominic Hart <dominic@georgeandjames.co.uk>
Sent: 11 May 2023 15:09
To: Hei-Tung-Hoh, Dorothy <Dorothy.Hei-Tung-Hoh@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Cc: Simon Drayson <simon@georgeandjames.co.uk>; Customer Service Centre <CustomerServiceCentre@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: H/23/94953

Dear Dorothy

I am working on 134 PARK ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1HQ and just wanted to touch base to check if everything is clear with the drawings and to see if you require any additional information.

Please do not hesitate to get in touch regarding any queries you may have

kind regards

Dominic Hart
Architectural Assistant

George and James Architects Ltd

telephone 0173 088 7287
www.georgeandjames.co.uk

Follow us on: [Instagram](#) [Facebook](#) [Linkedin](#) [Pinterest](#)



Please consider the environment before printing this email

The content of this message is confidential. If you have received it by mistake, please inform us by an email reply and then delete this message. It is forbidden to copy, forward, or in any way reveal the contents of this message to anyone. The integrity and security of this email cannot be guaranteed over the Internet. Therefore, the sender will not be held liable for any damage caused by the message.

From: [Hei-Tung-Hoh, Dorothy](#)
To: [Louise Cutts](#)
Subject: RE: 134 Park Road, Chandlers Ford
Date: 14 June 2023 14:43:15
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image302573.png](#)
[image675175.png](#)
[image888110.png](#)
[image177481.png](#)
[image841978.png](#)
[image562658.png](#)

Hi Louise,

Thank you for your letter and apologies for not getting back to you sooner.

I have carefully read the letter and considered its contents, and I appreciate your suggestion regarding the removal of the dormer in the scheme. This is considered to be an improvement but removing the dormers alone would not completely mitigate the reasons that I want to refuse the application. I must still express my reservations about the ground floor extension.

The proposed ground floor extension would significantly increase the size of the host dwelling, it would be significantly larger than the host dwelling, would appear out of scale and dominate it. Even though it would be sited to the 'rear', it would still be very visible from the main street. I believe a significant reduction of the ground floor extension is necessary for the application to be supportable.

Lastly, I appreciate your interest in meeting on site, however I had visited the site already and I feel that I have got all the information I need for assessment. If there are specific concerns or updates you would like to discuss, I am more than happy to schedule a virtual meeting at your convenience.

I would appreciate if you could advise whether you wish to withdraw or receive a refusal by midday Friday 16/06/2023. If I do not hear from you, the application will be refused.

Kind regards,

Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Planning Officer

Planning & Environment - Planning/Development Management

023 8068 8314



Eastleigh Borough Council | Eastleigh House | Upper Market Street | Eastleigh | SO50 9YN

This email is subject to recording and/or monitoring. Any content or attachments are for the person to whom it is addressed and may be confidential.

If you get it by mistake, please email us back as soon as possible, and then delete it from your system; please do not pass it on to anyone else or use the information in it.

We do our best to guard against viruses. If you get a virus, we cannot accept liability for any damage.

You should carry out your own virus check before you open attachments.

Eastleigh Borough Council

From: Louise Cutts <LouiseCutts@wessexplanning.com>
Sent: 09 June 2023 13:20
To: Hei-Tung-Hoh, Dorothy <Dorothy.Hei-Tung-Hoh@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: 134 Park Road, Chandlers Ford

Dear Dorothy

I have been instructed to assist the applicants for the extensions at 134 Park Road, Chandlers Ford. I have noted your concerns about their proposals, but, upon close analysis, do not believe that they can be substantiated.

I have attached this analysis in the form of a letter, and hope that you can agree with its contents. My clients have also instructed a 3d model of the extensions, so they can be more easily assessed. However, this model has produced a view that is above eye level and so is for information purposes only. An eye-level view will be forwarded to you imminently. Eye level photographs are included in my letter so that you might better appreciate how the proposals will appear in the street scene.

