

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97499

Site Address: 13 SATCHELL LANE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 4HF

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Single/two storey front extension to incorporate balcony, single storey side extension, two and single rear extensions, loft conversion to include hip-to-gable ends, elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area (Revised scheme to planning permission H/23/95847) (Amended Description)

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the Urban Edge Within an Established Residential Area Adjacent to the Hamble Conservation Area		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Reference No.	Proposal	Decision
H/23/95847	Single/two storey front extension to incorporate balcony, single storey side extension, two and single storey rear extensions, elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area (Amended plans and description)	Refused by the Local Planning Authority on 31/01/2024 and Allowed at appeal on 13/05/2024
H/22/94226	Single storey front; two/three storey side; and single and two storey rear extensions; removal of roof and provision of second floor accommodation; together with alterations to site frontage to enlarge parking area	Refused by the Local Planning Authority on 31/01/2023 and Dismissed at appeal on 17/04/2023
H/21/91232	Two storey front extensions with first floor balconies, two storey and first floor side extension, first floor and single storey rear extension and loft conversion to provide second floor living accommodation with dormer	Withdrawn October 2021

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	Nine letters of objections were received from six addresses raising the following concerns and issues: - Proposed roof is excessive, visually intrusive and overbearing. - Unacceptable introduction of a third storey. - Excessive height and Bulk. - Negative impact upon the street scene - Overdevelopment. - Out of character with the surrounding development. - Loss of light, privacy and amenity. - Overshadowing. - Loss of right to light. - Will block views of the river from The Bartletts (west of the site). - Impact on heritage assets with the locality. - Impact upon bats.		

	• Insufficient parking and excavation to the front garden. • Land stability and subsidence concerns. <u>LPA Comments:</u> The neighbour's objections also referred to the front, side and flat roof rear extensions and front balcony to this revised scheme. While this is acknowledged, these elements of the scheme do not differ in design and scale with the previous planning application H/23/95847 that was allowed at appeal. Therefore, the neighbour objections relating to the proposed roof will be covered in the assessment section below. The objections concerning subsidence and ground damage are not planning matters and would be assessed by Building Control Regulations. The objections regarding the loss of views to the river and the right to light are also not planning matters and are not included in the assessment of this application.
Hamble Parish Council:	<u>Objection</u> The Parish Council have considered this application carefully and object to this due to overdevelopment of the site by increasing the roof to make a three storey dwelling, as this would fundamentally change the street scene. That the excavation for parking requires further exploration as this could cause subsidence and there was an additional concern, despite a privacy screen, about the balcony and its interference with neighbours by way of noise due to proximity.
Built Heritage Consultant:	<u>Objection (summarised):</u> The Proposal. This building is in a particularly prominent position being on the apex of this curve of Satchell Lane. It is typical of the inter-war years with a square bay window projecting forward of the main reception and bed rooms both clad at first floor level in faux 'tudor-bethan' woodwork with render infill. The traditional roof of plain clay tiles is hipped all round, currently producing an almost pyramidal form with the forward projecting gable over the two spaces already mentioned. The front elevation under the gable is to be brought forward and squared off to the front of the bay window with white rendered masonry and the roof is to have a ridge across the building at the existing height with gables either side. A small ground floor flat roofed extension is to be provided in front of the existing front door and a new one under a lean-to construction on the north elevation. The roof is to be covered in slate, which will match no.15 to the north. Although the new roofline will be at the same height as the existing, this is higher than the others in the row, but does not seem it due to its tapering nature. The new proposal of a continuous ridge right across the property with gables either side will both increase the volume and produce a bulkier, more imposing presence to the street scene. This could be tempered by the introduction of half hips or gablets to the side gables level with the adjacent ridges. Conclusion. The raw gables either side will emphasise its bulk and dominate the group and this length of the street, softening the ridge ends as suggested above would help meld the new structure into the group to present a more cohesive group of buildings by restoring the apparent gap between adjacent properties and therefore the rhythm of the street scene overlooking the conservation area and its setting. The

