

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97088

Site Address: 103 HAVENDALE, HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 0FF

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Two storey side extension and new porch

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

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/19421/000/00 - Ground floor side extension - Permit - 31/05/1979 • Z/19421/001/00 - Erection of 1.8 metre high timber fence - Permit - 03/10/1995		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>1st Consultation period</u> One objection was received regarding the initial proposal, focusing on concerns about the extension doubling the size of the property, creating overlooking issues, and its impact on local trees and wildlife. <u>2nd Consultation period</u> No further comments were received during the re-consultation period following design amendments.		
Parish Council:	<u>1st Consultation period</u> No objection. <u>2nd Consultation period</u> No further comments were received during the re-consultation period following design amendments.		
Tree Consultant:	<u>1st Consultation period</u> We raise no arboricultural objection to the proposal, subject to the condition. <u>2nd Consultation period</u> No further comments were received during the re-consultation period following design amendments.		
Ecologist:	<u>1st Consultation period</u> I object to the side extension due to the impact on this tree. The tree officer should also be consulted on this application. There are no ecological concerns for a new front porch. <u>2nd Consultation period</u>		

	No further comments were received during the re-consultation period following design amendments.
--	--

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 3 rd May 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 Appraisal for Hedge End, West End and Botley (HEWEB 76)

Assessment:
103 Havendale is a two-storey, 3-bedroom, end-of-terrace dwelling, located on the south-eastern edge of Hedge End. The surrounding area is residential, primarily comprising 1970s and 1980s terraced developments. The application seeks planning permission to construct a two-storey side extension and a new porch. The original proposal was considered unacceptable due to issues with subservience and roof form, which did not harmonise with the existing structure and character of the area. Following discussions, the proposal was amended to reduce the width of the two-storey side extension, alter its roof form, lower its ridge height, lower the porch roof height, and omit the proposed garage from the proposal. These amendments have enhanced the design, making it more acceptable for the location. Following the design amendments, the application was placed on a 10-day re-consultation period to gather additional feedback. <u>Principle</u> 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. <u>Layout, design, and impact upon the character of the area</u> • 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. • 103 Havendale features a prominent gable roof that distinguishes it as the end house in a row of five. The revised design positions the two-storey side extension slightly set back from the principal wall and lowers its ridge height, ensuring subservience to the main dwelling and reducing visual dominance. The two-storey side extension is considered to integrate harmoniously with the original structure without compromising the architectural integrity of the terrace row. • From the site visit, it was noted that there is no uniform architectural style in the vicinity. Therefore, the two-storey side extension will not appear overly dominant or

incongruous within the street scene. Additionally, given the property's location at the end of a cul-de-sac, the proposed extension's visual prominence will be naturally limited, minimising any potential adverse impact on the overall street scene.

- The neighbour's concern about the extension doubling the size of the property is noted. However, it is considered that the site occupies a larger plot compared to neighbouring properties, providing sufficient space to accommodate an extension of this size without creating disproportionate visual bulk.
- The proposed front porch is modest in size and aligns with common architectural features in the surrounding area. Its gable roof complements the existing gable element of the house, ensuring a cohesive aesthetic that integrates seamlessly without introducing discordant elements.

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 that the application property is an end-terrace house, there are no adjacent buildings next to the proposed two-storey side extension. Therefore, concerns regarding loss of light, overshadowing, and loss of outlook are mitigated.
- The rear elevation of the proposed side extension will not extend beyond the current building line, ensuring that sightlines remain consistent with existing conditions, thereby minimising any perceived increase in overlooking into neighbouring properties. Additionally, the distance of approximately 24m between the proposed first-floor rear windows and the rear neighbours' windows exceeds the Council's recommended 22m separation, maintaining privacy levels.
- The extension will occupy the side garden, which is currently used for a shed. The primary amenity space remains the rear garden, which will continue to serve the occupants without significant alteration.
- Due to its elevated placement, the proposed rooflight within the loft area is not considered to cause any harmful overlooking for the rear neighbouring properties.

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.
- There are records of bats in close proximity to the application property, as well as records of grass snakes, common toads, stag beetles, and hedgehogs in the nearby vicinity. The Council's ecologist reviewed photographs of the house and found no potential bat roost features. The existing shed to the side of the house also lacks bat roost potential. Therefore, no further bat or ecological appraisal is required for the proposed development, including the new front porch.
- However, there is a medium/large tree located outside the fence on the side of the house, which could be severely affected by the construction of the proposed side extension. This tree is potentially significant for foraging bats and nesting birds.

The ecologist raised concerns about the side extension's impact on this tree and objected to the proposal due to these potential ecological impacts. Nonetheless, the width of the extension has been reduced and it has been set further away from the tree, mitigating some of these concerns. The Council's tree consultant will be consulted on this matter to ensure that the impact on the tree and associated wildlife is minimised. This issue will be addressed in a later section of the report.

Trees and landscaping

- There is a tree adjacent to the application site. This tree is under private ownership and is not protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). It has recently undergone a significant reduction. While it is not currently considered a specimen warranting protection, its existence requires consideration regarding foundation design. The Council's tree consultant has raised no arboricultural objections to the proposal, provided that an arboricultural method statement be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

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.
- 103 Havendale will remain a three-bedroom property, requiring two parking spaces. However, the proposal includes a loft conversion, which could potentially accommodate a fourth bedroom, thereby increasing the requirement to three parking spaces. The site plan indicates that the front garden will be reconfigured to provide two parking spaces, with an additional allocated parking space in an adjacent parking area. Given these provisions, parking is considered adequate for the application site, and no further concerns have been raised.

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 ☐