

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97199

Site Address: 7 ROGERS ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 6DZ

Case Officer: Rebecca Altman

Description: Retrospective: Single storey side and rear extension and alterations to fenestration (revised scheme to planning application H/22/93002).

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Urban Edge • TPO's rear of site • Surface water flood risk rear of site		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• H/22/93002 – Demolition of detached garage, single storey side and rear extensions and alteration to fenestration – permitted 13/07/2022		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None received.		
Parish Council:	No Comments received.		
Ecologist:	No apparent differences that would impact on ecology.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 24 April 2024 – photographs on file.		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance
Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policies are DM1, DM14 and DM23.
Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards.

Assessment:
Site and proposal The application relates to a single-storey semi-detached property on the east side of Rogers Road in Bishopstoke. Planning permission was granted in 2022 for a rear and side extension and these works have been undertaken but with some differences from the approved plans. The current application seeks to authorise the scheme as built. The main differences between the plans previously approved and the extensions as built are as follows: - Revised design and frame colour for windows and doors; - Amendment from render to brickwork for the extension elevations; - Amended positioning of roof lanterns; - Clear glazing to side facing kitchen window rather than obscure glazing; - Reduced width of side extension by approx. 0.3m; - Minor increase in depth of rear extension (approx. 0.1m due to roof overhang); - Full flat roof to rear extension rather than sloped end as previously proposed.

Design and appearance

Although the amendments have altered the appearance of the extension from that which was approved, it has not significantly changed its overall form and size. The extension is still considered to be of an appropriate size and design in relation to the main property and surrounding area and a suitable sized garden would be maintained to the rear.

The main change that has affected the appearance of the property from the streetscene is the amendment from white frames to dark grey frames for the windows and doors (including on the original dwelling). Whilst the majority of properties in Rogers Road are of similar construction with red brick elevations and white framed windows, they are not fully uniform in appearance (others have been altered by extensions and roof works for example), and there is greater variation in building designs to the north of the application site. Given that the elevations have remained red brick, the amended window frame colour is not considered to be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene.

With regard to the roof lanterns, it appears that these were only shown on the floorplans of the original application (not the elevations), but were taken into account in the Officer's assessment and determined to be acceptable. The roof lanterns have been constructed in different positions but this alteration does not significantly alter the overall appearance of the extension.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The amended design has only very slightly altered the size of the extension, with part of the side extension being reduced in width and a very minor increase in depth of the rear extension as a result of an overhang to the flat roof. The main walls of the rear extension continue to align with the neighbours extension to the south and therefore does not have any adverse impact on the amenities of those neighbours by way of loss of outlook, light or privacy.

To the north, the neighbouring property (No.5) is set away from the site boundary and the main alteration that changes the relationship with this neighbouring property is the installation of a clear glass window to the kitchen rather than obscure glazing as previously required by condition. This window faces across to the neighbouring garden, with a view over the side fence and the roof of an existing outbuilding. On balance, as this window does not serve a main habitable room and does not directly face the rear windows of the neighbouring property, it is considered that the clear glass be accepted in this instance. There are windows on other nearby properties that can be seen from the kitchen window, but these are a sufficient distance away to prevent adverse overlooking impact.

Parking

The extensions have increased the size of the property from 3 to 4-bedrooms, which increases the parking requirement from 2 to 3 spaces in accordance with the Adopted Parking Standards. The existing property has a driveway which would appear to be able to accommodate 2 cars, and this was determined to be acceptable under the previous application, with the Officer noting that additional space for parking could potentially be achieved under permitted development. As there has been no further increase in bedroom numbers as a result of the amendments, it would not be reasonable to raise objection due to lack of parking.

Ecology

The Council's Ecologist does not consider that the revisions would have any implications in relation to ecology impacts. They noted that the garden has been cleared which could have resulted in lost habitat, however, site photographs show that the garden had already

been cleared when the original application was submitted, therefore there has been no significant change in this situation.

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:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