

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/26/100965

Site Address: 191 LEIGH ROAD, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9DW

Case Officer: Gregg Chapman

Description: Proposed new two-storey side extension to form a new Two Storey Maisonette

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within urban edge • Nature Conservation; SAC, SPA, Ramsar • Air Quality Management Area • Airport Safeguarding		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
F/24/98148 - Two storey side extension, elevational changes, and conversion of single dwelling to 4no. 1-bedroom flats, with extension of dropped kerb access from Leigh Road (Amended Description) – Withdrawn, 20/11/2025.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	3 letters – Objection • Inadequate parking and poor access arrangements. • Highway safety concerns due to the constrained access onto a busy road. • Overdevelopment and over-intensive use of the plot. • Harm to neighbouring amenity through loss of light, outlook and privacy. • Overbearing and visually intrusive form of development on the boundary. • Poor relationship with the adjoining property, including maintenance and overhang issues. • Unclear and incomplete plans for existing and proposed dwelling, including all details of the bedroom. • Accommodation appears substandard and not clearly described. • Development would alter the character of the existing semi-detached pair and would create a terrace impacting property value. • Unclear rear garden treatment and potential ecological impact.		
HCC Highways	No objection • Parking provision is below Eastleigh Borough Council standards. • Existing 4-bedroom house should have 3 spaces. • Proposed additional 1-bedroom dwelling should have 2 spaces. • Only 2 spaces are shown in total, creating a shortfall of 3 spaces. • Additional parking may be achievable through a revised front layout. • Relocation of the bin and cycle stores may help create sufficient parking. • Updated plans are recommended to demonstrate policy-compliant parking provision.		

Environmental Health	Objection - Noise report required due to the site's location on Leigh Road and the proposed road-facing bedroom. - Mitigation may be needed for glazing and ventilation. - Contamination risk is low, but a watching brief condition is recommended because made ground may be present. - Site lies within an air quality management area. - Construction impacts on neighbours, including dust, should be addressed through a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
Ecology	Objection - Further ecological information is needed before impacts can be fully assessed, particularly close-up photographs of the roof, elevations and any affected garden areas. - Nearby records of bats and hedgehogs mean the proposal may require survey work depending on the building details. - Biodiversity enhancements (such as bat and swift boxes) will be required in line with policy.
Town Council:	No response received.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 09/04/2026		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework National Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> Policies: S1 (delivering sustainable development), S2 (approach to development), DM1 (General development), DM2 (environmentally sustainable development), DM6 (surface water management), DM8 (pollution), DM11 (nature conservation), DM13 (transport), DM14 (parking), DM23 (residential development within urban areas), DM29 (dwellings with higher access standards), DM30 (internal space standards). Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Eastleigh Character Area Appraisal.

Assessment:
<u>Principle</u> Within the urban edge, the principle of development is acceptable. Development is expected to meet the policies within the local plan, most notably policy DM1 of the EBLP which sets out the general criteria for new development. <u>Design</u> Policy DM1 of the EBLP requires all new development to respect the character and appearance of urban areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site and the

character, appearance and land uses of the surrounding locality, and be compatible with its surroundings in terms of mass, scale, layout, density, design and siting.

The plot is significantly narrower than those of surrounding dwellings. Whilst this is not, in itself, a harmful characteristic, the reduced width limits the amount of space available to accommodate a dwelling and is therefore a relevant consideration when assessed alongside the proposal's overall siting, proportions, spacing and relationship with surrounding development.

In terms of built form alone, the proposed two-storey side addition is considered to relate well to the existing dwelling. By reason of its height, width and overall form, it would appear subservient to the host building and has been designed in a manner that visually reads as an extension to the existing house. Whilst the space to the side of the dwelling would be lost, the neighbouring property benefits from a side driveway such that a gap would remain between the buildings, reflective of the relatively close spacing that characterises other properties in the surrounding area. On that basis, and when viewed from the public realm in isolation, the additional built mass is not considered to cause significant harm to the street scene in terms of scale or form.

Whilst the development has the outward form of an extension, it would create an additional and separate dwelling. The inclusion of a separate front door, together with the associated domestic paraphernalia and altered frontage arrangement, would result in the development being perceived functionally and visually as a new dwelling rather than as a subordinate addition to the existing house.

The creation of an additional dwelling on the plot would intensify the residential use of the site and materially alter the way in which the frontage operates and appears. The front area would become a shared space serving two separate units of accommodation, rather than a single dwelling. This would be accompanied by the removal of a section of hedgerow, the introduction of additional hardstanding to facilitate parking, the construction of bin and cycle storage within the frontage, and the loss of any usable side access.

Taken together, the cumulative impact of the additional dwelling, shared frontage, loss of landscaping, increased hard surfacing and siting of domestic storage features would result in a frontage that appears overly dense, cramped and urbanised, to the detriment of the character of the street scene. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy DM1 of the EBLP.

