

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97293

Site Address: 111 HURSLEY ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1JD

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Single storey rear/side extension and first floor rear extension and raised rear patio (Revised scheme approved under H/23/96567)

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the Urban Edge Within Established Residential Area Southern Water Sewer Buffer- Foul Sewer		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Reference No.	Description	Decision
H/23/96567	First floor rear and single storey rear/side extensions with raised rear patio	Permit – 27/02/2024

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None received		
Chandlers Ford Parish Council:	No comments received		
Ecology:	I have reviewed the Preliminary Roost Assessment Report by Hampshire Ecological Services (February 2024) originally submitted for H/23/96567. The report states that it is valid for a maximum of 12 months. As the proposals are similar, my consultation response is the same: The house and garage have been assessed as having negligible bat roost suitability, but the shed is assessed to have low-negligible suitability with a few potential access points for bats to enter the building and some exterior potential roosting features. The house and garage have no constraints to work being done, but the shed will need either a pre-works emergence check or demolition under ecological supervision by a suitably qualified ecologist. Given that bats move between roosts, and this is a small building I think that demolition under ecological supervision (which could be conditioned) would be the more pragmatic choice, however if the applicant prefers an emergence survey (between May and August) that is an acceptable option but would need to be done before determination. A temporary bat box must be installed on a retained tree to relocate any bats found during ecologically supervised demolition. If any bats are found, work must stop and a licence from Natural England must be applied for. The biodiversity enhancements and lighting guidance recommended in the report are appropriate and should be implemented.		
Southern Water Services:	No objection – guidance notes received		

Site Visit:	Yes ☐	No ☒
Details: Site visit carried out under H/23/96567 – Photographs on file		

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; Chandlers Ford and Hiltingbury Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:

Site and Surroundings

The application site contains a two storey semi-detached character property located on the eastern side of Hursley Road. The property itself is finished in predominately red brickwork and white render to the existing first floor rear projection. The property is set back from Hursley Road by a front garden and gravel driveway which extends up to the eastern side elevation. To the rear there is an outbuilding which is shared with the adjoining neighbour 113 Hursley Road (there is a dividing internal wall). There are also other outbuildings and a detached single garage contained within the rear garden.

The wider surroundings comprise residential two storey dwellings of differing age and character in semi-detached pairs. Immediately south of the site lies a two storey block of residential flats.

Proposal

Planning application H/23/96567 was granted in February 2024 for similar works; this included a single storey rear/side extension, a first floor rear extension and a raised rear patio following demolition of the outbuildings in the rear garden. This application seeks to amend the approved scheme, this includes the following:

- The single storey and rear extension would be increased in depth (from 7.2m to 8.9m) and a decrease in width (from 7.9 to 7.5m). A glass roof lantern is also proposed, the height of the extension would still be 3m (3.6m when including the lantern). This would be finished in matching brickwork and white uPVC doors and windows.
- The first floor rear extension would have a flat roof instead of a pitched roof. The proposed dimensions permitted under H/23/96567 would remain the same. This would be finished in matching white render and a white uPVC window.
- The raised rear patio would lead off from the single storey rear/side extension but would be reduced in depth (from 3.7m to 3m) and width (from 8.6m to 8.2m). The maximum height would still be 0.65m and 1m high glazed balustrade enclosing the patio has been omitted from this application.

Principle

The application site falls within the urban edge, whereby alterations or extensions to, or within the curtilage of residential dwellinghouses are considered to be acceptable in principle, however would be subject to the following conditions.

Design and Layout

- While it is acknowledged the proposed single storey side/rear extension is larger in depth than what was approved under H/23/96567, this element of the proposal is

still considered to be appropriate in terms of its form, scale and appearance. The majority of this element would not be overly visible as it is sited to the rear of the host dwelling; the side element, while visible within the street scene, is single storey in nature and would provide a sense of subservience. Additionally, the host dwelling itself has a relatively deep set back from the road and therefore the proposed development would not be overly dominant within the public domain. As such, the impact within the street scene would be minimal.

- The first floor rear extension now proposes a flat roof, while this is not particularly good design, it would not be visible within the public realm. Additionally, this extension is considered modest in size and would be set down from the main ridge, resulting in a subservient appearance; the use of matching materials would allow for the extension to have some cohesion with the main property. On balance, the amended design is considered to be acceptable.
- The changes proposed to the rear raised patio are acceptable, while the loss of the glazed balustrading removes interest in the rear garden, its omission is not harmful to the amended application.

Residential Amenity

- The neighbours most impacted as a result of the amended proposals, is the neighbour to the north, 113 Hursley Road and the rear residential flats within Grayton Court to the south, Flat 2 (ground floor) and Flat 4 (first floor).
- The amended proposed single storey rear/side extension would not impact upon no. 113 as there is a garage and outbuilding sited along the boundary shared with 111 Hursley Road that would screen the extension adequately.
- The previous report concluded the single storey rear/side extension would not impact upon Flats 2 and 4 to a harmful degree. The amendments would result in the side element being further set back from the shared boundary (from 0.8m to 1m). It is acknowledged the extension would be longer in depth than what was approved under H/23/96567. The window to Flat 2 closest to the site has a ground floor rear window serving a bedroom. During the previous site visit, it was noted this window has a limited outlook due to the bin/cycle storage to the rear of the flats and the garage within the rear garden of the site which is sited along the shared boundary. Additionally, this window already receives limited light due to its orientation (northeast facing). Due to the existing relationship and considering the garage along the boundary would be removed, allowing an improved outlook; the proposed extension and its siting away from this boundary is not expected to cause adverse harm to this neighbour. Additionally, the boundary treatment would screen the majority of the development from Flat 2.
- Flat 4 is located on the first floor of the residential block and is unlikely to be affected by the single storey extension due to its location. It is acknowledged the proposed first floor extension would slightly alter the outlook to Flat 4's bedroom window (rear facing). However, due to the separation distance between Flat 4 and this element of the proposal (8m approx.), the outlook to Flat 4 is not expected to be harmful to an unacceptable degree.
- In the previous application, it was concluded the first floor rear extension would alter the outlook and light to the rear bedroom window to no. 113 Hursley Road but not to an unacceptable degree to warrant refusal of the application. It is considered the amended roof change (flat roof) would allow for more light to be received to the bedroom window when compared to the previously approved pitched roof. Therefore, this amendment is considered acceptable with regards to neighbouring amenity.
- The raised rear patio is positioned slightly further into the garden as a result of the increased depth of the single storey rear extension. Any potential views would still continue to be screened by the existing boundary treatments along the neighbouring boundaries. As such, the raised patio does not generate any overlooking or loss of privacy concerns.

- Therefore and to conclude, the amended scheme accords with guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that there will be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.

Ecology

- Owing to the nature of the development, the Council's Ecologist was consulted. They reviewed the Preliminary Roost Assessment Report by Hampshire Ecological Services that was undertaken in the previous application. The Council's Ecologist has advised they are still satisfied with the ecological measures set out which will be secured by condition. They also recommended the outbuilding set to be demolished would require either a pre-works emergence check or that demolition be carried out under ecological supervision. The applicant has agreed to carry out these works under ecological supervision and this will also be secured by condition.

Other Material Considerations

- As noted, the one half of the shared outbuilding with 113 Hursley Road would be removed to make way for the development (up to the shared boundary). A note to applicant will be recommended to arrange a party wall agreement between the application and the occupier of no. 113.
- 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.

The NPPF aims for the need for housing to be met, and policy S2 of the Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. 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 and is expected to reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

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: This application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