I would like to arrange a meeting with yourself and the officers with whom you have conferred with if possible. I am away from 17th June for two weeks but am happy to meet either before or after these dates.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Louise Cutts BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI
Director



Meadowsweet Cottage, Morleys Lane, Ampfield SO51 9BJ



Email: louiseCutts@wessexplanning.com

Website: <http://www.wessexplanning.com/>

GEORGE & JAMES

ARCHITECTS

George and James Architects Ltd
The Workshop
Ingram's Green Lane
Mildhurst, GU27 0LJ

Dorothy He-Tung-Hoh
Planning/Development Management
Planning & Environment
Eastleigh Borough Council
Eastleigh House
Upper Market Street
Eastleigh
SO50 9YN

Wednesday 24th May 2023

134 Park Road, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh SO53 1HQ
Your reference: H/23/94953
Our reference: 317

Dear Ms He-Tung-Hoh,

Thank you for your email to my colleague – Dominic Hart – dated 19.05.23. I was going to write to you in any case, having read the consultation responses Mr and Mrs Sharma's neighbours, which your email only reinforces the need to do so.

We will now address each neighbour's comments in turn for your review –

136 Park Road

"It is an overdevelopment of the site and ruins a charming plot containing a double fronted Edwardian house - which is twice as big as mine in its current state. The main reason stated for the extension is to house their mother. Who is an independent lady that is very mobile and able to drive around. She could be easily be housed in the current home with minimal changes. It is a large 4 bedroomed house which has a family of 3. Two adults and a young child - leaving 2 bedrooms spare. It is commercial development that is akin to building a bungalow in their garden and adding an office gym etc and joining it to the main building classes it as an extension. This is overkill to a simple issue of 'housing' their mother. Adding a room in the loft in addition to the proposed extension will provide the property with 6 bedrooms - housing a family of 3 and a mother. Leaving three bedrooms not utilised. Ultimately this home is likely to have the husband and wife living together in a 6-bedroom house and it will be likely at that stage they may want to downsize especially when 4 to 5 bedrooms will not be utilised on a day to day basis. This charming property will be ruined permanently for what is a 'temporary' situation in life most people go through."

Whilst we believe this is not a consideration for planning. For the avoidance of any doubt, whilst Mrs Sharma (senior) is currently in good health, Mr and Mrs Sharma (junior) are looking to future-proof, should Mrs Sharma's (senior) health deteriorate as she ages. Mr and Mrs Sharma (junior) both work from home, and may have further children in the future. Multigeneration living and working from home are both social changes to embrace notwithstanding, as supported by local and national planning policy.

I have walked around the cul de sac that 134 Park Road faces and all the houses are well detached and have the feeling of spaciousness. I look across the road towards 135 Park Road and 137 Park Road property and they too are well detached giving a feeling of spaciousness and attractive greenery. Currently my house - 136 Park Road is well detached from 134 Park Road - by at least 10 to 15 metres. They wish to reduce this space from 15 metres to just 2 meters. This is not acceptable - it is not in character and keeping with the current properties in our immediate vicinity. The extension is proposed to be 3 meters high and run 1 meter away from my fence for approximately 20m alongside my fence. The extension will be overbearing and dominating. It will be approximately 70cm higher than the top of the

windows in my lounge. Currently I sit in my lounge and I can see the sky. My room is well lit with natural light - whilst they at 134 Park Road are maximising the natural light going in their extension they are denying the natural light coming into my lounge. Instead of seeing the sky - I will be seeing the timber cladding from their extension. The height of their extension will also block out the sunlight going into my conservatory. The height of the extension will be approximately two thirds of the height of my house - approximately one meter below the bedroom window sill. It will be an eye sore to other neighbours as well as myself."

The part of the extension which this comment relates to houses Mrs Sharma's (senior) annex. Whilst this is joined to the dwellinghouse for practical reasons, it should be noted that an outbuilding in the same location with the same form and materials would fall under Permitted Development Rights.

