

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/23/96533

Site Address: Hacketts, High Street, Bursledon, Southampton, SO31 8DL

Case Officer: Summer Sharpe

Description: Second floor extension and remodelling of the existing exterior, following the removal of the existing roof.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Countryside - Conservation Area (Old Bursledon) - Special Policy Area - Great Crested Newt (Red Zone) - Listed Buildings nearby		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Planning App no.	Proposal	Decision
Z/14824/001/00	addition of single storey extension at front for use as store	Permitted (November 1979)
C/14824/002/00	External cladding in brick work and tile hanging, new front porch, pitched roof over utility room and front oriel window.	Permitted (September 1996)
C/06/57051	Erection of detached garage & conversion of existing garage to provide additional accommodation.	Permitted (August 2006)
C/10/67115	Single storey & 2 storey front & side extensions & single storey rear extension, with 1no. Rear balcony & new roof to existing front extension, following demolition of existing porch, conservatory & pergola.	Permitted (July 2010)
H/20/87550	Replacement 2no. garden sheds.	Permitted (May 2020)
H/21/90487	Construction of single storey outbuilding for use as a home office and yoga studio.	Withdrawn
H/21/91597	Loft conversion by raising roof and addition of dormer windows to create second floor accommodation and canopy for the balcony's.	Withdrawn

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>12no. Objections (some duplicates and from the same addresses) summarised as follows:</u> (a) design, (b) does not preserve the character/ appearance of the village, (c) out of scale with Old Bursledon Conservation and nearby listed cottages, (d) contrary to local plan policies and guidance, (e) visible from public vantage points, (f) proposals would change the visual weight and impact of the building on its surroundings and streetscene, (g) misleading comparisons to other dwellings, (h) existing building is already out of place, proposals would be more out of keeping, (i) detrimental impact upon the River, (j) concern about fairness and consistency, (k) large/ tall contemporary building, (l) disproportionate to neighbours, (m) out of keeping with listed and other period properties nearby, (n) concern of overlooking, and (o) exceeds 25% volume increase.		

	<u>3no. Support:</u> (a) the footprint is retained, (b) proposal does not extend towards any adjoining property, (c) colour should blend well, (d) design is modern like existing building, (e) only 0.75m higher so not imposing, (f) proposals would be less prominent, and (g) planning permission at other sites must be a material consideration. <u>1no. Comment:</u> (a) applicant advised neighbour the proposals were submitted because the existing roof is in a state of disrepair, (b) comparison to previous scheme.
Parish Council:	Object: Concerns with the increase in volume of habitable space breached conservation area policy. Due to the changes in the roof style concerns were also raised regarding changes to the view from the river.
Old Bursledon Action Group:	This application seriously contravenes the following very important policy BU7.
EBC Conservationist:	Hacketts lies in Zone 7 of the Old Bursledon Conservation Area in a generous plot both between and opposite listed buildings and backing onto the railway cutting along its south-east boundary. The building therefore has the power to affect the setting of three listed buildings. The existing building of Hacketts has already been extended three times and was remodelled some years ago giving a modern image to a previously mediocre non-listed dwelling at the heart of this conservation area. It is strongly suspected that this property has already used its 25% increase in volume, so this proposal will take over and therefore be contrary to the policy that was largely brought about by the residents of Bursledon themselves. Although the planning statement claims this extension is within the allowance, there is no proof this is actually the case. All the surrounding buildings have pitched roofs, which is always the case in this core of the conservation area so the flat roof combined with the second floor or third storey in this location will have both a dominating and urbanising effect that has no place here in Bursledon and will detrimentally affect the setting of three listed buildings. The building was allowed to take on a modern image when last refurbished but increasing the height will increase its impact to a degree that will be unacceptable in this conservation area. Conclusion: there has been various increases in volume that have occurred since the conservation area was adopted (December 1982) and changes to the detail of policies application to this property. Additionally this proposed increase in the size of the property and its detail will have a detrimental effect on the setting of three listed building and the conservation area in general. Object.
EBC Ecology:	<u>Comments 14 February 2023 (following the receipt of Preliminary Roost Appraisal):</u> The building has been assessed to have negligible bat roost potential. The lighting and the mitigation strategies for hedgehogs and great crested newts recommended in the report are appropriate and should be implemented. Two built-in swift nest boxes have been recommended as enhancements and should be built in on the eastern elevation as close to the eaves as possible.

