

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/26/101612

Site Address: 5 THE DROVE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2EF

Case Officer: Alexandra Stone

Description: Proposed porch following demolition of existing porch

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Within Urban Edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
F/14/73923 – Permit – 28/02/2014 Front porch LDC/26/101611 – Certificate Issued – 29/07/2026 Lawful Development Certificate for the Proposed single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory. Installation of windows to side elevation on the ground floor.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Parish Council:	No Objection		
Ecologist:	No Objection		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 3/08/2026		

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, DM11 and DM14. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places (June 2026); Parking Standards (September 2025); Character Area Appraisals.

Proposal:
The application is for the replacement of the existing flat roof porch, for a pitch roof canopy porch. The porch extension would measure approximately 3.8 in width by 1.4m in depth, with the overall canopy being 2.5m in width to the existing roof by 2.3m in depth.

Assessment:

Principle

The site is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the detailed matters according with the relevant planning policies.

Character and Appearance

Policy DM1 requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be well integrated with these (in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting), both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

The detached dwelling is located within The Drove, to the northeast of Moorgreen Road. The properties within the road are a mixture of houses and bungalows, each with differing style of roof such as pitch or hipped, and some also having dormer windows.

The application dwelling has a hipped roof with a small flat roof porch.

The proposal is to alter the front porch, from flat roof to pitch roof with a canopy. As there is an eclectic mix of design within The Drove, coupled with the hipped roof, a pitch canopy is unlikely to create a incongruous feature, and unlikely to be noticeable within the wider street scene. Therefore alterations are considered modest and in keeping with the character of the area.

- The design of the proposal is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site, would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards.
- The design and layout respects the character and appearance of the locality.

Residential Amenity

Policy DM1 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 porch would be of single storey with good spacing between neighbours. It would overlook the public realm which is expected. Therefore unlikely to cause overlooking or overshadowing to neighbouring properties.

- 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

- 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 2030; (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 ...