"I also object to the windows in the attic overlooking my front garden. They are obtrusive large and not using material that matches the current character of the home. The zinc finish on the Dormer's [sic] in the attic will definitely not be in keeping with current properties in Chandlers Ford. They could just use skylights. In short this extension should not be allowed because it is too large - it is an over development of the current site."

Dormer windows on the rear and side elevations fall under Permitted Development. We have a reduced impact by having them serve non-habitable rooms (namely a landing, dressing room and ensuite), with the only habitable room (the bedroom) having a roof light on the front elevation.

"Whilst the brief says it is to house their mother - who is independent - clearly it is much more than that. It feels like a commercial development. It is essentially a bungalow in its own right but by attaching it to the property classes it as an extension. Otherwise it would be a property within its own right and would have the associated running costs such as council tax. 2. The extension is very large. It is 3 metres tall and will tower over the current fence - block out the light from my lounge. Be two thirds of the height of my property. It is not in character of the current home and will negatively impact the street scene. It is unattractive and will be visible to many neighbours. 3. The height of the extension will block out the sunlight getting into my conservatory 4. Materials used for the extension (timber) do not match the red brick of the current character home. 5. The Dormer [sic] windows project 2 meters out from the roof - they are unattractive - not in keeping of the character or charm of the current property. Adding a zinc finish make the Dormer's [sic] more conspicuous in an unpleasant way. They will also overlook my house invading my privacy and to some extent my immediate neighbours' privacy. The Dormer [sic] facing the back of the house will overlook the garden at 3 Linden Grove - also invading their privacy. 6. The garden space would be significantly reduced currently it commensurate to the size of the property. 7. I also object to the bin store being so close to the boundary between our houses. They could place it away from the boundary. We bought our property because it was well detached and the area was attractive with its greenery - this 'new' building takes this element away from it."

See above.

"Another concern I have is - what's to stop this building from being further extended into a double storey by the current owners at a later stage. Chandler's Ford is a lovely place to live and we are privileged to have some homes with characters and charm - like the double-fronted Edwardian house under question. I believe we need to preserve these homes and stop them from being over-developed. 134 Park Road is a lovely large character property that can that needs to be preserved in its current state and the pleasant street scene maintained. If the current owners must have an extension it would have the least effect on others if it was built either at the back of their house in place of the conservatory or run alongside their back fence. These solutions will not negatively impact the street scene block the light from my lounge windows conservatory or impact the space between my house and theirs. Having a feeling of greenery and space is not only great for the street scene - it also gives the people living or walking in this area a feeling of well-being in general and helps in mental wellbeing of the residents."

For the avoidance of doubt we are not looking to build a two-storey extension, and agree that this would have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties; we would welcome a planning condition prohibiting this to be applied for at a later date. By replacing the conservatory in the middle of the plot with the annex to the rear of the plot (viewed from Linden Grove) we are in fact actively looking to improve the streetscape.

138 Park Road

"I would like the following comments to be considered in relation to the current application. (i) the installation of windows in the roof would allow a dominating perspective from which it would be possible to look down on neighbouring properties including the front and rear gardens of my own property."

As above, dormer windows on the rear and side elevations fall under Permitted Development. We have reassessed this impact by having them serve non-habitable rooms (namely a landing, dressing room and ensuite), with the only habitable room (the bedroom) having a roof light on the front elevation.

"(ii) the rear extension would create a long blank wall which would again be a dominating feature in the street scene and have a detrimental effect on the same."

We presume this refers to the wall behind the proposed Shoes/Coats and Utility/Pantry which faces 134 Park Road; we believe this is no more detrimental to the streetscape than the existing pre-fab garage.

"(ii[i]) the overall development would seriously damage the appearance of a fine example of an Edwardian [sic] villa."

Our clients' house is not Listed nor situated in a Conservation Area; we believe our contemporary extension only enhances the historic fabric of the original building.