Internal & External Amenity for Future Occupiers

To ensure adequate internal living standards are achieved, the Local Planning Authority assesses proposed residential accommodation against the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). Policy DM30 of the EBLP requires all new dwellings to meet the NDSS as a minimum. In addition, the Quality Places SPD requires new residential development to provide a garden area equivalent to at least 60% of the floor area of the host dwellinghouse.

The NDSS sets out minimum gross internal floor areas for new dwellings, having regard to the number of bedrooms, the number of intended occupants and the number of storeys. It also sets minimum bedroom sizes, with a single bedroom required to measure at least 7.5sqm and a double bedroom at least 11.5sqm.

The proposal is for a two-storey, one-bedroom, two-person dwelling. For this form of accommodation, the NDSS requires a minimum gross internal area of 58sqm. As originally submitted, the plans show a total floor area of 38.5sqm, comprising 30.47sqm at ground floor level, plus a 1sqm allowance for space beneath the stairs in accordance with the NDSS, and only 7.0sqm at first floor level with headroom above 1.5m – being constrained by the roof pitch and the hipped roof. The submitted plans identify the bedroom as measuring 11sqm; however, when scaled from the drawings, the bedroom measures approximately 10.23sqm (including the areas under 1.5m in height). The

proposed dwelling therefore fails to provide sufficient overall internal floor area and does not achieve an adequately sized bedroom. As such, the proposal fails to meet the NDSS and conflicts with Policy DM30 of the EBLP, resulting in inadequate living accommodation.

Following this concern being raised, amended plans were submitted seeking to increase the overall floor area to 58sqm in an attempt to achieve compliance with the NDSS. However, those amended plans were not accepted or consulted upon. The increased floor area was to be achieved through an extension to the ground floor accommodation by approximately 11 metres, which in turn would reduce the size of the garden area – as discussed below.

In addition to internal space standards, the Quality Places SPD requires new residential development to provide private amenity space equivalent to at least 60% of the gross internal floor area of the host dwellinghouse. As originally submitted, the proposed scheme would provide only 21.8sqm of garden area. This would amount to approximately 56% of the proposed substandard dwelling size, and only 37% of the 58sqm minimum floorspace required by the NDSS. The proposal would also materially reduce the garden serving the existing dwelling to 77sqm. Given that the ground and first floors each have an area of approximately 78sqm and noting that a second floor has also been constructed, this would leave the existing dwelling with private amenity space amounting to less than half of its overall floorspace. The proposal therefore fails to provide an adequate standard of outdoor amenity space and conflicts with Policy DM30 of the EBLP and the Quality Places SPD. While there is public amenity space within the wider area, which may in some circumstances justify a limited reduction, the extent of the shortfall in this case, together with the significant impact on the existing dwelling, is such that the proposal would result in private amenity space materially below expected standards.

For completeness, even if the amended scheme had been increased to achieve 58sqm of internal floorspace, the resulting garden area would have been only 8.3sqm, equating to approximately 14% of the overall floor area. This would remain well below the requirements of the Quality Places SPD and would not overcome the identified conflict.

Given the site's position adjacent to the busy Leigh Road, the Council's Environmental Health Team was consulted and raised concerns regarding noise exposure and the ventilation of windows, requesting a Noise Assessment to establish the degree of impact. No such assessment has been submitted. Notwithstanding this, it is recognised that there are a number of existing residential properties fronting Leigh Road, and there is no reason in principle why additional residential accommodation could not be achieved subject to appropriate mitigation. It is considered that these matters could be satisfactorily addressed by condition.

Impact upon Neighbouring Amenities

Policy DM1 of the EBLP amongst other matters, stipulates that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.

The proposed dwelling would have a depth of 8.4 metres to the single-storey element, with a frontage width of 5 metres and a rear width of 6 metres, all measured inclusive of the roof overhang. The greater rear width arises from the single-storey element extending partially across the rear of the existing dwelling. The single-storey element would have an eaves height of 2.8 metres, while the first-floor hipped roof would have a ridge height of 6.25 metres. Fenestration is proposed only within the front and rear elevations.

Having regard to the offset relationship with the neighbouring dwelling (as a result of the neighbours driveway), the limited height of the single-storey element, the hipped form of the roof pitching away from the neighbour, the comparatively modest overall height of the first-floor element relative to the existing dwelling, and the absence of side-facing windows within the proposed dwelling, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to harmful overshadowing, overbearing impact, loss of outlook, or overlooking to

neighbouring occupiers that could be sufficient to warrant refusal. The proposal therefore would not result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity and is considered to accord with Policy DM1 of the EBLP.

Highway Safety & Parking

Policy DM13 of the EBLP requires development to provide safe and suitable access and to avoid unacceptable impacts on the highway network. Policy DM14 requires parking provision to be adequate in terms of highway safety and traffic management, having regard to the Council's adopted Parking Standards SPD. Policy DM14 states that proposals with parking levels that deviate from the expected standard should be supported by robust evidence within a transport statement, transport assessment or travel plan. The SPD also makes clear that insufficient parking provision can lead to indiscriminate parking on the carriageway, creating obstruction and safety hazards for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.

