

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97154

Site Address: 245 HURSLEY ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1JQ

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Single storey side and rear extensions with rear facing dormer.

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

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• H/23/96234 - Single storey side and rear extensions with rear facing dormer - Refuse Planning Permission For - 08/12/2023		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	No official comment received online, but the adjacent neighbour at 247 Hursley Road has sent an email inquiry asking if there have been any changes to this application. It appears to be the same as the previously refused scheme (H/23/96234).		
Parish Council:	No comments were received.		
Ecologist:	There are several potential bat roost features on the rear elevation and a pond in the rear garden. A preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) is required. If the pond will not be affected by these proposals, then a preliminary bat roost appraisal (PRA) would be acceptable. A CEMP will be required and can be conditioned. This must contain a precautionary working method to protect reptiles, amphibians, hedgehogs, and stag beetles. It must also contain methods that will be used to protect the stream and pond from pollution including sediment from the building works.		
Southern Water:	In order to protect drainage apparatus, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following condition is attached to the planning permission; prior to the commencement of development, the developer must advise the local authority, in consultation with Southern Water, of measures which will be undertaken to protect the public sewers.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 1 st November 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:

The application property is a 4-bedroom detached bungalow, featuring a rear dormer and a detached garage located at the side. Situated within a small close on Hursley Road, the application site is part of a row consisting of 3 detached bungalows. The immediate surrounding is residential in nature. This application is a resubmission following the refusal of application H/23/96234, which was declined due to concerns regarding its adverse impact on the host dwelling and street scene. The proposed scheme in this application remains identical to H/23/96234, seeking planning approval for a single storey side and rear extensions, along with the demolition of the existing detached garage and rear conservatory, and the addition of a rear dormer. Given that no modifications to the current proposal and the failure to address previously raised concerns, this application remains unsupportable for the following reasons:

Principle

- 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.

Character and Design

- 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 proposed single storey side extension would elongate the existing ridge line of the application property. It is worth noting that the application property, along with its adjacent neighbours at 247 and 249 Hursley Road in the small close, maintains a well-proportioned and cohesive appearance, contributing positively to the area. Therefore, it is considered that any increase in length for any of these bungalows would create a jarring contrast, disrupting the established rhythm and balance. While it may be argued that the current ridge lengths of Nos. 245, 247, and 249 are not identical, it is important to highlight that none of these properties possess the same length as proposed in the current application.
- 245 Hursley Road faces North Millers Dale, a significant junction, meaning that any alterations at its front would be notably prominent. While the adjacent property on the right-hand side (243 Hursley Road) shares a prominent location with the application site and also has an elongated ridge line due to a single storey side extension, it's essential to note that each application is assessed based on its individual merits. Planning consent for No. 243's side extension was granted over 30 years ago, during a period significantly distinct in terms of policy and guidance compared to the present. Additionally, No. 243 is situated outside the row of bungalows within the small close, so it should not serve as a precedent; the two properties cannot be directly compared. Replicating No. 243's extended ridge line might result in two excessively long bungalows when viewed from a wider street scene, potentially causing an adverse visual impact on the public realm and the wider area.

- The proposed introduction of various new materials and colours, such as vertical larch cladding, white render, and grey anthracite windows, is deemed to disregard the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Consequently, it creates an incongruous visual effect when viewed alongside neighbouring properties.
- In terms of the proposed rear dormer, it will cover a substantial portion of the rear roof and be designed with a shed roof, incorporating new materials. While it would not be visible from the front elevation and thus would not directly impact the overall street scene, its size, design, and material used would conflict with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. As a result, the host dwelling's side and rear profiles would not be aesthetically enhanced.
- Paragraph 134 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 documents. To conclude, the proposal is considered to fail to respect the original house and pose a potential disruption to the cohesive appearance of the area, adversely impacting the street scene.

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.
- Given the separation distance from adjacent neighbours and the absence of side-facing windows, the proposed developments are not deemed to pose immediate harmful impacts on neighbouring properties in terms of loss of outlook, light, and privacy.

Ecology

- Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough.
- The application site falls within an amber impact risk zone for great crested newts, with recorded of various wildlife including grass snakes, slow worms, common toads, bats, hedgehogs, and stag beetles, as well as plants such as lesser spearwort and annual knawel nearby. Moreover, a stream flows along the eastern rear boundary of the property. In light of these ecological considerations, the Council's Ecologist has been consulted as part of this application process. Upon reviewing the site photos, it was advised that there are potential bat roost features on the rear elevation and a pond in the rear garden, requiring a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA). If the proposed developments will not impact the pond, a preliminary bat roost appraisal (PRA) would be acceptable for assessment. In the event the application was deemed acceptable in other respects, the mentioned appraisal would have been requested, and biodiversity enhancements could have been secured through conditions.

Trees and landscaping

- There are no significant trees within influencing distance of the proposed development area.

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.
- Despite the proposal not resulting in additional bedrooms, maintaining the application property as a 4-bedroom dwelling, the removal of the existing garage would lead to a loss of one on-site parking space. However, it is noted from the site plan that there are 3 available parking spaces within the front garden area after widening the dropped kerb. As such, no objection on highway grounds.

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:

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed roof alteration, coupled with the single storey side extension, by reason of their excessive length and prominent positioning facing North Millers Dale, would introduce a visual dissonance and disrupt the cohesive appearance of the area that adversely affect the street scene. The proposal is 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).
2. The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its size, design and material used, would not respect the character and appearance of the original building, thereby being at odds with the group of bungalows of which the application property forms part. The proposal is 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).
3. There are several potential bat roost features on the rear elevation, which are protected by virtue of the Habitats and Species Regulations (2019). Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that bats are not likely to be affected by the works, and therefore the works are unlikely to be granted a license by Natural England. The proposal would therefore be likely to result in an offence under the Habitats and Species Regulations (2019). The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