

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/23/96567

Site Address: 111 HURSLEY ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1JD

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: First floor rear and single storey rear/side extensions with raised rear patio

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the Urban Edge Within Established Residential Area Southern Water Sewers 2 Buffer – Foul Sewer		

Planning History	Yes ☐	No ☒
No planning history		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None received		
Chandlers Ford Parish Council:	No comments received		
Ecology:	<u>Updated Comments on PRA received 19/02/24:</u> I have reviewed the Preliminary Roost Assessment Report by Hampshire Ecological Services (February 2024). The house and garage have been assessed as having negligible bat roost suitability, but the shed is assessed to have low-negligible suitability with a few potential access points for bats to enter the building and some exterior potential roosting features. The house and garage have no constraints to work being done, but the shed will need either a pre-works emergence check or demolition under ecological supervision by a suitably qualified ecologist. Given that bats move between roosts, and this is a small building I think that demolition under ecological supervision (which could be conditioned) would be the more pragmatic choice, however if the applicant prefers an emergence survey (between May and August) that is an acceptable option but would need to be done before determination. A temporary bat box must be installed on a retained tree to relocate any bats found during ecologically supervised demolition. If any bats are found, work must stop and a licence from Natural England must be applied for. The biodiversity enhancements and lighting guidance recommended in the report are appropriate and should be implemented. <u>Review of Site Visit Photos received 18/01/2024:</u> I have reviewed the site visit photos. There is a small gap in the edge of the roof tiles visible on the rear gable end directly above a repaired crack in the wall and a gap at the corner of the fascia board. The rear elevation of the roof is not visible in the photos. These features must be checked by a suitably qualified ecologist to determine whether they are potential bat roost features, and the interior of the loft must also be inspected. A Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) is required.		

	The area around the existing rear brick addition is surfaced with gravel and paving slabs, however another photo of the rear garden contains some brown leaves in the lower right corner which could be montbretia (<i>Crocasmia crocosmifolia</i>), an invasive plant listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act. It is illegal to allow this plant to spread into the wild, so care will need to be taken to keep any soil from this area on site. Alternatively, it can be disposed of as hazardous waste by a licensed contractor. The ecologist who does the PRA can also check these plants. The outbuilding to be demolished is well lit by at least 4 windows, with a corrugated metal roof, so would have negligible bat roost potential. The rear corner of the roofing is lifted and may provide a gap for nesting birds to enter the building. This building should be demolished before the start of bird nesting season if possible. Bird nesting season is generally assumed to be from the end of February through the end of August, however this can vary with temperature and weather conditions. If there are any active bird nests, all work must stop, and a 5 m buffer created to prevent the nest from being disturbed until after the young have fledged and left the nest. <u>Original Comments received 28/12/2023:</u> This property is in a green impact risk zone for great crested newts. There are records of bats very close to the site and hedgehogs, swifts and stag beetles in the neighbourhood. I need to review photos of any areas which would be impacted by these proposals to determine whether a survey will be required. This would include any flashings, fascias, roof tiles, rear and side elevations and the rear garden. Biodiversity enhancements will be required. A bat box and a swift box may be appropriate for this building.
Southern Water Services:	No objection – guidance notes received

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 17/01/2024		

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, DM2, DM11 and DM14. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Chandlers Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:
<u>Site and Surroundings</u> The application site contains a two storey semi-detached character property located on the eastern side of Hursley Road. The property itself is finished in predominately red

brickwork with render to the existing first floor rear projection, a tiled pitched roof and white uPVC fenestration. The property is set back from Hursley Road by a front garden and gravel driveway which leads up the eastern side elevation. To the rear is an outbuilding which is shared with the adjoining neighbour 113 Hursley Road with a dividing wall internal wall as well as other outbuilding and a detached garage contained within the rear garden.

The wider surroundings comprise residential two storey dwellings of differing age and character in semi-detached pairs. Immediately south of the site lies a two storey block of residential flats.

Proposal

This application proposes a first floor extension which would increase the depth of the existing first floor projection, a single storey rear/side extension and a raised rear patio which would lead off from this extension. To make way for the proposals the outbuildings would be demolished, this would include the applicant's half of the outbuilding shared with no. 113.

The first floor rear extension as noted would increase 2.4m (approx.) in depth, it would be set down from rear projection with a pitched roof sited partly over the proposed single storey rear extension. This would allow for the existing bedroom and bathroom to be enlarged. This element of the proposal would be finished in matching white render and a grey uPVC window.

The single storey rear/side extension proposes a flat roof and would project a further 1.8m into the rear garden. The side element would extend 3.8m to the south with an overall depth of 7.2m (including the rear extension) and a height of 3m. The extension would comprise of an open plan, dining and family area and a study. This element would be finished in red brick to match the host dwelling, the doors and windows would be grey uPVC.

