

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/96917

Site Address: 37 KINGSWAY GARDENS, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1FF

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Two storey side and rear extension, and single storey rear extension

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

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/25018/000/00 - Extension to garage and side extension - Permit - 29/01/1981 • H/17/80437 - Two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension - Permit - 23/08/2017		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	No comments were received.		
Parish Council:	No comments were received.		
Ecologist:	<u>4th March 2024</u> A preliminary ecological appraisal is required. A precautionary working method for hedgehogs, great crested newts and stag beetles will also be required. <u>7th May 2024</u> I have reviewed the site photos (2/4/24) and the amended proposed elevations. The site photos show that the hanging tiles have been removed previously and this area has been rendered at some point in the past (as also mentioned in an email from the applicant, May 2024). I don't see any obvious potential bat roost features in these photos however it must be noted that the existing roof elevations are not visible.		
Tree Consultant:	No arboricultural objection to the proposal, subject to condition.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 28 th February 2024		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance
Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 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 two-storey, three-bedroom, detached dwelling. The front elevation of the property presents various features, including a brick construction complemented by a rendered finish on one half, a first-floor balcony, and a carport. To the rear of the property, there is an enclosed garden. Kingsway Gardens is characterised by two predominant house types, the first type is the two-storey detached dwellings featuring integral garages and balconies, and the second type is the two-storey detached dwellings, characterised by cat slide roofs, and projected balconies. The current application seeks planning permission for the construction of a two-storey side and rear extension, as well as a single-storey rear extension. Additionally, the proposal includes replacing the balustrade of the front balcony from brick to black railing. Initially, the design of the entire single storey rear extension features a pitched roof. However, a section of this roof will protrude beyond the existing flat roof side extension, potentially compromising visual cohesion. Therefore, adjustments have been proposed, with a portion of the roof structure of the single storey rear extension being amended to a flat roof design.

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.

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 proposal will introduce a significant increase in the overall mass, bulk, and scale to the host dwelling. However, it is noted that the proposed two-storey extensions primarily occupy the footprint of the existing carport and storage area, while the single storey rear extension is to fill the rear void of the property, thereby allowing for the retention of sufficient amenity space. Furthermore, given that numerous properties in Kingsway Gardens have already undergone various extensions, it is considered that the resultant dwelling would not appear disproportionately large and would integrate well with the diverse street scene.
- The proposed two-storey elements will be set back from the principal wall, ensuring a degree of subservience to the host dwelling and preventing the creation of an elongated brick block structure within the Kingsway Gardens. Regarding the proposed single storey rear extension, while it will span the entire length of the property, its rear placement minimises its visual impact on the surrounding area.
- The replacement of the front balcony's brick balustrade with black railing is considered beneficial in lightening the visual weight of the property, particularly following the addition of a two-storey brick development to the side. It was noted from the site visit that neighbouring properties on either side also feature front balconies with black railing, suggesting that this design choice would integrate

seamlessly with the prevailing style in the street.

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 most directly impacted neighbour by the proposal will be 39 Kingsway Garden due to the proximity to the proposed two-storey side and rear extensions. However, it was observed that there is only one obscure glazed side window on this neighbouring property facing toward the two-storey extensions. Additionally, the two-storey extensions will only slightly extend beyond the existing rear wall of the host dwelling, thus it is not anticipated to cause overshadowing or significant loss of light to a level that would warrant refusal. Furthermore, only one very small en-suite window is proposed on the first-floor side elevation, which is unlikely to result in overlooking concerns.
- Regarding the replacement of the balustrade with black railing, while this change will result in a clearer view from the balcony, it's worth noting that the balcony is situated at the front where all views are already open to the public. Therefore, the proposed replacement of the balustrade is not considered to cause any overlooking issues or loss of privacy.
- As for the proposed rear extension, due to its single storey nature, it is not anticipated to cause adverse impacts on adjacent neighbours.

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 site falls within an amber impact risk zone for great crested newts, and there are records of bats, hedgehogs, and stag beetles in the vicinity. Given the scale of the proposed extension, which would affect a significant portion of the house, its roof, and the rear garden, the Council's Ecologist initially requested the submission of a preliminary ecological appraisal. However, upon investigation, it was discovered that the hanging tiles had been previously removed, and the area had been rendered at some point in the past, with no obvious potential bat roost features remaining. As such, the need for the preliminary ecological appraisal was deemed unnecessary.
- Furthermore, the Ecologist raised concerns about a drain located at the end of the tarmac path in the rear garden, suggesting that if it serves as a soakaway, it might be affected by the proposed rear extension and may need relocation. Regulations stipulate that soakaways must be positioned at least 5 meters away from any built structure. In the event that this distance is less than 5 meters, a surface water drainage plan would be required, outlining the placement of a new surface water drain at a minimum distance of 5 meters from the house and outbuildings. However, upon clarification from the agent, it was confirmed that the drain at the end of the tarmac path functions solely as a drain and not as a soakaway, thus negating the necessity for a surface water drainage plan.

Trees and landscaping

- Due to the presence of trees to the rear (offsite), the Council's Tree Consultant has been consulted as part of this application process. Following a thorough review of the proposal, no arboricultural objections were raised. However, approval is subject to condition.

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.
- The proposal includes the addition of two extra bedrooms, resulting in the property being classified as a 5+ bedroom dwelling, which requires a minimum of three parking spaces. With the proposed two-storey extensions replacing the existing carport, the current driveway can accommodate only one vehicle. However, according to the submitted site plan, it is evident that modifications are planned for the front garden to convert it into a parking area. As such, two additional parking spaces can be accommodated, thereby fulfilling the parking requirement for the property.

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 ☐