

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT:**Application Ref:** H/23/95399**Site Address:** BURLAIR, BOTLEY ROAD, HORTON HEATH, EASTLEIGH, SO50 7DQ**Case Officer:** Clare Martin**Description:** Two storey rear extensions. Interior and elevational changes. Alterations to fenestration.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☐	No ☒
Details:		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
H/21/91402 - Rear extension and raising roof line to form accommodation over and elevational alterations – Refused (Nov 2021) & dismissed on appeal.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Ecology Officer:	<u>No objection (14/8/23)</u> I have reviewed the photos and don't see any potential bat roost features or habitat for amphibians, reptiles or hedgehogs. 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 called. 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>Previous Comments (31/7/23)</u> There are records of bats nearby and the proposal involves extensive works to the roof. This site is in an amber impact risk zone for great crested newts and there are records of slow worms, common toads, common lizards and hedgehogs in the vicinity. Scoreys Copse Meadow SINC is nearby but would not be impacted by this proposal. I have seen the site photos on-line but need to review close-up photos of the roof, flashings, soffits, existing windows and fascia to determine whether a survey will be required. The garden does not appear to have any potential to support common amphibians and reptiles or hedgehogs. Biodiversity enhancements will be required. A bat brick and a swift brick may be appropriate for this building. Planting flowering plants or shrubs for pollinators and openings in the baseboards of closed board fencing for hedgehogs would also be enhancements. Consultation response provides further guidance on ecology enhancements.		
Parish Council:	No objection		
Southern Water	No objection - General advice provided.		

Esso Pipeline	No works should be undertaken until advice has been sought from Fisher German
---------------	---

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out on 25/7/23		

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 Appraisals.

Assessment:
Principle The site is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the details according with the relevant planning policies. Character and Appearance The current property is a modest detached chalet bungalow, of a simple design with a long front to rear gable and a smaller single storey side garage and rear projection. While there is a notable variation in the scale, proportions and design of dwellings along Botley Road, the property itself sits neatly within a handful of smaller dwellings of fairly traditional designs. The scale of the existing chalet bungalow providing a comfortable transition between the small bungalow to the north (Les Claire) and the chalet dwelling to the south (Conifer). The proposal is a resubmission of a previous scheme, which was designed with three overlapping gables and formed a large two storey dwelling extending across the width of the plot and 6m to the rear. The application was refused due to its impact on the character and appearance of the house and wider locality. The scheme was subsequently dismissed on appeal with The Planning Inspector considering that <i>"the extent of development would not be sympathetic to the relatively modest scale of the existing chalet bungalow and those properties to either side. The cumulative impact of the mass and bulk at first floor level, together with the substantial triple gable features, would appear dominant and obtrusive within the context of the local street scene (para 6)."</i>

The current proposal has been redesigned so it maintains both the existing two storey gable (albeit increased in height) and the second lower ridge running north to south with a smaller single storey extension replacing the existing side garage. The design approach at the front is an improvement on the previous refused application as retains some elements of the character of the existing dwelling and no longer stretches the entire width of the plot at a two storey level.

However, the amount of accommodation contained within the first floor of the dwelling is still extensive comprising four bedrooms, a bathroom, ensuite, dressing area and enclosed balconies. The result is a property with very deep and bulky two storey side elevations, with the large front to rear gable end dominating the existing smaller sections of the property. Further bulk is added by the addition of two extensive flat roof sections, which sit behind the main ridge. These flat roof sections extend the first-floor outwards and would appear as two boxes attached to either side of the large gable end. It is considered that the design, massing and scale of the proposed development would not be sympathetic to the existing chalet bungalow.

Furthermore, the bulky side extension would be visible from Botley Road as there are large spacing between properties allowing more visibility of the dwellings. The enlarged dwelling would appear dominant and obtrusive compared to the more modest scale of the adjoining properties and out of keeping with the context of the local street scene.

Residential Amenity

The two storey dwelling will extend 4m past the rear of the existing single storey extension and so be visible from both of the adjoining properties. However, there is good spacing between the property and neighbouring dwellings who have a reasonably open view to the rear. As such the proposal is not considered to unacceptably harm the outlook or daylight of the neighbouring properties.

The property's main windows are located at the front and rear where there is no significant overlooking. The only first floor windows serves a bathroom and could reasonably be conditioned as obscure glazed had the application been recommended for permission. As such the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact upon the privacy of the neighbouring dwellings.

Other Material Considerations

- The development would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards.
- Photos have been provided which don't demonstrate any potential bat roost features or habitat for amphibians, reptiles or hedgehogs No objection has been raised by the Ecology Officer. There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention.
- There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

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 ...