

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/23/96245

Site Address: 60 RUSKIN ROAD, EASTLEIGH, SO50 4JX

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Single rear extension with flat roof, front porch extension and alterations to fenestration

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within Urban Edge Within Established Residential Area EBC Owned Land Southern Water Sewers 2m Buffer – Foul Sewer		

Planning History	Yes ☐	No ☒
The site has no planning history		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None received		
Boyatt Wood Parish Council:	No comments received		
Asset Management:	No objection		
Southern Water Services:	It appears that the developer is intending to build close to a public foul sewer which is crossing the site. Building over a “public sewer” is not normally permitted by Southern Water. An investigation of the sewer is required to confirm its size and depth, ascertain its condition, number of properties served and potential means of access before any decision can be made as to whether it would be acceptable for Southern Water to allow building close to the sewer. In order to protect drainage apparatus, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following condition is attached to the planning permission: Prior to the commencement of the development, the developer must advise the local authority, in consultation with Southern Water, of measures which will be undertaken to protect the public sewers. Reason: To protect public sewers		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visits carried out 07/12/2023		

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 Appraisals.

Assessment:

Site and Surroundings

The application site contains a semi-detached, two storey dwelling with a front/side bay window and porch located on the south eastern side of Ruskin Road. The property is set back from the road by a front garden laid to gravel and a hardstanding driveway and there is side access to the rear garden containing two sheds. The surrounding area is residential in nature and features similar style properties, some of which have front/side bay windows, resulting in a fairly strong character within the locality.

Proposal

This application seeks approval for a flat roofed single storey rear extension, a front porch extension and alterations to the existing fenestration which would replace a ground floor side facing window on the north eastern elevation with a door to create access to a newly created utility room.

The proposed single storey rear extension would see the removal of an existing rear conservatory and W.C. It would be set in from the boundary shared with no. 58 and would measure approximately 5.8m in length, 8m in width and 3.2m in height. The extension would be served by 1no. window and a set of bi-fold doors (both anthracite polyester powder coated) to the proposed rear elevation and 1no. rooflight and would be finished in white render.

The proposed front porch extension looks to infill the recess between the existing porch and bay window and would not project any further into the front garden. This would have a mono-pitched roof extending to the bay window, a new entrance door with a full-length panel window and would be finished in materials that would match the host dwelling.

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 Boyatt Wood where the principle of development is acceptable.

Design and Layout

- The design of the single storey rear extension, front porch extension and alterations to the existing is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The single storey element, while relatively large in depth, would be sited to the rear and would not be visible within the public realm. It would extend slightly beyond the rear-built line of the neighbour, however, it has been noted there are fairly sizeable rear extensions within this section of Ruskin Road. Therefore, the proposed rear extension would be in keeping within the locality.
- It is acknowledged the introduction of white render and anthracite fenestration to the rear extension is not currently found on the host dwelling, however, due to the location of the extension and that white render is found within the wider surroundings, the use of this material is not considered to detract from the property or the character area.
- The proposed front porch extension is considered to be a modest addition. The host dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair and it is noted the porch extension would alter the principal elevation and slightly unbalance the semi-detached pair. However, no. 58 has also altered its frontage and there is already an existing imbalance. Moreover, nos. 63 and 65 also have similar porch extensions that are akin to the proposal in this application. Therefore, it is considered the porch extension does not cause detrimental harm to the pair of dwellings nor to the character area.

- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site, would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards as no additional bedrooms are proposed.

Residential Amenity

- The neighbour most impacted as a result of the proposal would be the adjoining neighbour, no. 58. This neighbour has a single storey rear extension that would be closest to the proposed rear extension. The Quality Places SPD sets out a 45-degree daylighting test for primary windows to neighbouring properties, noting that if a development crosses the 45-degree line on both the elevation and floor plan then the extension will probably cause a noticeable reduction in skylight received by the window.
- In the case of the conservatory doors to no. 58 (closest to the extension), the proposal only crosses the 45-degree line on the floor plan and as such passes the daylighting test. Additionally, the rear of no. 58 is south-east facing and is expected to still receive a good amount of light during the day with the development in place.
- The extension proposes windows and doors to the rear elevation only which would directly face the rear garden to the application site and therefore does not generate any overlooking or loss of privacy concerns.
- The majority of the rear extension would mostly be screened from nos. 58 and 62 by the boundary fence enclosing the rear garden and when considering the abovementioned factors, this element is not expected to adversely impact upon the adjoining neighbours.
- The proposed front porch extension, as mentioned would infill a recess which would not result in any built form projecting closer to neighbours. As such, this element of the proposal would not impact upon the nearby neighbours.
- Therefore, 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.

Other Material Considerations

- The proposed extension would be sited over a public foul sewer. Southern Water were consulted upon and they requested a pre-commencement condition whereby the applicant must submit a build over application. The applicant has agreed to this condition via email.
- 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.

The NPPF aims for the need for housing to be met, and policy S2 of the Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. 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 and is expected to reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

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 ☐