

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/96732

Site Address: 68 CHALK HILL, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO18 3DB

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Extension of basement level to rear with ground and first floor rear extensions including terrace (Resubmission of application H/22/93889)

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the Urban Edge TPO trees (to the frontage of the site)		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Application No.	Description	Decision
H/22/93889	Extension of basement level to rear with ground and first floor rear extensions including terrace	Refused November 2022 Appeal Dismissed June 2023
H/21/91872	Second storey extension above existing single storey rear extension with balcony, re-positioning of external staircase	Refused – December 2021
F/05/55875	Ground floor and lower ground floor extensions with external steps and addition of pitched roof to garage	Permit – March 2006

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>1no. objection received from 66 Chalk Hill (summarised):</u> • Overdevelopment • Loss of sunlight • Loss of privacy • Subsidence concerns • Appearance is visually intrusive <u>LPA Response</u> Subsidence, underpinning and foundations will be inspected under Building Control legislation and is not a planning matter. The other points raised are covered in the assessment below.		
West End Parish Council:	<u>Objection</u> Councillors felt no significant alterations had been made since the previous application.		
Trees:	This application appears to be similar, from an arboricultural perspective, to that submitted previously under H/22/93889. There are some trees to the front of the property that are subject to Tree Preservation Orders, and some vegetation on neighbouring properties to the south. All other trees are vegetation appear to be suitably distant from the proposed development area. With regards to the trees to the front, these are suitably naturally protected by the property boundary and the driveway, and no further formal protection is warranted beyond their statutory protection.		

	Regarding the trees within the property to the south, while these are third party property, they are not significant from an amenity point-of-view. There is a risk of root damage to the trees, but the area between the proposed development is hard-standing and it is unlikely that any significant roots are within the proposed development area. Therefore, we raise no arboricultural objection to the proposals.
Ecology:	The ecology response for this application is the same as the ecology response for the previous application H/22/93889. I don't see any changes between the two proposals which would affect ecological concerns. There are records of bats, hedgehogs, swifts and badgers near this property and an area of woodland at the western boundary. I don't see any potential bat roost features on the building. Please could you add the following informative to the decision notice: In the unlikely event of any bats being found during demolition or construction, all work must stop immediately, and Natural England must be informed. Additional information is available on the Bat Conservation Trust website at https://www.bats.org.uk/advice/im-working-on-a-building-with/bats/ive-found-a-bat-during-works A CEMP containing a precautionary working method to protect small mammals during construction will be required. If badgers or signs of badgers are found on site, all work must stop and Natural England must be notified. Standing advice on badgers is available on line at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/badgers-advice-for-making-planning-decisions If exterior lighting is to be used, a wildlife sensitive lighting plan will be required. Biodiversity enhancements are required. A bat brick/box and swift brick/ box may be appropriate for this building.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 27/02/2024		

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; Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:
<u>Site and Surroundings</u>

The application site comprises a two-storey detached dwellinghouse located to the west of Chalk Hill. The property is largely screen by mature trees/vegetation front Chalk Hill (which are covered by a TPO). The dwelling is served by a modest driveway which has a western decline down to the property. The dwellinghouse itself is finished in yellow brickwork which white uPVC fenestration and a tiled roof. The property benefits from a single storey side extension (to the north) and single storey extension to the rear (west). The rear garden slopes away from the host dwelling due to the topography of the land, having a noticeable western decline.

The wider surroundings are characterised by large detached dwellinghouses. Whilst there is no real uniformity in terms of appearance, there is a general material palette comprising; red/yellow brick work, white fenestration and tiled roofs.

Proposal

This application seeks the approval of a combination of extensions to the rear comprising; an extension to the existing basement to include a terrace above as well as ground and first floor rear extensions (due to the topography of the land the property would appear as a three storey dwelling when viewed from the rear garden). The current external staircase would be enclosed creating internal access between the ground and basement.

The proposed first floor extension would have a double hipped roof and would be sited over the existing ground floor extension, mostly spanning the width of the host dwelling. The first floor extension would be stepped in to the north of the host dwelling, as a result the larger element of this extension is positioned to the south of the property.

The ground floor extension facilitates the enclosure of the north external staircase, this would have a mono-pitched roof and would create an internal staircase between the ground floor and basement.

The basement would be extended and would project a further 3.6m into the rear garden and 2.4m towards the northern boundary. There would be a terrace above the extended part of the basement. This would be enclosed by a 1.0m high clear balustrade facing west, to the north and south, there would be 1.8m high obscured glazed privacy screens. An external staircase would be sited to the northern side of the extended basement, providing access from the ground floor to the rear garden.

The proposals would be finished in materials that would match the host dwelling.

Principle

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

Background and Comparison to Previously Refused Schemes

The site has two recently refused planning applications (as stated in the planning history section of this report), one of which (H/22/93889) was also dismissed at appeal.