	<u>Comments 4 January 2023:</u> There are records of bats, great crested newts, and hedgehogs very close to the site. From the photos in the Planning Statement, it is not possible to see whether there are any potential bat roost features. Since the proposal will involve removing the entire roof, a preliminary bat roost appraisal including an internal inspection of the loft space is required. Precautionary working methods will also be required to avoid harm to great crested newts and hedgehogs. As this is a second-floor extension only, the working method will be limited to keeping materials storage on hard standing and disposal of construction waste so that it does not become habitat for hedgehogs and terrestrial great crested newts or other small animals. No fires are to be lit on site. Biodiversity enhancements are also required.
--	--

Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

Policies: S1 (sustainable development), S2 (approach to development), S5 (new development in the countryside), S7 (The Coast), S8 (Historic environment), DM1 (General development), DM11 (Nature Conservation), DM12 (Heritage assets), DM14 (parking), DM26 (residential extensions in the countryside), and BU7 (Residential Extensions Old Bursledon).

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area Appraisal, Old Bursledon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals, and Trees and Development.

Site Visit	Yes ☒	No ☐
A site visit was not undertaken as part of this application, but was undertaken 27 October 2021, as part of the previous application (H/21/91597).		

Assessment:

Site & Surroundings

The application site lies to the south of the High Street, falling within the Old Bursledon Conservation Area. The site benefits from a spacious plot, with a large driveway to the north-west. The dwellinghouse itself is fairly contemporary in terms of its design; finished in white render, light grey fenestration and a slate roof, and has noticeably been previously extended.

The wider surroundings also fall within the Old Bursledon Conservation Area, whereby there are also nearby listed buildings; Lattice Cottage (west), Woodbine Cottage and Dale Cottage (east), Yew Tree Cottage and Rosewood (north).

Proposal

The application proposes a second floor extension and remodelling of the existing exterior, following the removal of the existing roof.

The existing dwelling currently measures approx. 7.8m in height with a pitched roof form, including a combination of two-storey (front and rear) additions with respecting pitched roof elements.

The proposals would effectively remove the existing roof, taking it back to the highest eaves height (approx. 5.8m) making this a flat roof and then adding a further storey (2.7m). This would increase the overall height to approx. 8.5m (some 0.7m taller than the existing). The proposed additional storey would be set in from all edges of the host dwelling. The widest point of the host dwelling is approx. 16.6m whereby the proposed additional floor would measure approx. 15.7m. This would also measure approx. 8.5m in depth (compared to the 9.9m depth of the host dwelling).

The existing two-storey elements would also be altered from pitched roofs to flat roofed, to allow for the additional storey. The proposals would be finished in a combination of materials (set out on the Material Schedule), comprising; dark grey flat roof covering, a green roof and solar panels, grey rainwater goods/ guttering/ fascias etc, blue/grey fenestration, and blue/grey cladding.

Principle

The application site falls within designated countryside protected by Policy S5. This Policy sets out that new development in the countryside is generally restricted and notes (1) compatible usages for which new development in the countryside is appropriate. The Policy also goes on to note (2) that new development in the countryside will seek to avoid adverse impacts upon the intrinsic character of the landscape. It should be noted that new residential dwellinghouses are not included as appropriate or compatible development within the countryside. However, the proposal relates to extensions/ alterations to the existing dwelling, therefore Policy DM26 is engaged. This Policy sets out that the extension or replacement of a permanent dwelling in the countryside can be acceptable subject to criteria being met. These criteria comprise; the size, ensuring that this would not be disproportionate, or have an adverse impact upon neighbours. Therefore, the general principle of extending and altering the existing dwelling is accepted, however would be assessed against the below criteria.

