

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/26/101100

Site Address: 12 HOLMESLAND LANE, BOTLEY, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2EH

Case Officer: Charlie Vallis

Description: Proposed two storey side extension, new oak framed porch, rear facing dormer and loft conversion.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Outside the urban edge SGN medium pressure pipeline (12.5m buffer)		

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒
No relevant history		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None were received		
Parish Council:	Members voted to raise no objection although it was requested that Building Regs. Document B, Volume 1 is considered. Members would also welcome the inclusion of Solar PV panels.		
Ecology:	<u>19/5/26:</u> I have reviewed the Preliminary Bat Appraisal by Broadleaf Ecology (Rev A, May 2026). The house had overall moderate potential for roosting bats however the features on the southern elevation that would be impacted by the proposed works were assessed to have low potential to be used by an individual bat on an opportunistic basis only. The report recommends a pre-works inspection by a bat licensed ecologist rather than an evening emergence survey. In the unlikely event that a bat was present then the works would have to stop until a Natural England bat licence was obtained. The applicant must ensure that no scaffolding is allowed to block any areas identified in the report as having bat roost potential, such as the hanging tiles on the bay window on the eastern elevation or the gaps in the mortar in the brickwork on the southern elevation which will be inspected by the licensed ecologist prior to the start of works. At least one bat box and two swift bricks were recommended as ecological enhancements. Their locations must be shown on a plan to ensure that they are in the appropriate places. The pre-works inspection and location plan for the enhancements can be conditioned. <u>13/4/26:</u> There are a few lifted/missing tiles on the rear elevation of the roof near the ridge and a missing hanging tile on the front elevation. Given the extensive works proposed to the roof, a preliminary bat roost appraisal (PRA) including an internal inspection of the loft spaces will be required. The ecologist doing the PRA must also recommend suitable biodiversity enhancements. <u>1/4/26:</u> A precautionary working method must be used to prevent harm to wildlife that could be using this site.		

LineSearch (SSEN & SGN):	1/4/26: Information provided in relation to the location of SSEN and SGN service pipes/cables and assets, with advice in respect of working in the vicinity of underground services. Outlined that Esso assets may be close to the development site.
Esso Pipelines:	No response received.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 10/4/2026		

Policy: National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (EBLP)</u> The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1, S2 and S5; and Development Management policies DM1, DM11, DM14 and DM26. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Hedge End, West End & Botley Character Area Appraisals (HEWEB 46).

Assessment: <u>Policy and principle:</u> The property lies within designated countryside where development must accord with specific planning policy to be acceptable. Amongst other matters, EBLP policy DM26 outlines that extensions to permanent dwellings in the countryside should be permitted subject to the general development criteria and transport policies of the Local Plan and provided that: the extension is not disproportionate in size to the existing dwelling, neighbouring properties or in relation to its plot, or involve any extension to its curtilage; and provided no additional dwellings are created. <u>Site and proposal:</u> The application site contains a two storey semi-detached house situated on a large plot, with parking and landscaping to the front and garden to the rear. The site is positioned in a low density residential area on the outer edge of Botley. The application proposes a two storey side extension, maintaining the existing hipped roof form, as well as an open oak framed front porch and a loft conversion with a flat-roofed rear dormer. The property which forms the other half of its semi-detached pair received planning permission for a similar side extension and front porch under ref. H/18/84538. <u>Design and layout:</u> The design of the proposed extensions are suited to the host dwelling in terms of their form, scale and appearance, following the lines and styling of the existing dwelling. The proposed side extension and front porch would bring a sense of balance to its semi-detached pair, mirroring similar extensions approved and constructed at no.10. In relation to the proposed rear dormer, its positioning and use of tile hanging to match the roof is such that it would not be noticeable from the street scene of Holmesland Lane. Character appraisals for this area outline that materials applied in new development must be similar or complementary to those prominent in existing properties. The use of facing materials to match the existing dwelling and an oak framed porch ensure the proposals are in line with this requirement and maintain the character and appearance of the locality.
--

The appraisal also indicates that hedge plot boundaries should be maintained. Although hedgerow would be removed to accommodate the side extension and allow side access to the rear garden, the site plan indicates that any vegetation forward of the principal elevation would be retained, helping to retain the verdant character of Holmesland Lane.

Although fairly close to the neighbour to the south, reasonable distance would be maintained (approx. 0.8m at its closest, widening to approx. 1.3m) allowing for side access and, given the style of the dwellings would not result in a terracing effect detrimental to its spacious character.

The proposals would not represent overdevelopment of the site, retaining ample rear amenity space and comfortably meeting parking standards.

Residential amenity:

At no.14 there are understood to be 2no. windows serving the lounge which would face the proposed extension, as well as 2no. windows serving non-habitable rooms. The latter are not subject to the same protection under the Quality Places SPD as primary living spaces. Light and outlook to the lounge windows is already significantly restricted by its boundary hedge and the application dwelling. The primary source of light and outlook to this room through double doors to the rear, via an archway, would also remain unrestricted. As such, the extension is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the light and outlook received by this neighbour. Privacy would be maintained through obscure glazing to the proposed side door, which will be conditioned.

The proposed dormer would be oriented towards its own rear garden, with no dwellings located to the rear. As such it would not present significant overlooking concerns, not impacting the privacy of adjacent properties more than its existing first floor rear-facing windows.

Other matters:

Due to the nature of the proposal and records of protected species' close to the site, the Council's Ecologist was consulted on this application. Following review of site photos they noted potential bat roost features and a preliminary roost appraisal was therefore requested and subsequently carried out at the site. The recommendations of this appraisal are considered suitable to ensure protected species are not adversely impacted by the development. The recommended pre-works inspections and biodiversity enhancements are to be conditioned. The additional recommendations in relation to local ecology will be added to the decision as advisory notes to the applicant.

Comments from the Parish related to Building Regulations, Document B, Volume 1 are separate from the planning process.

There will be no likely 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:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐

Comments ...