3 Linden Grove

"Reasons for Objection: Loss of privacy: This dwelling has a naturally higher roof than most of the surrounding dwellings and by converting the loft and making this a 3 storey house the elevated position of the new top floor windows will project an uninterrupted view directly onto our main amenity area immediately outside our back door where our hot tub and decked area are situated from both the proposed north and west facing dormer windows. Although there is already a west facing window on the second floor the lower height of this means it does not project a view onto our decked area and we can sit down and enjoy our outside space without being overlooked – this would no longer be the case. If the loft conversion windows were skylights instead of dormers or if the windows were above eye height and/or obscure glass and un-opening it would be a solution to this problem. As the north and west dormer windows are for a staircase and dressing room respectively a view is presumably not essential and just be needed as a source of light therefore this need would be met."

As above, dormer windows on the rear and side elevations fall under Permitted Development. We have reassessed this impact by having them serve non-habitable rooms (namely a landing, dressing room and ensuite), with the only habitable room (the bedroom) having a roof light on the front elevation.

"Detrimental impact upon residential amenities: The proposed development does not respect the local context or the scale and proportions of surrounding buildings and would be out of character for this area to the detriment of the local environment and would set a precedent for surrounding dwellings to add large box style extensions. The proposed ground floor extension's appearance is that of an infill dwelling with no consideration given for the appearance and treatment of spaces between and around surrounding buildings. The single storey extension seemingly doubles the footprint of the existing dwelling and its excessive scale, form, design and appearance would result in a sense of enclosure creating an overbearing impact upon the amenities. As stated in the Design and Access Statement (part 1.3 Site Constraints, Opportunities and Access) the dwelling to the north (136 Park Road) has a conservatory and two ground floor windows close to the bordering fence and it is acknowledged that the proposed extension needs to be set back to avoid an issue (the specific issue is not addressed however). The position of the proposed extension is not significantly set back and together with its 3m height and timber cladding would give the appearance of a 3m fence or a view similar to a row of containers resulting in a very poor view, overshadowing and probable loss of light to the neighbouring dwelling made more impactful given the neighbouring dwelling is to the north. It would effectively look like an unsightly 3m high fence stretching the length of the site also visible to us and other surrounding neighbours. As detailed in 1.4 Site Context of the Design and Access Statement the example houses given as exceptions to the more typical surrounding houses do not support the proposed features of this proposed extension in fact they just confirm that they too are typical houses traditionally built with plenty of surrounding space and of only two storeys in height. I have not been able to determine the distance between the proposed ground floor extension and the two adjacent dwellings as it is not detailed in the plans but in this low density area the proposed development does not fit in with other houses in the street."

As above, the part of the extension which this comment relates to houses Mrs Sharma's (senior) annexe. Whilst this is joined to the dwellinghouse for practical reasons, it should be noted that an outbuilding in the same location with the same form and materials would fall under Permitted Development Rights. And furthermore, our clients' house is not Listed nor situated in a Conservation Area; we believe our contemporary extension only enhances the historic fabric of the original building.

"The design with its substantial dimensions is not in keeping with the host dwelling which is a charming and characterful period property. The zinc roof is at odds with the current slate roof and the timber cladding is at odds with the brick construction of the host dwelling and the box shaped rear extension creates an unsympathetic and unharmonious addition."

Meta dormer windows are a traditional detail on Edwardian properties; with lead being prohibitively expensive and hazardous to work with, we are proposing zinc which is more affordable and non-hazardous. Furthermore the green roof will enhance the streetscape and add to the streets biodiversity.

"The final overall size of this property would be significantly bigger than the space needed to house one additional (elderly) family member and there is risk that the property could quite comfortably house 10-12 people with the 5 proposed bedrooms plus other rooms which could easily be converted to bedrooms in the future. This could potentially create parking issues and the 3 suggested car parking spaces could become inadequate resulting in congestion in the surrounding roads or the front garden becoming a car park reducing significantly the amount of green space."

