

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/26/101632

Site Address: 67 LAKEWOOD ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5AE

Case Officer: Charlie Vallis

Description: First floor side & single storey rear extensions, integral garage conversion and part conversion of detached garage.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Within the urban edge - Tree Preservation Order (250-E)		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- H/26/101632 – First floor side & single storey rear extensions, integral garage conversion and part conversion of detached garage – Permit – 23/09/2024 - Z/10060/002/00 – Erection of double garage – Permit – 30/08/1991 - Z/10060/001/00 – Single storey front rear and side extension – Permit – 25/02/1987		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None were received		
Parish Council:	No comments received		
Ecology:	No objection. I have reviewed the Update Bat Survey Report by Hampshire Ecological Services Ltd. (Sep 2026). The update walkover was done in Aug 2026. Due to the presence of several potential bat roost features one emergence survey was carried out in 2024. Due to the presence of foraging and commuting bats in the area, a precautionary working method is required. The recommendations in the report are appropriate and must be followed. Biodiversity enhancements must be marked on a plan to ensure that they are on appropriate elevations.		
Tree Officer:	We raise no arboricultural objection to the proposal.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 16.7.26		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - National Decision-Making Policies (NDMP) 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 (Hiltingbury & Hocombe Park Special Policy Area).

Assessment:
<u>Principle:</u> The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being based upon the exact nature, design and

impact of the proposal being considered acceptable and in accordance with the relevant policies of the NPPF, adopted local plan and supplementary planning guidance.

Site and surroundings:

The application dwelling is positioned on a large plot, set back significantly from the road within a well-wooded residential area, with a detached double garage to the front. The surrounding area consists of detached dwellings set in large plots, whose character and appearance have changed over time as they have been extended.

Proposal and background:

The application proposes first floor side and rear extensions, a single storey rear extension and partial garage conversion. An extant permission is in place at this property for similar proposals under H/26/101632. Key changes compared to H/26/101632 are a first floor extension to the south rather than an enlarged side dormer and an increased depth to the first floor rear extension, by approx. 1.5m.

An amended set of plans were provided during the application. These consisted of corrections to the existing and proposed site plan and elevations to accurately reflect the dwelling's roof form. As they did not significantly alter the proposals reconsultation was not deemed necessary.

Design and layout:

Particularly in the context of the scale of extensions and replacement dwellings in the immediate locality, the proposed extensions are considered fairly modest and in keeping with the rhythm of the street scene, with the resulting mass and spacing of the host dwelling likely to allow the property to continue to sit comfortably within its plot and the street scene.

The host dwelling retains dominance over the proposed extension, with the roof ridge sitting lower than the existing central roof ridge. The fenestrations are in balance and proportion to the existing property, and the design of the proposed extension is suited to the host dwelling and its locality in terms of its form, scale and appearance. The property's catslide roof form is a feature fairly common along this section of road and contributes positively to the character of the property and the surrounding area. However, the loss of this feature would not amount to harm to the character of the locality.

The proposal would not represent an overdevelopment of the site, with ample rear amenity space retained and space to the front of the property to meet parking standards. The proposed part conversion of the garage would have a minimal impact on the street scene, whilst sufficient on site car parking would remain.

Residential amenity:

NDMP P3 of the NPPF (2026) 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.

There is sufficient separation from neighbouring properties to the north and south such that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on their light and outlook. Significant overlooking and loss of privacy is also unlikely given that no first floor side facing windows are proposed.

Regarding the neighbour to the rear (no.67a), the proposals are considered sufficiently distanced (at over 45m) from this neighbour and not likely to significantly impact their outlook, light or privacy.

Other Matters:

The Council's Tree Officer was consulted due to the presence of protected trees on site. The Tree Officer confirmed that they had no objection to the scheme, with no significant trees likely to be impacted by the extensions.

As the survey data from the initial ecological assessment of the site was only valid for a period of 12 months, an update bat survey report was required to assess the presence of bats. This was reviewed by the Council's Ecologist who was satisfied with the findings of the report and the measures set out. As such, the measures recommended shall be secured by condition and advisory notes.

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 ...