Design

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of the surrounding areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbouring, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design and siting. Policies S8 and DM12 stipulate that development of a heritage asset would only be permitted where the proposals do not harm or detract from the significance or special interest of the asset. Policy BU7 specifically relates to residential extensions and replacement dwellings within the Old Bursledon Special Policy Area, this sets out that the proposals should not increase the volume of the original dwelling (from when the conservation area was first designated 1982) by more than 25%.

The application site also falls within the "Old Bursledon" Conservation Area. Thus triggering Section 72 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), which requires the local planning authority, or as the case may be, the Secretary of State, pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

The application proposes a second floor extension and remodelling of the existing exterior, following the removal of the existing roof. Initially it should be noted that the application site has undergone significant extensions, alterations and remodelling. As per the Council's Conservationists comments, the dwelling was allowed to be modernised around 2010, this also allowed large extensions and alterations. The modernisation

appeared to be acceptable at the time given the former dwelling was considered 'mediocre' and was 'non-listed'. The dwelling has therefore established itself within the Old Bursledon Conservation Area, however given its sensitive siting, and the close proximity of neighbouring listed buildings, development must be carefully considered within this location, as there is the power to affect the setting of 3no. listed buildings.

Whilst accepting the modern design of the existing dwelling, the proposals would completely remove the existing roof form and add an additional storey with a flat roof, which is considered completely uncharacteristic of the context and wider surroundings. With the Council's Conservationist noting that *"All the surrounding buildings have pitched roofs, which is always the case in this core of the conservation area so the flat roof combined with the second floor or third storey in this location will have both a dominating and urbanising effect that has no place here in Bursledon and will detrimentally affect the setting of three listed buildings."* The additional storey would add a significant amount of bulk which would be worsened and exacerbated as a result of the proposed flat roof form.

Turning to specific policies, and starting with Policy DM26, as set out above, this policy seeks to ensure that new development is proportionate in size to the existing dwelling. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed additional storey would be set in from the parameter of the existing dwelling, it is of a cumbersome form and would add significant bulk and massing to the existing dwelling. Despite setting the proposed in from the boundaries, it is not considered that this could be considered 'proportionate', thus would not comply with this policy.

Further to the above, the application site falls within the Old Bursledon Special Policy Area, which is further protected by Policy BU7, and as set out above, this stipulates that new development should not increase the volume of the original dwelling by more than 25%. The Council's Conservationist noted that *"It is strongly suspected that this property has already used its 25% increase in volume, so this proposal will take over and therefore be contrary to the policy. Although the planning statement claims this extension is within the allowance, there is no proof this is actually the case."*

As noted above, no calculations have been provided as part of this application. Therefore the LPA have sought to undertake some calculations. From the plans submitted as part of Z/14824/001/00 the overall crude volume is calculated to be approx. 401.7m³. The submitted existing plans appear to have a crude volume calculation of approx. 1,299.9m³, which is already over 3 times the size of the original property. Further, the proposed additional floor would have a volume of approx. 360.3m³ (15.7 x 8.5 x 2.7). Despite the measurements being crude, it is evident that the development already approved at the site exceeds the 25% policy limitation, whereby the proposed addition would further exceed this to a significantly harmful extent. Thus, the proposals would be in complete conflict with this policy.

Whilst accepting the application was allowed to take on a more modern image when last refurbished, the additional height and bulk will increase its impact to an unacceptable degree, especially with its siting within the Old Bursledon Conservation Area, and Special Policy Area, combined with its close proximity to listed buildings. The Council's Conservationist has raised an objection and concluded that the proposals would have a detrimental effect on the setting of 3no. listed buildings, and the Conservation Area in general.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states 'development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents'. Due to the inappropriate scale and form of the development, the proposal is considered to result in an incongruous addition, which would have an adversely harmful impact upon the streetscene and wider vantage points (views obtained from the south/east along the River Hamble).

