

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/100490

Site Address: 49 NICHOL ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5AX

Case Officer: Katie Lasham

Description: Two storey front extension with single storey front canopy and single storey ground and first floor rear extension

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the urban edge Within SSSI Impact Risk Zones TPO Trees Protected species within the vicinity		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
At application site: Z/07099/004/00: Single storey rear extension. Approved April 1980. 47 Nichol Road: H/17/81877: Two storey side and single storey rear extensions and porch. Approved January 2018.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	One representation submitted in support has been received raising the following points: Rear gardens are long so neighbour does not anticipate any impact on their property.		
Parish Council:	No Comment		
Ecology	Ecology response 31/12/2025: Requested close-up photos of dwelling / roof be provided as there are records of bats, hedgehogs and water shrews very close to the site with common toads and slow worms records also nearby. Ecology response 21/01/2026: The site photos show there are several potential bat roost features in the areas affected by the proposal and suitable habitat for hedgehogs in the garden. A preliminary roost appraisal is therefore required. Ecology response 19/02/2026: The submitted preliminary roost appraisal prepared by Vesper Conservation and Ecology Limited (Feb 26) shows there is negligible bat roost potential. The officer also requires the proposal to ensure safe working practices are carried out to preserve the surrounding wildlife. Biodiversity enhancements are to be provided.		
Trees	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have been submitted. No objection to impact on the TPO trees subject to full compliance with the submitted documents.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 14 January 2026		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM11 and DM14.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals; Trees and Development; Biodiversity.

Assessment:Summary of site and proposal

The application site is set within a residential area of Chandlers Ford, with Nichol Road comprising a wide variety of architectural styles and scales of properties including examples of traditional and contemporary designs. No.49 is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse and is located in proximity of the junction where Randall Road meets Nichol Road, making this a prominent dwelling within the street scene. Whilst scale and style of dwellings vary, Hiltingbury Road West Character Area Appraisal recognises the character of the road comprises uniform building lines and it seeks for development proposals to ensure the existing building line along street frontages are respected.

No.49 is a detached two-storey dwelling comprising 4-bedrooms and benefits from off-road parking to the site frontage. A large rear garden comprises several mature trees, all of which have TPO protection.

The proposal comprises the erection of a two-storey front extension including a single storey extension for the garage and a front canopy as well as a single storey ground and first floor rear extension. The proposal will not increase the number of bedrooms proposed, with the first-floor increase in footprint creating a larger stairway landing and a larger principal bedroom. The ground floor increase in footprint will reconfigure the whole ground floor and create space for a large open plan living area, a WC, a utility, gym and music room. A Preliminary Roost Assessment and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have all been submitted in support of this proposal.

Principle of development

The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, in accordance with Policy S2 of the Local Plan.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

Policy DM1 of the Local Plan requires all development to respect and where possible enhance the character and appearance of the area, taking full account of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

The application proposes a two-storey gabled front extension set to the centre of the front elevation, where the roof eaves align with the eaves of the host dwelling and extends up to the ridge line of the host dwelling too, not offering any subservience from the ridge line, creating a large expanse of built form to the site frontage. The front gable extends out from the front building line by two metres. Despite being a large extension on a prominent part of the dwelling, the road comprises many examples of large gables to front elevations, including the neighbouring dwelling at no.47 Nichol Road, as such this addition would not appear unduly out of keeping. Hiltingbury Character Area Appraisal explains that development should respect the existing front building line and whilst the proposal will create new built form at two-storey level extending out from the existing front building line, the increase in depth being 2metres is not considered so detrimental as to significantly harm the character of the area. Furthermore, whilst the gable is set forward of the front building

line, it is not the full width of the house that is set to extend forward, allowing for some of the front building line to remain aligned with the existing front building line of dwellings along this road, offering some relief and break in the massing to this front elevation.

The glazing proposed to the gable will appear more contemporary in its design however within the context of a wide range of architectural designs and styles of dwellings, the proposed fenestration is an acceptable addition.

The single-storey front extension to the garage and canopy are also acceptable to ensure the design of the front extension does not unduly harm the character of the area, with the canopy also offering visual interest to the property. The proposal also includes the loss of one chimney which will not impact the visual amenity of the area.

The rear first floor extension is not prominently visible from the street scene and is set down from the ridge line of the main dwelling and as such is an acceptable addition as to not impact the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the single-storey flat roof rear extension is not visible from the street scene and accordingly safeguards the visual amenity of the area.

Due to the front extension impacting some of the front forecourt used for existing parking, there is a modest reduction in the soft landscaping to allow for continued ease of vehicle movements. This modest alteration is not considered harmful, with the proposed block plan showing the retention of soft landscaping to the site frontage, as is characteristic of this road.