	modernised frontage, although different, is in keeping with those further along the road. Holding objection.
Ecology:	<u>Updated Ecology response on bat survey received 18/07/2024:</u> I've had a look at the bat survey (KJF Consultancy June 2024) and it looks ok. No bats recorded emerging from the building. Of course this doesn't prove the absence of roosting bats but if bats are using it, at most it will be an occasional day roost. Therefore please can you put the precautionary advisory on any permission granted along the lines of: Bats advisory: Care must be taken when dismantling the structure. If a bat is found at any stage, work must stop immediately and advice sought from Natural England or a suitably qualified ecologist. Birds advisory: If an active bird nest is found during works, then a suitably sized undisturbed buffer must be established around the nest until all the young have fledged <u>Original comments received 18/06/2024:</u> I've looked at the Review of the Phase 1 Bat Survey (KJF Consultancy, Oct 2023) in addition to the email below from Tony Holt Design. Vesper Ecology concluded that the dwelling has moderate potential for roosting bats (Mar 2023) which requires a minimum of two emergence surveys to assess presence or absence. The latest Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition released in Sep 2023) has not changed this survey requirement for a structure with moderate potential. The KJF Review does not dispute the presence of Potential Roost Features (PRFs) identified by Vesper within the dwelling. Therefore, the structure must still be classed as having moderate potential for roosting bats and two emergence surveys will still be required
Asset Management:	No objection
Hampshire County Council Highways:	<u>No objection</u> In regard to application H/24/97499, it is noted that this is a revised scheme to H/23/95847, for which HCC Highways previously provided a consultation response (14 December 2023). Having reviewed the revised plans, it is noted that the proposed access and parking area remains unchanged from that previously submitted, and as such the comments remain the same, with no objection to the proposals subject to the condition outlined below being applied. Access into the site from the highway is to remain in generally the same position, but will require a slight widening of the existing drop kerb to the south to facilitate the widened access flare. This will require an additional permission from HCC as Highway Authority to actually undertake the works, details of which can be found via the following link - https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/parking/droppedkerbs In terms of the actual layout of the site, again this is acceptable with adequate space for parking, and a turning area which is an improvement over the current situation if this is fully utilised. Onwards, it would appear that visibility would be improved, which again would be beneficial. CONDITION

	ACCESS CONSTRUCTION PROVISION No development shall start on site until the access, including the footway and/or verge crossing shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans. Reason: To provide satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety.
Southern Water Services:	No objection – guidance notes provided

Site Visit:	Yes ☐	No ☒
Details: Site visit carried out on previous planning permission application H/23/95847 – 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 Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM11, DM12 and DM14. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area Appraisals; Hamble-le-Rice Conservation Area Appraisal

Assessment:
<u>Site and Surroundings</u> 13 Satchell Lane is a 1920/30s two storey detached dwelling. It has a red brick ground floor with cream rendered first floor and timber detailing to a prominent front gable which sits atop a double height rectangular bay window. The property sits up and back from the lane in a prominent position on the inside of a bend. The elevated position of the plot allows views eastwards towards the River Hamble. The surrounding area is residential in nature, however the main access to the Hamble Marina and the river is just north of the site. The site itself is not within the Hamble Conversation Area but lies immediately adjacent with Satchell Lane being the boundary line. Most of the properties on the western side of the lane are of a similar age to the application site with traditional pitched roof forms and architectural style. There are two properties along the lane that are of a contemporary design with large glazed gables and front balconies facing east towards the river. <u>Proposal</u> Planning application H/23/95847 was allowed at appeal by The Planning Inspectorate in May 2024 for a single/two storey front extension to incorporate balcony, single storey side extension, two and single storey rear extensions, elevational alterations and enlargement to front parking area. This application seeks to amend the approved scheme, which includes the following: Loft conversion to provide second floor accommodation involving roof alterations which includes hip-to-gable end alterations and a pitched roof with a second floor rear facing window which would sit atop of the flat roof two story rear extension allowed under planning application H/23/95847. The two storey rear extension as a

result of the proposed roof form would increase from approx. 5m to 8.75 (5m to eaves) and would be set down slightly from the main ridge of the host dwelling.

- There would be 4no. rooflights to the front roof slope, 2no. roof lights to both side roof slopes (facing north and south).

Aside from the roof alterations, the remainder of the proposals in this scheme do not differ in size, scale and external finishes with what was proposed under planning permission H/23/95847 which was allowed at appeal. Therefore, the assessment of this application will mostly focus on the proposed roof alterations.