Paragraphs 200-214 relate to proposals affecting heritage assets and considering potential impacts. As set out above the Council's Conservationist considers that the proposals would have an adverse impact upon heritage assets (namely 3no. listed buildings and the surrounding Conservation Area), therefore the abovementioned paragraphs would be engaged. These paragraphs introduce the term 'less than substantial harm'. Paragraph 208 then goes on to note that *'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'*. The proposals are considered to result in adverse harm to listed buildings and the surrounding Conservation Area. Given that the proposals would result in residential extensions there would be no public benefits, and therefore any harm cannot be outweighed.

Overall, and to conclude, the proposed development, as a result of its disproportionate size, flat roofed form and design would result in an unacceptable bulky addition which would appear at odds with the host dwelling and wider surrounding Conservation Area, thus being contrary to the abovementioned policies, and SPD. In accordance with the abovementioned Paragraphs of the NPPF, this development is not considered well designed, nor does it reflect local design policies, thus warranting refusal.

Impact upon Neighbouring Amenities

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulates that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.

As a result of the loose knit character of Old Bursledon the neighbouring amenities are of a sufficient distance from the application site, so as not to be adversely impacted upon by the proposals. It would be noted that the visual amenities of the neighbouring properties and vantage points would be adversely impacted upon, however this is largely a design consideration and has been assessed above.

Highway Safety & Parking

Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires residential development to provide off-highway parking which is adequate in terms of highway safety / traffic management. The Residential Parking SPD sets out the relevant parking provisions for dwellinghouses, which are dependent upon the amount of bedrooms.

The existing dwelling currently has 5no. bedrooms, thus requiring 3no. off-street parking provisions. The proposals would result in an additional bedroom, however this would not increase the off-street parking provisions. The application site benefits from a large driveway to the frontage which could comfortably accommodate the necessary parking requirements. As such, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Ecology

Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough.

Due to the nature of the proposals, the Council's Ecologist was consulted. Originally they advised that the proposals could have an adverse impact upon protected species

including bats. Therefore a preliminary bat roost appraisal was requested. They also advised that biodiversity enhancements would be required.

The agent then submitted a preliminary bat roost appraisal which the Council's Ecologist has reviewed and advised that there is negligible bat roost potential, and that the mitigations suggested within the report were appropriate. As such, and had the proposals have been acceptable in all other regards the recommended mitigation measures and biodiversity enhancements could have been secured via condition.

Other Matters:

The LPA provided the Council's Conservationist's comments to the agent as well as advising that the proposals were unlikely to be acceptable. Following comments from the Council's Ecologist, the agent also sought to submit a preliminary bat roost appraisal, and requested to submit amended plans. The preliminary bat roost appraisal was not requested, however, as it was provided the Council's Ecologist reviewed. Amended plans were discouraged as it was considered significant amendments would be required to make the scheme acceptable, thus would result in a materially different scheme, requiring a new planning application. The agent was given the opportunity to withdraw the application, however no response was received. The LPA have therefore sought to determine the application within the 8 week target date.

Equalities Act:

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.

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 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.

Conclusion:

Reasons for Refusal:

- 1) The proposed development, by reason of its disproportionate size, flat roofed form and design would result in an incongruous and unacceptably bulky addition which would appear at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling, which in turn would have an adverse impact upon the setting of 3no. listed buildings and the wider surrounding Conservation Area. The proposals are therefore contrary Policies S8, DM1, DM12, and DM26 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), Quality Places SPD (2011), and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
- 2) The proposed development would result in an unacceptably bulky addition, resulting in an exceedance of 25% volume increase, thus would be contrary to Policy BU7 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