As above, whilst we believe this is not a consideration for planning. For the avoidance of any doubt, whilst Mrs Sharma (senior) is currently in good health, Mr and Mrs Sharma (junior) are looking to future-proof, should Mrs Sharma's (senior) health deteriorate as she ages. Mr and Mrs Sharma (junior) both work from home, and may have further children in the future. Multi-generational living and working from home are both social changes to embrace not resist, as supported by local and national planning policy. Furthermore the number of proposed parking spaces meet Eastleigh's Residential Parking Standards.

We note that 137 Park Road fully support our proposals, which seek to create a modern, contemporary addition to a traditional house, and trust you have taken these neighbouring opinion into account.

Regarding the further comments raised in your email –

We note that whilst our clients' house is indeed historic, it is not Listed nor situated in a Conservation Area. For the avoidance of doubt the front elevation (with the front door) faces Paulson Close whereas the side elevation (with the garage door) faces Park Road. We therefore consider the front elevation facing Paulson Close to affront the principal highway.

Whilst we do not dispute that we are seeking to increase floorspace, both the existing and proposed conditions far exceed the minimum of 60%:

	Existing (m ²)	Proposed (m ²)
Site		
Developed	154	214
Undeveloped	618	558
Total	772	772
Dwellinghouse		
Ground Floor	112	214
First Floor	86	86
Second Floor	0	29
Conservatory	19	0
Garage	23	0
Total	240 (258%)	329 (170%)

We disagree with your statement that the required alterations will result in a materially different scheme, and we believe your suggestion to withdraw and resubmit rather than work with us on this goes against the spirit of proactive and collaborative working as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

In light of yours and the neighbours' comments, we would be willing to submit revised drawings, and keen to have a conversation with you about how they might need to look to be acceptable to you and your senior colleagues. We are not proposing any changes to the oft-conversion unless advised, as we believe this is compliant with both local and national planning policy.

Please note our clients are away from 24.05.23 to 31.05.23, so we suggest a week's extension of time is reasonable. I am available on my mobile between 9am and 6pm Monday to Friday to discuss further.

Yours sincerely,



Simon Drayson
07538 420 849
simon@georgeandjames.co.uk

CC:
Sanjeev and Harriet Sharma (Applicant)
Dominic Hart (George and James Architects)

Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh
Development Management
Eastleigh Borough Council
Eastleigh House
Upper Market Street
Eastleigh
SO50 9YN

09 June 2023

Wessex Planning Ltd
Meadowsweet Cottage
Morleys Lane
Ampfield
Romsey
SO51 9BJ
louisecutts@wessexplanning.com

Dear Dorothy

Planning Application for Ground Floor and Loft Extension at 134 Park Road, Chandlers Ford

I have been instructed by my client, Mr Sharma, to address your comments and proposed refusal of the above planning application.

I consider that there has been a misreading of my clients' proposals for his home. In order to progress discussions, I have instructed my clients' architects to produce a three-dimensional model so that the Local Planning Authority is better able to assess the proposals for the extension of this property.

As the LPA will be aware, this property is an imposing detached Edwardian dwelling whose aspect is side-on to Park Road, facing Paulson Close. Its architecture is well-recognised as typical of its era and its overall height, the double frontage with full height bays, sash windows, and recognisable roof shape domineer the street scape in a manner that more recent development within the area does not. The strength of character in Edwardian architecture is very strong and not easily diluted through extensions.

On the dwelling's boundaries along Park Road and most of the Paulson Close is a replacement 1.5m timber fence with trellis above. However, to the side of the property (its private amenity area) there is a 1.8m high replacement timber fence with trellis above. Importantly this makes the area to the west of the property completely invisible in the street scene.



It is very important to note that, whilst useful, Google Street View photographs are taken at 2.5m (8.2 feet) above ground level. As such they do not represent a realistic view.