The main concerns to this application where:

- Excessive size of the proposed rear extensions
- Use of new materials
- Overbearing impact upon the neighbour to the north, no. 66

In response to the above concerns, this planning application has sought to alleviate these. The differences are laid out for clarity:

- The first floor extension has been reduced in scale

- The ground floor extension close to the northern boundary has been significantly reduced in bulk and mass with a mono-pitched roof proposed
- The proposed use of matching materials

This revised scheme is considered to have addressed the concerns and reasons for refusal as set out in the previous planning applications and dismissed appeal and will be set out and expanded upon within the relevant sections of this report.

Design and Layout

- The design of the proposed development is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance. The extensions are subordinate additions to the host dwelling and considered proportionate in relation to the dwelling. While the extended basement is relatively sizeable, it is single storey in nature, lessening the overall massing and overbearing. Additionally, the proposed development would be sited entirely at the rear of the property and not visible within the public realm.
- The proposals would be in keeping with the existing extensions seen within the wider surroundings, some of which have been extended heavily at the rear which includes terraces/balconies. The use of matching materials will ensure the proposal remains respectful to the host dwelling with a consistent appearance across all elevations to the property.
- As noted, the basement extension allows for the introduction of a rear terrace which would be enclosed by glazed balustrading, providing a more practical and accessible outside space for the occupants than what currently exists. While combined, the basement and terrace screens add more bulk at the rear of the dwelling, these screens are lightweight and are not overly prominent.
- The proposal would not be an overdevelopment of the site, a large garden would remain with the development in place.
- To conclude, it is considered the proposals in this planning application has been scaled back and along with matching materials, is now deemed acceptable in terms of overall design.

Residential Amenity

- As a result of the location of the proposed development and differing ground levels. The neighbour most impacted would be the neighbour to the north, 66 Chalk Hill. A site visit was undertaken to the neighbouring property, here it was ascertained there is a significant change on topographical levels. The application site being on higher ground levels than no. 66. Concerns were raised by the previous Planning Officer and the Planning Inspector in the previous planning applications and deemed the two storey extensions sited in close proximity to the shared boundary with no. 66 detrimentally imposing.
- This application has appeared to rectify those concerns; the ground and first floor additions are suitably distanced from this neighbour (7m approx.) with the main mass and bulk of the proposal to the south of the host dwelling where in turn the neighbour to the south, no. 70 is on higher ground than the application site and there is a similar separation distance between 68 and 70.
- The extended basement would be set in 2.1m from the boundary shared with no. 66 and there would be a 4.4m separation distance between the dwellings. The rear terrace located on basement roof is set in further at the north from the shared boundary by 4.8m. The height of the extended basement would be 2.6m high, combined with the obscured screen to the northern side of the terrace there would be an overall height of 4.6m. While it is acknowledged the basement and terrace together result in a visual presence, it is accepted the basement is now single storey only. The obscure screen (while providing privacy) would be glazed and lightweight and is not considered to be unacceptably dominant and would allow light to enter the garden to no. 66. Furthermore, there is mature vegetation along this boundary which would screen the basement and most of the rear terrace when the neighbouring resident is using their main private amenity space. Additionally,

the privacy screens have been marked as obscured glazed which would provide privacy to both the applicant and the neighbouring resident. A condition will be applied to ensure the screen remains in place to ease privacy and overlooking concerns.

- Concerns have also been raised by no. 66 in that the proposal would create a loss of light into their lounge. The site plan indicates the 45-degree line from no. 66's closest window shows the extended basement would slightly impede this line. However, at the time of the visit to the neighbouring property, it was ascertained this window serves a utility room, not in frequent use. The next rear window further north serves the lounge to no. 66, the 45-degree test was applied to this window and was found not to breach this line. As such, the outlook and light to the closest habitable room would not be significantly impacted upon.
- On balance, when considering the above-mentioned points, it is acknowledged the proposal will impact upon no. 66, however with the changes made in this application, this impact is now no longer to a detrimental and harmful degree. It is accepted no. 66's outlook at the rear will change but due to the reduction in scale and massing, the extensions would not result in an imposing presence. The proposal is no longer expected to cease no. 66's enjoyment of their property when compared to the previously refused scheme and the proposed development in this application is deemed acceptable.
- As noted, due to the distance, differing ground levels and extensive, high boundary treatment between nos. 68 and 70, the proposal is not expected to impact upon no. 70 as the development would be screened sufficiently.
- Overall, 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.

Highway Safety and Parking

- The property has 4no. bedrooms which requires 3no. off-street parking spaces. The proposals do not result in any additional bedrooms, therefore the parking would remain unaffected and the current off-street parking arrangements would remain unchanged.

Trees and Ecology

- Both the Council's Tree Officer and Ecologist have been consulted as part of this application.
- The Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposal. They note that are protected trees to the front of the site, however these are not considered to be impacted upon as a result of the proposals.
- The Council's Ecologist was content the host dwelling did not have any potential bat roost features. They have recommended a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) as a pre-commencement condition to ensure small mammals are protected during construction. The agent has agreed to this condition. The Ecologist has also recommended biodiversity enhancements and advice on external lighting which will be recommended as an informative to the applicant.

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: On balance due to the changes that have been made, this planning application is recommended for approval.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