

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/96873

Site Address: ANNEXE, 62 CHESTNUT AVENUE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 5AL

Case Officer: Alexandra Stone

Description: Single storey extension

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

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Z/40576/000/00 – CLUED issued - 26/02/2004 Certificate of lawfulness for an existing use for single storey rear extension to provide an additional unit of accommodation.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Parish Council:	No Objection		
Ecologist:	No Objection		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 05/04/2024		

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:
<u>Principle</u> The application is for the addition of a single storey extension to the existing annexe to enlarge the living and kitchen areas, measuring approximately 3m by 5.8m. • The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.
<u>Design and layout</u> Policy DM1 states; All new development should (as relevant): a. not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance: i. residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast;

The annexe is located to the rear of a semi-detached dwelling which is situated on a corner plot, to the north of Chestnut Avenue, where Cranbury Road runs along to the west.

The existing annexe is of substantial size measuring approximately 9.6m in depth and 3.4m in height. The proposed extension would be a further 3m which when combined with the existing would be considered overdevelopment of the site. This would also fail to retain sufficient amenity space, contrary to the Council's Quality Places SPD, (which sets out that at least 60% external amenity area should be retained).

The proposed extension would also be visible from public vantage points along Cranbury Road, as a result of the low boundary treatment. The proposed extension would appear as an excessively large structure within the rear garden of a domestic property, which is fairly uncharacteristic when compared to the existing surrounding development. It is acknowledged that there are some outbuildings/ garages within rear gardens, however none appear to be of a comparable size to that proposed within this application. Thus, would be contrary to the established urban grain.

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 siting of the development, the proposal is considered to result in an incongruous addition, which would have an adversely harmful impact upon the streetscene and vantage points along Cranbury Road.

Residential amenity

No60. would be the main neighbouring property to be impacted. The existing annexe is situated in close proximity to the Eastern boundary and is of substantial dimensions. The addition of the proposed extension would result in development of 3.4m in height along the whole of the Eastern boundary thus would have an oppressive and overbearing impact upon this neighbour. It would also result in a sense of enclosure which would be detrimentally harmful to their amenity, contrary to DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), and the Council's Quality Places SPD.

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 ☒

- 1) The proposed development by reason of its siting, size and scale (especially when combined with the existing development), would result in an incongruous addition which would have an adverse impact upon the host dwelling and also wider public vantage points (namely along Cranbury Road), this would also result in an unacceptable loss of external amenity space, contrary to Policy DM1 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 extension, due to its siting, scale and close proximity to the eastern boundary, would result in an oppressive and overbearing structure, and would create a sense of enclosure, which would be adversely harmful to the neighbouring amenities of 60 Chestnut Ave. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), Quality Places SPD (2011), and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).