

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97471

Site Address: 2 ELIZABETH CLOSE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3LT

Case Officer: Rachael Morris

Description: Conversion and extension of Garage into Annexe

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Tree Preservation Order(s) • Within the urban edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/18042/001/00 - five houses with garages, conversion of house into 7 self-contained flats and new access for proposed Scout hut – Grant outline – Dec 1979 • Z/18042/009/00 - Erection of 3 detached houses, conversion of existing building to 7 Elderly persons Flats and extension of existing building comprising 10 Elderly persons Flats – Permit – Oct 1981 • Z/18042/011/00 - Erection of 4 detached houses with double garages – Refuse – June 1982 • Z/18042/012/00 - Erection of 4 detached 4 bedroomed houses with double garages – Permit – Aug 1982		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	56 Britannia Gardens. Support. 2 Elizabeth Close is downhill from the other houses, and therefore the extension would not overlook anyone as the other properties are uphill from the windows. Flat 10, Elizabeth Court. Support. No reason to object. Flat 3, Elizabeth Court. Support. The garage that already exists hardly changes and the extension is relatively small. Planning has added two additional parking spaces on the property. The Vicarage, Elizabeth Close. Support. No objection. Springwood, 1 Elizabeth Close. Objection. Conversion and extension would be completely out of character and would ruin the outlook of the street scene. This would represent an over development of Elizabeth Close with the effect of a one bedroom bungalow being built at no 2 Elizabeth Close, in the relatively small front garden at the property in question. The distance from the ground to ridge level (bearing in mind the sloping ground of both properties) would be to first floor level (approx 4m) and this would be visually invasive and overbearing preventing light entering my property at ground and first floor level. Elizabeth Close is in a conservation area, and it would be necessary to fell a mature flowering cherry tree at No 2. 4 Elizabeth Close. Objection. The front door and two sets of windows of the proposed would overlook the front of our property. The front elevation (from the road) will have two windows which will look completely out of place when compared with either the garage door at Number 1 or the brick wall that is the back of our own garage. Granting the application would entirely remove our outlook that we have had for over 25 years (which has already been reduced). 2 Elizabeth Close (applicant). Support. Our house is the only house in the street without an extension. The design is not 'out of place' in a street where all properties are already markedly different. We are happy to replant hedges along the fence boundary, which will also offer additional privacy to all parties - we would be happy for this to be a condition of planning. Reference to this being a bungalow is factually inaccurate. The annexe will be ancillary to the main house		

	and is intended to be used by my mother. We would be happy for the requirement that the annexe is ancillary to the main house to be a condition of planning.
Parish Council:	No Objection
Tree Officer:	Despite an old Area TPO being present on the site, there are no significant trees within influencing distance of the proposed development area. Therefore, we raise no arboricultural objection to the proposal.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 18/06/2024		

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, DM11 and DM14.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals (HEWEB 61); Annexes for Dependent Relatives.

Assessment:

The development has been considered against policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that:

Principle

- The proposal sits within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable provided the development accords with the policies within the development plan.
- HEWEB 61 defines the area as '1970s/1980s terraced/detached development on multi-headed cul-de-sacs to the south of West End centre'.
- As set out in the Annexes for Dependent Relatives SPD, proposals would be expected to: be subordinate in scale to the principal dwelling (an annexe capable of being made into a separate dwelling, will not be acceptable); be linked internally to the principal dwelling and be designed in such a way as to easily enable the annexe to be used as an integral part of the main dwelling at a later date (a separate external entrance to the annexe may be acceptable provided it is subsidiary to the entrance to the principal dwelling); share a vehicular access with the principal dwelling; be in the same ownership as the principal dwelling; have no boundary demarcation or sub-division of garden areas between the curtilage of the principal dwelling and the annexe; comply with the Council's normal design standards for extensions, and include adequate amenity space and car parking provision for the enlarged property.
- The SPD also states that detached annexes will not be acceptable unless they involve the appropriate conversion of existing suitable outbuildings within the curtilage of the principal dwelling.

Design and layout

- 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 is for the extension to an existing detached garage to the front elevation of the main dwelling. The existing garage dominates the main view of the plot from the street scene. The proposed extension to the garage would extend to the rear of the garage towards the main dwelling to infill an existing gap.
- The Quality Places SPD states that “For existing properties, as with any other extension, garages should be sympathetically related to the main dwelling, whether they are adjoined or free-standing. Pitched or lean-to roofs are normally preferable to flat roofs as they are more likely to complement the existing house and locality. In normal circumstances, garages should be in line with or be behind the front of the house.”
- While it is noted that the annexe would make use of an existing garage, this garage would require further extension to create a suitable space for habitation and would continue to increase the garage size, set forward of the main dwelling. This would exacerbate a poor design further and create an even more dominant addition to the front of the main dwelling to an overpowering degree.
- The extension and conversion of the garage changes the existing character of the garage which has a very similar appearance to a neighbouring garage in a similar position. This would create an appearance of a small stand-alone dwelling in a front garden which would appear cramped and overdeveloped.
- In addition, the proposed annexe would not accord with the Annexes for Dependent Relatives SPD which suggests these developments should have an internal link and be an integral part of the main dwelling. While it partially accords with the SPD when referring to the re-use of an existing outbuilding, this is not considered appropriate and overall, it states that detached annexes will not be acceptable.
- With the absence of an internal link, it is questioned how much the annexe would be an integral part of the main dwelling. The annexe proposes a kitchenette, living area and dining table and as such very limited day-to-day activities will depend on the main household.
- Paragraph 139 from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that “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 such as design guides and codes.”
- Overall, it is considered that the proposal would create an incongruous and unattractive feature for the host dwelling and locality which would result in the appearance of an overdeveloped site.

Residential amenity

- There are a couple of objections from neighbours in Elizabeth Close who state the proposal would create a visual intrusion to the habitable space within dwellings and result in a loss of outlook. However, it is considered the proposal is suitably distanced from no.4 Elizabeth Close where there are also other opportunities for outlook from habitable room windows and does not create a sense of overbearing where nothing else can be seen. In addition, although the extension would be viewable from over the existing front boundary wall and from first floor windows, the proposal would not create an unacceptable visual intrusion to the enjoyment of habitable rooms from no.1 Elizabeth Close.
- The residential amenity for the proposed occupier of the annexe is questioned. The proposed internal floor space measures approx. 40 sqm with a double bedroom. As such, the space required for a single-storey, 1-bed 2-person area should be 50 sqm, according to the Nationally Described Space Standards. In this case, it is recognised that the extension may well only be for a single-person use (applicant's mother) and as such a single-storey, 1-bed 1-person area only requires 39 sqm.

- Overall, it is not expected that the living environment for the proposed occupier or existing occupiers are detrimentally impacted by the proposal to an unacceptable degree.

Other material considerations

- The proposed extension is required to provide accommodation for a dependent parent of the applicant. However, the benefits of the proposed development to the applicant's family must be weighed against other material considerations, including relevant local planning policies related to character and appearance, and the wider public interest. There is no other demonstrable evidence to indicate that the scheme is the only or least harmful way of satisfying the needs of the family. Therefore, it is considered that the harm that would be caused by the proposed development clearly outweighs the needs of or benefits to the family.

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.

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:

Recommendation:	PERMIT ☐	REFUSE ☒
• The proposed development due to its siting would create an overdevelopment to the front of the site, creating an incongruous feature which is to the detriment of the host dwelling and the locality. As such the proposed development is contrary to Policy DM1 from the Eastleigh Local Plan (2016-2036), the Quality Places SPD and the Annexes for Dependent Relatives SPD.		