I have therefore included up-to-date photographs of the site within this letter. These have been taken today at a more realistic 1.65m above ground level.



The requirement for a full and proper consideration of site context cannot be underestimated in the formulation of a well-constructed overall planning assessment.

Unfortunately, it appears that the consideration to date has been one-dimensional and focused on the plans only rather than the real-life appearance of the proposals within the street scene.

In considering the **single storey extension**, a one-dimensional view of the plan may well elicit a confused initial response, as the extension does 'look' (on plan) to be quite large. However, when faced with such a seemingly bold expanse of built form, as a professional planner one must question the rationale of the architect, as there is usually a very good explanation as to why such a design has been proposed.

In this case, one does not need to concern oneself with the western side of the single storey extension when one views the dwelling from Paulson Close, as the extension is clearly invisible situated behind the 1.8m high garden fence and at some distance (see photo below taken at 1.65m above ground level).



Neither does the extension, located 'behind' the dwelling in this view cause any concern as, of course, the dwelling itself hides the extension in this view (see photograph below taken at 1.65m from ground level).



The only view that requires assessment, in relation to the single storey extension in terms of material planning impact is the street scene within Park Road itself. As you will be aware, there is a large, long, white-painted garage which, together with an existing, white-painted single-storey extension, presents a stark and ugly expanse of built form to the street (see photograph below taken at 1.65m above ground level).



To remove the existing white painted garage and replace this with the proposed dark-stained timber clad extension can only be considered vast improvement in, rather than a detriment to, the street scene.

Not only does the proposed extension, in this view, reduce both the protuberance and the prominence of the existing garage in the street scene along Park Road, but the timber clad extension is significantly more in character with the burnt orange coloured brick used on many of the dwellings in the area, the dark grey and dark brown tones of the roof tiles in the area, the existing timber cladding on the dwelling directly located directly opposite, and the myriad light and dark stained timber boundary fences in the area.



Indeed, if a timber coloured cladding can be allowed on the dwelling opposite and even a green coloured timber cladding allowed at No 141 Park Road (see photograph below), then a small single storey side extension clad in timber must surely be considered acceptable. The remainder of the extension simply cannot be seen from any public vantage point. It is therefore impossible for these parts of the extension to have any materially detrimental impact upon the street scene, or the character of the area. To consider otherwise would be unreasonable.



In relation to the proposed dormer windows on the side and rear elevations, such dormers are a very common addition to an Edwardian property as such properties have deep roofs with significant pitches which means that a loft conversion is a popular choice. I attach some examples below but here are many more to refer to.



You appear to also have stated that there are no examples of dormer windows in the area, which is, I'm afraid, incorrect. A cursory walk or drive around the area reveals several dormer roof extensions e.g.

4 Paulson Close – direct neighbours to the rear of 134 Park Road



71 Merdon Ave (another Edwardian property nearby)



75 Merton Avenue (another Edwardian property on a corner plot nearby)



116 Park Road



Again, I believe that the one dimensional plans have been misread or misunderstood. The dormers on each roof slope are subservient to the main roof and finish below the ridge line. In historical terms the design and proportions are both appropriate, and it would be unreasonable to suggest otherwise. If the dormers had been designed in during construction, they would have been constructed in lead, amongst other materials. Zinc is a good impersonator and is therefore eminently suitable as a dormer material.

In order to assist you with the proper assessment of these dormer windows, the three dimensional plan is helpful. It can be seen from this plan that the dormers are neither over dominant of the streetscape, nor out of character with this age of property or the character of the area.

Finally, No 134 Park Road is not in a conservation area, nor a special character area, nor in an area subject to a character appraisal. Whilst high quality design cannot be precluded in areas outside these designations, such design must be considered with proper regard to the site's context. In this case this means considering what the 'character of the area' actually consists of (including materials used), which part of the proposal will be seen from public vantage points and therefore potentially have any impact upon that character, and only then, a consideration of the impact of the proposal upon that character. Precedent must also be considered and there are numerous examples (as can easily be demonstrated from using Google Maps) of much larger extensions to properties in this, and the wider Chandlers Ford area.