Principle

The application site falls within the urban edge and within an established residential area. As such the basic principle of development is acceptable, with any formal planning approval being based upon the exact nature and details of that proposed and how well it is considered to accord with the relevant adopted Local Plan Policies.

As noted, a previous planning application H/23/95847 was refused by the Local Planning Authority but was allowed at appeal via The Planning Inspectorate (APP/W1715/D/24/33339148). The application permits the front, side and the flat roofed rear extensions as well the front balcony. These elements remain unchanged and have not been assessed in this application as they have been considered acceptable by the Inspector. Therefore, as noted, the assessment of this application will mostly focus on the proposed roof alterations proposed in this revised scheme.

The site is also just outside the Hamble Conservation Area, and as such Policy DM12 has some relevance. Although it should be noted in the previous allowed and dismissed appeals, The Planning Inspectorate concluded the allowed scheme and previously refused scheme would not impact upon the conservation area to a detrimental degree.

Character and Appearance

13 Satchell Lane sits on an elevated position in a relatively narrow triangular plot and while detached is sited fairly close to the immediate adjoining neighbours. The roof forms along this section of Satchell Lane are pitched or hipped, sloping away from shared boundaries, resulting in a general pattern of development with a sense of space afforded to each dwelling along the roof lines.

As noted, planning permission was allowed via the Planning Inspectorate for fairly significant works which will result in a substantially sized property, particularly at ground floor level. This application seeks to further increase the bulk, mass and scale to the property, this time focusing on the first floor and roof level to achieve second floor accommodation.

The proposed roof alterations proposed particularly to the front elevation would alter the roof from the formations seen within the locality. This change is considered to be out of keeping with the general pattern of development, closing the space between neighbouring dwellings at roof level, resulting in an incongruous feature within the street scene. It is acknowledged the planning statement that accompanies this application has indicated the hip-to-gable alterations could be carried out via the applicant's permitted development rights as indicated on the submitted plans, however combined with the proposed roof over the two storey rear extension; the revised scheme has been considered collectively. Combined as whole, the proposals are considered to be excessive in bulk, mass and scale at roof level to an unacceptable level, detracting from the character of the host dwelling.

Furthermore, the roof proposal due to its design, bulk, scale and massing along with the property's elevation position would result in an incongruous and overly prominent feature within the locality. As such the revised scheme is also considered to be detrimental to the street scene.

This application also introduces a variance of contemporary materials not currently found on the host dwelling (as proposed in the previous planning application). A materials schedule has been provided in this application and states the external finishes will mainly be a combination of off white render and light grey facing brickwork to the elevations with grey powder coated aluminium to the front gable. The fenestration would also be grey aluminium framed; the roof tiles would be slate grey and the privacy screen to the balcony would be obscured glazed to Pilkington's privacy level 3.

As there are a few examples of contemporary dwellings in the nearby surrounding area, the materials provided appear to be of high quality and would have a satisfactory visual appearance. Had the revised scheme been acceptable, the external finishes would have been considered appropriate given the existing contemporary development within the nearby locality.

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 on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents'*. To conclude, loft conversion and associated roof alterations (as noted) by reason of their size, scale and prominent siting would result in incongruous additions, at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the wider surroundings, thus being contrary to the abovementioned policies and the Quality Places SPD. In accordance with Paragraph 134 of the NPPF, this development is not considered well designed, nor does it reflect local design policies, therefore warranting refusal of the application.

Residential Amenity

The neighbours most impacted as a result of the proposals would be the immediate neighbours either side of the application site, no. 11 to the south and no. 15 to the north. Both neighbours have raised concerns with regards to the revised scheme and the impact it will have upon their amenities.

Impact on no. 11 (south of the site):

11 Satchell Lane is a fairly substantial two storey dwelling that has been extended to the southern side elevation at two storey level and extended to the rear at single storey level. There is an approximate 1.3m separation distance between this neighbour and the site. The property has no side windows that face the application site.

The previous reported stated that the two and single storey extension to the rear would not impact upon this neighbour. While it was recognised the development would alter the light and outlook to the neighbour's rear windows, the previous proposal passed the Quality Places SPD daylighting test with regards to the neighbour's rear windows and was considered acceptable.