The proposed raised rear patio would lead off from the rear/side single storey extension, this would have a maximum depth of 3.7m, it would expand the width of the plot (8.6m) with a maximum height of 0.65m. This would have steps leading into the rear garden and would be enclosed with a 1m high glazed balustrade.

Principle

The application site falls within the urban edge, whereby alterations or extensions to, or within the curtilage of residential dwellinghouses are considered to be acceptable in principle, however, would be subject to the following considerations.

Design and Layout

- The design of the first floor rear extension, single storey rear/side extension and raised rear patio is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The first floor element when viewed from the rear would appear as a two storey rear extension. However, it would be set down from the ridge of the host dwelling and is considered a modest addition.
- Overall, the majority of the development would be sited to the rear of the host dwelling; the side element, while visible is single storey in nature and set well back from the principal elevation, which would provide a sense of subservience. Additionally, the host dwelling itself has a relatively deep set back from the road and, therefore the side extension visible would not be overly dominant within the public domain. As such, the impact within the street scene of Hursley Road would be minimal.

- The development proposes matching materials that would match the host property, the proposed grey fenestration (to the extensions only) is not currently found on the host dwelling. It was noted the properties opposite the site have grey coloured fenestration to all windows. As such, the proposed fenestration is not considered to be detrimentally harmful to the host dwelling and with the proposed matching materials, the development would be respectful to the property and the character area.
- From a site visit it was also noted that there were other examples of similar extensions within the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposals are considered to be in-keeping with the existing development within the locality.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site, adequate amenity space would remain with the extensions in place.
- Parking would remain unaffected as the development does not propose any additional bedrooms. The frontage to the site has ample space for off-street parking.

Residential Amenity

- The neighbours most impacted by the proposals would be the neighbour to north, 113 Hursley Road and the rear residential flats within Grayton Court to the south, Flat 2 (ground floor) and Flat 4 (first floor).
- The proposed single storey rear/side extension would not impact upon no. 113 as there is a garage and outbuilding sited along the boundary shared with 111 Hursley that would screen the extension adequately.
- The side element would project 3m closer to Flat 2 on the ground floor and would be set in 0.8m from the shared boundary. The window to Flat 2 closest to the site is a rear window serving a bedroom. At the time of the site visit it was noted this window has a limited outlook due to the bin/cycle storage to the rear of the flats and a garage along the boundary within the garden to the application site. Additionally, the window already receives limited light as this window is northeast facing. Due to the existing relationship and considering the outbuilding along the boundary would be removed and the proposed extension would be located away from this boundary, the extension is not proposed to cause adverse harm to this neighbour. Additionally, the boundary treatment would screen the majority of the development.
- Flat 4 on the first floor is unlikely to be affected by the single storey extension. It is acknowledged the proposed first floor extension would slightly alter the outlook to Flat 4's bedroom window on the rear elevation. However, due to the separation distance between the two dwellings (8m approx.), the outlook is not expected to be harmed to an unacceptable degree.
- The first floor rear extension has the potential to impact upon 113 as this property has a first floor rear facing window which serves a single bedroom and the proposed extension would alter the outlook and light received to this room. The Quality Places SPD sets out a 45-degree daylighting test for primary windows at the rear of neighbouring properties, noting that if a development crosses the 45-degree line on both the elevation and floor plan then the development would cause a noticeable reduction in skylight received by the window. Plans were provided that apply the daylighting test and the proposal crosses the 45-degree line on the floor plan only and as such passes the daylighting test. Furthermore, it is noted this window faces northeast and therefore the daylight received to this window receives is already limited. As such, while it is acknowledged the first floor extension would impact the outlook and light to the bedroom window, it would not be to an unacceptable degree that it warrants refusal of this application.
- The raised rear patio and potential views would be screened by the existing boundary treatments along the neighbouring boundaries and outbuilding/stores located in the adjoining neighbouring rear gardens. As such, the raised patio does not generate any overlooking or loss of privacy concerns.

- Therefore, and to conclude, the proposed 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.

Ecology

- Owing to the nature of the development, the Council's Ecologist was consulted upon. Initially they advised that the site was in close proximity to bat roosts and requested site visit photos. Upon review of these photos, the Ecologist requested a preliminary roost assessment.
- The Preliminary Roost Assessment Report by Hampshire Ecological Services was received 16 February 2024. The Council's Ecologist reviewed this and is content with the measures set out which will be secured by condition. They also recommended the outbuilding set to be demolished would require either a pre-works emergence check or that demolition should be carried out under ecological supervision. The applicant has agreed to carry out these works under ecological supervision and this will also be secured by condition.

Other Material Considerations

- As noted, the one half of the shared outbuilding with 113 Hursley Road would be removed to make way for the development (up to the shared boundary). A note to applicant will be recommended to arrange a party wall agreement between the applicant and the occupier of no. 113.
- 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 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.

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, 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 reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

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: This application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