

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/96743

Site Address: 53 WHALESMEAD ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 8HJ

Case Officer: Alexandra Stone

Description: Proposed single and two storey rear extension and side window alterations

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

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>51 Whalesmead (summarised):</u> Ground floor window on boundary overlooking and opening onto garden. Concerned that the fascia, soffits and guttering to the extension up to his boundary will overhang into garden. The loss of light to his lounge and garden following the build of the 1 and 2 storey extension. <u>Officer comments:</u> The ground floor window is to be obscured and restricted opening. There is no proposal of guttering to overhand to neighbouring property. The second storey would be substantially stepped away from the boundary therefore unlikely to cause overshadowing of the neighbouring lounge.		
Parish Council:	No Objection		
Ecologist:	No Objection		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 01/03/2024		

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; Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:
The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that: <u>Principle</u>

The application is for a single storey rear extension measuring approximately 5m by 7.4m to the rear of the existing garage, to provide an office and utility room. There is also a two-storey aspect above part of the rear extension to create an upstairs bathroom.

- The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.

Design and layout

The dwelling is within Whalesmead road, consisting of bungalows with similar frontages and attached garages. From the front of the dwelling the raising of the flat roof garage would be seen although this would be similar to the existing.

Part of the proposal is to extend the existing garage at single storey height to create a utility room and office. As this is at single storey height it is unlikely to cause over shadowing and the height would be similar to what is allowed under permitted development.

The two-storey aspect is set away from the boundary by approximately 2.7m and would not exceed the existing roof therefore would remain unseen from the front of the dwelling. The ground floor of the two-storey extension would create a dining room and to the first floor the addition of an upstairs bathroom. The rear of the proposed two-storey extension would have a Juliette balcony and would be cladded. This would remain unseen from the highway.

- The design of the rear two storey and single storey extensions are suited to the host dwelling in terms of their 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

It is noted that there are 2no. side windows proposed, one to the first floor and one to the ground floor. These are to be obscured glazed so unlikely to cause overlooking. As the proposed balcony would be a Juliette balcony, it would also be unlikely to cause overlooking.

- 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 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.

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 ...