In my view there is no reasonable justification for a refusal of planning permission, especially in light of the above evidence.

I also understand that you have discussed the proposal with your manager. However, it would be very useful to understand if your manager has visited the site and therefore has a proper appreciation of site context. If not, or in any case, I would suggest a meeting is held on site to discuss the proposals further.

Notwithstanding the above, more detailed, justification for the proposed extensions and dormers, my client is willing to consider removal of the dormers from this application if the LPA reasonably consider this to be necessary, and also to consider a planning condition requiring the colour of the timber stain for the single storey extension to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to construction. Whilst my clients would prefer to retain the dormers within the application, they could be the subject of a separate application at a later date. In terms of priority, a planning permission for the single storey extension is essential due to immediate family circumstances including an elderly relative requiring care and the imminent arrival of another child.

If you could please confirm whether you consider it reasonable to request the removal of the dormers from this application, I would be most grateful. My client is happy to agree to a further extension of time to allow your further consideration of amended plans, but there is most certainly no need to request a withdrawal of this application and the resubmission of a separate, new application on this basis.

Your early comments would be much appreciated.

Yours sincerely



Louise Cutts BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Director
Wessex Planning Ltd



DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/22/94056

Site Address: 117 HIGH STREET, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3DY

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Two storey side/rear extension. Single storey front extension. Alterations to fenestrations

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within Urban Edge Within Built Up Established Area HRA Screening Criteria – River, SAC, SPA and Ramsar Southern Water 2m Buffer		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Reference	Description	Decision
Z/29686/001/00	Construction of garage	Permit – 17/02/1992

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
West End Parish Council:	No Objection		
Ecology:	<u>Comments on Preliminary Roost Assessment received 04/01/23:</u> I have reviewed the Preliminary Roost Assessment by Arbtech (December 2022). The buildings have been assessed as having negligible bat roost suitability and no further surveys are needed. The biodiversity enhancement recommendations of a minimum of one bat box on the southeast elevation just below the soffit and a swift nest box on the northwest elevation are sound and should be implemented. The rear garden has been reported as being bare ground so this would be a good opportunity to enhance the garden and plant flowering and fruiting native trees, shrubs and hedges to attract pollinators including moths as food for bats and birds. Please could you add the following informative to the decision notice: In the unlikely event of any bats being found during demolition or construction, all work must stop immediately, and Natural England must be informed. Additional information is available on the Bat Conservation Trust website at https://www.bats.org.uk/advice/imworking-on-a-building-with-bats/ive-found-a-bat-during-works. <u>Comments on site visit photos received 30/11/22:</u> I have reviewed the site visit photos. The soffits appear to be intact, although this area is dark in colour and it was not a sunny day, so any gaps would not be clear. There are still slipped roof tiles in several locations and some gaps in the walls which could be used by bats or nesting birds. A preliminary bat roost assessment is required. The ecologist should also recommend appropriate locations for biodiversity enhancements in their report. <u>Initial comments received 21/11/22:</u>		

	The extension roof is set back in the front but continuous with the main roof at the rear. There are records of bats, breeding swifts and hedgehogs in the vicinity. From the photos of the house on Google Maps I can see some raised or slipped roof tiles at the front and side elevations, but this image is dated 2012. I need to review current close up photos of the roof and any areas that would be affected by the extensions to determine whether further surveys will be required. A precautionary working method for hedgehogs must be followed: If hedgehogs are using the site they would be sheltering under dense vegetation or within long grass, dead leaves, or piles of dead wood. These areas should be cleared by hand, not using a digger, to allow animals time to escape. Removal of potential habitat must not take place from November through March when animals may be hibernating. No fires can be lit on site. During construction any excavations or open pipes must be covered at night or fitted with a small mammal escape ramp (a rough board slanted at a shallow angle) to prevent hedgehogs from becoming trapped. If hedgehogs are found they should not be handled but be left to move away on their own to a place of shelter. If a hedgehog is found during development and/or there are welfare concerns, the British Hedgehog Preservation Society can be contacted for advice and guidance on 01584 890 801. Biodiversity enhancements are required. This property may be suitable for a bat box and/or a swift nest box. Built-in boxes/bricks are preferred as they do not require maintenance and cannot fall off.
Southern Water Services:	No objection – It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works. An investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 30/11/2022		