This application proposes additional mass to the approved two storey rear extension; the pitched roof raises the height of the extension by 3.75m and projects 3m in depth with a facing rear gable. It is accepted the mass of this form is undeniably excessive, however the roof slopes away from this neighbour which reduces any perceived overbearing. A further daylighting test was applied with the new roof formation and the rear windows to no. 11; the test appeared to breach the 45-degree code on the floor plans but not with the elevational plans and ultimately passes the daylighting test. The Quality Places SPD states if a proposal breaches the 45-degree code to both the floor and elevational plans to neighbouring rear windows, then the development would harmfully impact this neighbour. Additionally, as the neighbour is positioned to the south, the proposed roof is not likely to cause unacceptable overshadowing to this neighbouring garden. As such, the revised scheme, while considered unneighbourly, is not expected to impact this neighbour to an unacceptable degree.

Impact on no. 15 (north of the site):

15 Satchell Lane is a traditional two storey dwelling north of the site and is distanced 2.6m from the two storey rear element of the application site. No. 15 does not have any side windows that face no. 13. The previous report stated this neighbour's light and outlook would not be negatively impacted upon as the two storey extension proposed a flat roof and passed the daylighting test.

The proposed roof change again would slope away from this neighbour and passes the daylighting test with regard to this neighbour's rear facing windows. However, this neighbour is positioned north of the site; the proposed roof formation change and its increased excessive height is considered to cause intolerable overshadowing to the private garden space of this neighbour. This part of the garden would see the amount of light reduced significantly, receiving light only to the late afternoons and is considered unacceptable to this neighbour's amenity, forming a further reason for refusal.

Hip-to-gable alterations, rear window and roof lights and their impact upon neighbours:

The proposed hip-to-gable alterations while considered overly prominent in design is not expected to impact upon the immediate neighbours as these properties do not have any side windows facing the application site.

With regards to the second floor rear facing window that would be inserted to the roof atop of the two storey extension; this is not expected to cause any unacceptable overlooking or loss or privacy concerns to nearby neighbouring amenity. This proposed window would look into the neighbouring gardens, but this is no more harmful than the existing first floor rear windows and is unavoidable in an urban setting. Furthermore, there would be a 30m separation distance from the proposed window to the rear boundary which is considered reasonable and would not overlook or impede the privacy to the neighbours to the rear of the site.

The rooflights to the front and side roof slopes are above head height and do not create any overlooking or privacy concerns.

Ultimately and to conclude, the proposed roof alterations to the two storey rear extension is considered to result in an adverse impact upon the amenity space to the neighbour to the north (no. 15) and is recommended for refusal.

Ecology

The application was accompanied with a preliminary roost assessment prepared by Vesper Conservation and Ecology (March 2023) and a bat survey report prepared by KJF Consultancy Ltd (June 2024).

The Council's Ecologist has reviewed the latest bat survey report prepared by KJF Consultancy Ltd and was satisfied with the survey findings in that there were no bats recorded from the building. They noted this doesn't prove the absence of roosting bats and have recommended an informative to applicant detailing what action should be taken if a bat or nesting bird is found during construction works. Had the revised scheme been acceptable these informatives would have been issued to the applicant.

Highway Safety and Parking

The revised scheme would result in an additional bedroom, resulting in a 4 bedroom property which requires three off-street parking spaces as set out in the Residential Parking Standards SPD. The submitted site plan shows off-street parking provision for three vehicles to the driveway to the front and as such, it is concluded the required parking can be accommodated within the site.

Hampshire County Council Highways were consulted due to proposed parking arrangements, and they have no highway objections subject to an access construction condition which would have been secured had the scheme been recommended for

approval.

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 Environment 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.

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 alterations by reason of their size, scale and prominent siting would result in incongruous and discordant additions, at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling, and the character of the wider surroundings. The proposals are therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), the Quality Places SPD (2011), and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2) The revised roof alterations to the approved flat roofed two storey rear extension (allowed under H/23/95847) due to its design, massing and siting would have an adverse impact on the rear private amenity space of the occupiers north of the site (15 Satchell Lane). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), the Quality Places SPD (2011), and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