As submitted the application included a total of two parking spaces for the existing dwelling and proposed dwelling, whereas the overall SPD requirement is for a total of five spaces. Whilst revised plans have been submitted to increase the on-site provision to four spaces, the development would nevertheless remain below the expected level of provision and would therefore rely, to some degree, on parking demand being displaced onto the surrounding streets.

Although the site is relatively close to the town centre and local facilities, it is not located within a Controlled Parking Zone. No evidence has been submitted to justify a reduced level of parking provision, and no parking stress survey has been provided to assess the availability of off-site parking. As such, the development could lead to indiscriminate on-street parking, to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow and safe movement of vehicles. It could also harm the amenities of nearby residents by further reducing the availability of already limited on-street parking.

Whilst the Highway Authority has raised no objection in principle to the proposal from an access perspective, that does not overcome the absence of evidence needed to justify a reduced parking provision in this location. In the absence of a parking survey or other robust supporting evidence, it is not considered that the shortfall in off-street parking can be absorbed within the surrounding area without resulting in additional pressure for on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety and convenience. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies DM13 and DM14 of the EBLP and the Parking Standards SPD.

Ecology

Policy DM11 of the EBLP stipulates that the Council will work to protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and to promote the net gain of biodiversity. In addition, under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, public authorities exercising functions in England must have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing biodiversity.

The proposed dwelling would be located partially on the footprint of an existing garage and would not, therefore, result in any protected habitat. Some tree removal would occur to extend the access, however, this is not significant and is domestic planting as opposed to native hedgerow. However, the demolition of the garage, together with the proposal for an attached dwelling, has the potential to impact bats, which are known to be present within the area. No supporting Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been submitted. In the absence of this information, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the development would not result in harm to protected species or their habitats, or that adequate mitigation and enhancement measures could be secured. As such, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would comply with Policy DM11 of the EBLP and with the Council's statutory duty under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

SPA Mitigation

The Council, as the competent authority for the purposes of Habitats Regulations Assessment, must be satisfied before granting planning permission that the proposal, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European protected site. In this case, the proposed residential development gives rise to habitats considerations in relation to the Solent designated sites, the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation, and the New Forest Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar site. Residential development of this nature has the potential to result in impacts upon these designated sites.

In relation to the Solent designated sites and the River Itchen SAC, Natural England's nutrient neutrality advice confirms that new residential development within the relevant catchments has the potential to increase nutrient loading through additional wastewater arising from future occupiers. That wastewater is treated through the foul drainage network and can ultimately contribute to increased levels of nitrogen and phosphorous entering the receiving water environment, leading to eutrophication and harm to the ecological features for which the sites are designated. Where likely significant effects cannot be ruled out, the proposal must be subject to assessment under the Habitats Regulations and can only proceed where appropriate mitigation is secured to ensure nutrient neutrality.

In addition, residential development within the relevant 13.8km catchment of the New Forest has the potential to increase recreational pressure on the protected habitats sites as a result of additional visits from future occupiers. This form of impact likewise requires assessment and, where necessary, mitigation to ensure that the integrity of the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar site would not be adversely affected.

In this case, the application is recommended for refusal and, accordingly, no Appropriate Assessment has been completed. Notwithstanding that position, the applicant has not proposed, or thus progressed or secured the necessary mitigation in respect of nutrient impacts on the Solent designated sites and the River Itchen SAC, nor in respect of recreational impacts on the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar site. In the absence of sufficient information and secured mitigation, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would avoid an adverse effect on the integrity of these protected sites. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy DM11 of the EBLP and the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

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; (c) ensure that the Councils 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 and development plan 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 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 and 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 limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

Equalities

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2021 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.

Other Matters

The concerns raised regarding future maintenance responsibilities and any overhang, relate to private civil matters (trespass) between landowners and are not material planning considerations. Such matters fall outside the scope of the planning system and carry no weight in the determination of the application.

Concern has also been expressed that the development would alter the appearance of the existing semi-detached pair, create a terrace, and affect property value. Any impact on private property value is not a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into account in the assessment of the application. The character and appearance of the proposal has been considered above.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

Although the proposal would provide one additional dwelling in a sustainable location, contributing modestly towards housing supply at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, the benefits of the scheme are limited due to its small scale.

In contrast, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, would provide substandard living accommodation with inadequate private amenity space, and has failed to demonstrate acceptable parking provision. In addition, insufficient ecological information has been submitted, and the application fails to secure or demonstrate the necessary mitigation for impacts on European protected sites arising from nutrient loading and recreational pressure.

When applying the tilted balance in accordance with paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF, the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. As such, the proposal does not constitute sustainable development and planning permission should be refused.

Conclusion:		
Recommendation:	PERMIT ☐	REFUSE ☒
Comments ...		