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 Surroundings</u>

The application site contains a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot on the junction of High Street and Moorgreen Road. The property features a ground to first floor bay window, white rendered walls, recessed porch and a hipped roof, set within a triangular plot. This property forms part of three pairs of semi-detached houses that are similar in appearance with some of these dwellings featuring single storey side and rear extensions. The wider surrounding area is residential in nature, made up of two storey dwellings to the north and west and a block of residential flats to the south and to the east. The surrounding dwellings are mixed in age and character.

Proposal

This application seeks permission for a two storey side extension, a single storey front extension which would comprise a modest entrance hall/porch and 2no. rooflights to the front elevation and 3no. to the rear elevation in order to provide habitable accommodation within the roof space. This would be finished in materials that would match the existing.

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 two storey side extension, single storey front extension and roof lights are suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The proposed side extension would have a hipped roof and would be set down from the main ridge of the host dwelling as well as set back from the principal elevation resulting in a subservient addition that mirrors the design feature of the property.
- The proposed single storey front extension would extend beyond the principle-built line of the host dwelling projecting a modest 2.1m into the front garden. However, the application site is set well back from the road with a generous front and side garden, the site would still retain the open aspect to its frontage with the front extension in place. Additionally, significant weight needs to be given as to what can be carried out under permitted development (Class D) without the need for formal planning permission. The dimensions for the proposed porch fall slightly over the Class D regulations, which is a material consideration and therefore the proposed porch is acceptable.
- The development would be visible from the street scene and it is acknowledged the proposal would unbalance the semi-detached pair. However, it was noted on the site visit, the immediate dwellings have been extended to the side albeit at single storey level. It is considered this proposed side extension at two storey level would blend in sympathetically within the street scene and would not cause significant material harm to the surrounding area.
- As noted, both the side and front extensions are considered subservient/modest additions. This is further reinforced by the usage of matching materials ensuring the proposal would be respectful to the character of the host dwelling and immediate properties.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site and sufficient amenity space would remain.

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 proposed side extension would project 3.8m closer to the neighbour to the north, no.1 Moorgreen Road and there would be a separation distance of 7.8m. Due to this separation distance and existing relationship, the proposal is not considered to result in an adversely harmful impact upon the amenities of this neighbouring property. Further, it is noted that there is 1no. window at first floor level on the neighbouring property. The proposal would have front and rear windows which would look directly onto the application site and no side elevation windows proposed and as such, there would be no concern with regards to overlooking or loss of privacy.

Highway Safety and Parking

- The application proposes an additional bedroom, resulting in a 4no. bedroom dwellinghouse which would require 3no. off-street parking spaces as set out in the Residential Parking Standards SPD. The required spaces will be accommodated within the site curtilage and accords with the SPD.

Ecology

- Owing to the nature of the development, the Council's Ecologist was consulted upon. Initially they advised that the site was in close proximity to bat roosts and following a review of the site visit photos, the Ecologist requested a preliminary bat roost assessment.
- The Arbtech – Preliminary Roost Assessment – 117 High Street, West End, Southampton, SO30 3DY was received on 23 December 2022. The Council's Ecologist has reviewed this and is content with the measures set out. As such, it is recommended that this be secured via condition. In addition, biodiversity enhancements are recommended to be included by way of informative.

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:

This application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