

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/96792

Site Address: 134 PARK ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1HQ

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Demolition of the existing conservatory. Single storey side and rear extensions. New timber porch. Alterations to fenestration.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within Established Residential Area • Within Built-up Area Boundary		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/12589/003/00 - Erection of 9no. Flats in a three storey block with car parking, bin store, bike store, landscaping and vehicular access from paulson close following demolition of existing building - Refuse Planning Permission For - 12/03/2002 • Z/12589/004/00 - Erection of 8no. Flats in a three storey block with carparking, binstore, bike store, landscaping and vehicular access from paulson close following demolition of existing building (amended design) - Withdrawn By Applicant - 12/06/2002 • Z/12589/005/00 - Conversion and extension of existing dwelling to 5 apartments with associated vehicle parking, cycle and refuse stores with new vehicular access from park road - refuse planning permission for - 29/01/2003 • F/06/58613 - Rear conservatory - Permit - 09/01/2007 • H/22/94178 - Retention of fence - Permit - 07/03/2023 • H/23/94953 - Ground floor extension and loft conversion - Dismissed - 17/10/2023		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	Two letters of representation have been received. One letter expresses a comment regarding the compatibility and integration of the proposed development with the existing building. Specifically, it raises concerns about the creation of a porch on the elevation facing Park Road. The second letter presents objections to the proposed alterations, emphasising the importance of preserving the historic and visual integrity of the existing Georgian-style period building at 134 Park Road. The objections outlined in the second letter highlight several key points: • Concerns about compatibility with existing building, particularly the porch. • Emphasises preservation of Georgian-style period building. • Dissatisfaction with scale, form, and position of proposed alterations. • Impact on neighbouring properties and street scene. • Lack of consideration for alternative designs. • Wasted space and inefficient layout, including unnecessary kitchenette and lounge areas. • Detrimental effect on street scene and loss of spaciousness.		

Parish Council:	No comments were received.
Tree Consultant:	Do not raise an arboricultural objection to the proposal.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 5 th October 2023		

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: 134 Park Road is a brick built detached, two-storey, double-bay fronted Georgian-style dwelling with a hipped roof, occupying a corner plot fronting Paulson Close, a short cul-de-sac, and with a side return boundary to the east facing Park Road. The dwelling has a single-storey bay window projection across part of its west side elevation with a recessed larger projecting conservatory addition beyond. To the rear, and projecting forward of the dwelling's east, side elevation is a detached, prefabricated single-width garage with a driveway in front accessed from Park Road. The garden to the west side of the dwelling is enclosed by a tall, close-boarded fence. The remaining roadside boundaries are enclosed by lower close-boarded fencing. The area is residential in character comprising a broad range of property types, ages, and appearances. The current application is a resubmission following the dismissal of appeal application H/23/94953. It seeks planning permission for the ground floor side and rear extensions to the main house. The proposed rear extension is intended for use as a self-contained annexe, while the side extension will enlarge the existing family room and lounge following the demolition of the existing conservatory. Additionally, the proposal includes the construction of a new porch facing Park Road. <u>Background</u> The inspector highlighted that the proposed ground floor extension in the dismissed appeal application H/23/94953 would not harmonise with the existing dwelling or its surroundings due to its size and design. The extension's scale, siting, and appearance were considered incongruous with the character of the original building and the neighbourhood. Despite reviewing alternative options and considering the appellant's personal circumstances, the inspector concluded that the proposed development would cause harm and conflict with local and national planning policies. As a result, the appeal was dismissed. <u>Principle</u> The application site lies within an established residential area where the basic principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being based upon the exact nature, design, and impact of that proposed being considered acceptable and in accordance with the relevant policies within the adopted local plan and supplementary planning guidance.

Layout, design, and impact upon the character of the area

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of urban areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design, and siting.
- The application proposes to add a rear extension intended to function as a self-contained annexe, comprising utility, WC, bedroom, kitchen, and living room facilities. Additionally, a new porch linked to the rear extension and facing Park Road is proposed, while the existing conservatory will be demolished to accommodate the side extension, thereby enlarging the existing family room and lounge.
- The proposed rear extension will measure approximately 15.0m in length and adopt a rectangular shape. It will not extend as far along the northern boundary fence and will employ matching materials to facilitate integration with the original structure. Positioned slightly back from the principal wall, it will help to avoid brickwork mismatch. Notably, the introduction of the rear extension will result in the removal of the existing garage. This change is considered to contribute to a more uniform side elevation, enhancing the overall profile of the house and positively impacting the street scene.
- Regarding the proposed side extension, its flat-roof appearance, location, and modest size, protruding only approximately 2.5m from the side wall at its furthest point, ensure that it will not have an adverse impact on the street scene.
- While the proposed porch within the side of the rear extension may raise concerns about visual impact, its modest dimensions do not warrant refusal. Additionally, it serves to soften the transition between the main dwelling and the rear extension. Considering the diverse mix of styles among neighbouring properties along Park Road, the addition of the porch is unlikely to attract undue attention or significantly alter the area's character.
- The resubmission has effectively addressed the concerns raised by the inspector during the appeal process. The proposed developments exhibit differences in form, scale, and materials compared to the previously refused application. Additionally, the combined rear and side extension will not lead to overdevelopment, as the application site will retain sufficient amenity spaces.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulate that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.
- The neighbouring property at 136 Park Road will be the most affected by the proposed developments. However, it's essential to note that the inspector's assessment during the appeal statement concluded that although the previously refused ground floor extension failed to complement or respect the character or appearance of the existing house, its single-storey height and adequate separation distances from neighbouring boundaries meant it would not be unduly overbearing or likely to reduce levels of light or outlook to an unacceptable degree. Building upon this, given that the previously refused extension, which was larger, was deemed to have no harmful impact on the adjacent neighbour, the reduced size and increased setback of the current rear extension in this resubmission will similarly not cause any adverse effects on the adjacent neighbour's residential

amenity.

- While the rear extension's facilities could allow it to function as a self-contained annexe, its physical connection to the main house mitigates the possibility of subdividing it into independent units, thus minimising potential impacts on neighbouring properties. A condition will be imposed to restrict its use to complement the existing dwelling or for use by a dependent relative of the occupiers. Its use as an independent unit of accommodation will be prohibited.
- The proposed side extension will be further away from the shared boundary and distance away from 4 Paulson Close, so it is also not considered to have any harmful impacts on any neighbours.

Trees and landscaping

- Despite a TPO showing on the system, there are no significant trees within influencing distance of the proposed development area. Therefore, the Council's Tree Consultant raised no arboricultural objection to the proposal.

Highways and 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.
- It was noted from the site visit that sufficient on-site parking space remains within the curtilage of the dwelling, to serve a property of this size. Therefore, the proposal would not have a detrimental effect to highway safety and would accord to guidance set in the Residential Parking Standards SDP.

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, 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.

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:

- Permit subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