Materials shown on the proposed elevation plan indicate that the walls will comprise brick work to match the existing dwelling and render. Roof tiles are proposed to be tiled slate and windows and doors are to be uPVC grey. With no uniformity of materials along this road, the proposed materials are acceptable to not unduly harm the surrounding area.

Overall, the design and layout respect the character and appearance of the locality as the proposal is not considered an overdevelopment of the plot and will appear as a suitable addition to the dwelling within the context of the wider street scene, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Local Plan.

Impact on residential amenity

Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF and Policy DM1 of the Local Plan requires all development to preserve the amenity of neighbouring residents and where possible enhance it to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

No.47 Nichol Road

No.47 is located to the south side of the application site. The proposed single-storey rear extension is considered an appropriate scale and a sufficient distance away from no.47 as to not significantly harm the residential amenity of this neighbouring unit. The proposed first floor rear extension and two-storey front extension are set sufficiently far away from this neighbour to ensure their amenity is preserved in all regards. Furthermore, there are no new windows proposed on the south side elevation, ensuring their privacy is maintained.

No.51 Nichol Road

No.51 is located to the north side elevation of the dwelling. The proposed first-floor rear extension is in proximity of this neighbouring dwelling. Due to the separation distances between the two dwellings and there being no side windows at first floor level on the affected side of no.51, the proposed first floor extension is acceptable to not create undue harm on their residential amenity by way of overbearing impacts, loss of light or overshadowing in this regard. A 45-degree line measurement from the rear windows of no.51 has been undertaken and demonstrates that there will be no harmful loss of light by way of the proposed rear first floor extension. The proposed rear window serving the principal bedroom

which extends further out into the garden area remains in a similar location to that of the existing rear window and is not considered to create significantly harmful loss of privacy or overlooking onto the neighbouring private garden space of no.51.

The two-storey front extension set to the centre of the front elevation is a suitable distance from no.51 to preserve their amenity. A proposed window to the north side elevation of the front gable extension serving the first-floor bathroom will overlook onto the front forecourt and site frontage of no.51. Whilst there is no concern with the window overlooking or perceived overlooking onto this neighbour's forecourt area as this is not an area of private amenity space, as the window serves a bathroom, for mutual benefits of both the neighbour and the occupiers of the application site, a condition has been added for the window to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7metres from finished floor level.

Properties on Maytree Road

Properties to the rear of the site fronting onto Maytree Road are set sufficiently far away from the development area to ensure their amenity is safeguarded.

Overall, the development accords with Policy DM1 of the Local Plan and 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, outlook or overbearing impacts.

Impacts on parking and highway safety

Policy DM14 of the Local Plan requires all proposals to provide adequate parking to ensure highway safety/traffic management. Provision will take account of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Council's Parking Standards SPD which sets out minimum requirements for parking provisions.

There is no change in the number of bedrooms proposed and the dwelling will remain as a single-family unit, therefore this is no change to the parking requirements from that of the existing dwelling, which the Parking Standards states should be three parking spaces for a 4-bedroom house. However, with the front extension reducing the parking provision available to the front forecourt, the proposal includes a small loss of soft landscaping to the site frontage to allow for an increased vehicle parking area and to improve manoeuvrability. The proposed block plan only shows two parking spaces, however a third could likely be added parallel to the dwelling. Even if there was an under provision of one parking space, the surrounding street benefits from unrestricted on-road parking availability and the potential shortfall of one vehicle parking space would not be so detrimental as to materially harm the parking and highway safety of the area, in accordance with the aims of Policy DM14 of the Local Plan and the Parking Standards SPD.

Impact on trees

Policy DM11 of the Local Plan and the Trees and Development SPD requires trees to be carefully considered and appropriately protected during development. Due to the site comprising TPO trees within the garden and within the immediate area of built form, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have been submitted. The tree officer has reviewed the reports and plans and raises no objection to the proposal subject to a condition being added that requires full compliance with the submitted reports. With an appropriate condition in place, the scheme is in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Local Plan and the Trees and Development SPD.

Impact on ecology

Policy DM11 of the Local Plan requires the protection, conservation and enhancement of all international, national and local nature conservation and designations and networks of habitats and features. It also requires all proposals to seek a net gain of biodiversity on all development sites.

A Preliminary Roost Appraisal was submitted in support of the proposal as requested by the ecology officer. The report explained that the building had been assessed to have negligible bat roost potential. The ecology officer therefore raises no objection to the proposal, subject to the provision of biodiversity enhancements in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Local Plan and a condition to ensure safe working practices are carried out to protect surrounding wildlife.

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; (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:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐

Comments ...