

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97673

Site Address: HACKETTS, HIGH STREET, BURSLEDON, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 8DL

Case Officer: Gary Osmond

Description: Second-floor extension and new roof, with external alterations.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Countryside - Conservation Area (Old Bursledon) - Special Policy Area - Great Crested Newt (Red Zone) - Listed Buildings nearby		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Planning App no.	Proposal	Decision
H/23/96533	Second floor extension and remodelling of the existing exterior, following the removal of the existing roof.	Refused – Feb 2024
H/21/91597	Loft conversion by raising roof and addition of dormer windows to create second floor accommodation and canopy for the balcony's.	Withdrawn
H/21/90487	Construction of single storey outbuilding for use as a home office and yoga studio.	Withdrawn
H/20/87550	Replacement 2no. garden sheds.	Permitted – May 2020
C/10/67115	Single storey & 2 storey front & side extensions & single storey rear extension, with 1no. Rear balcony & new roof to existing front extension, following demolition of existing porch, conservatory & pergola.	Permitted – July 2010
C/10/67115	Single storey & 2 storey front & side extensions & single storey rear extension, with 1no. Rear balcony & new roof to existing front extension, following demolition of existing porch, conservatory & pergola.	Permitted – July 2010
C/14824/002/00	External cladding in brick work and tile hanging, new front porch, pitched roof over utility room and front oriel window.	Permitted – Sept 1996
Z/14824/001/00	addition of single storey extension at front for use as store.	Permitted – Nov 1979

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	At the time of writing, a total of ten representations have been received all objecting to the application proposals on the following grounds: - Detrimental to the conservation area		

	- Tall, flat roofed buildings are not in keeping with the character of the area - Impact upon neighbouring listed buildings and their setting - Negative impact upon views from High Street and the river - House has exceeded the 25% volume limit of Policy BU7 - Creation of a third floor would set a precedent for other properties to do the same - Poor design, disproportionate and bulky - Overlooking of neighbouring properties and gardens - Little difference to the previously refused application
Parish Council:	Objection and requests that the application be determined by Local Area Committee.
Heritage Consultant:	Objection. “Context Hacketts lies in Zone 7 of the Old Bursledon Conservation Area in a generous plot both between and opposite listed buildings and backing onto the railway cutting along it’s south-east boundary. This building therefore has the power to affect the setting of five listed buildings The existing building of Hacketts has already been extended three times and was remodelled some years ago giving a modern image to a previously mediocre non-listed dwelling at the heart of this conservation area. Policy The current Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036, in Policy DM12 - Heritage Assets stipulates that ‘Development of a heritage asset or within its setting will be permitted provided it does not harm or detract from the significance or special interest of the asset, and sustains and enhances its special character and qualities.’ This policy also stipulated that any such development should have regard to the impact of the development on the space between buildings and openness of the area, ensuring the character of the undeveloped landscape between buildings is conserved and enhanced together with not creating a dwelling disproportionately larger than the one that is being replaced, are subservient to and in proportion to the existing building in form, scale and design or contribute to the cumulative urbanisation of the area and are not otherwise detrimental to the character of the area as viewed from the River Hamble. The Proposal This current scheme to extend and remodel this dwelling involves the removal of all pitched roofs to provide building volume within the policy BU7 limits in order to enable a third storey to be added in flat roof form. All the surrounding buildings have pitched roofs, which is always the case in this core of the conservation area so the flat roof combined with the second floor or third storey in this location will have both a dominating and urbanising effect that has no place here in Bursledon and will detrimentally affect the setting of five listed buildings. The building was allowed to take on a modern image while retaining a traditional form when last refurbished but increasing the height of the building particularly as it stands on higher ground, will increase its impact to a degree that will be unacceptable in this conservation area. The three other flat roof houses in Bursledon that are cited as

	exemplars – Waters Edge and Shearwater, neither of which are close to heritage assets and Kebun which while to the rear of a listed building is, by virtue of how it is set on a lower level, little more than single story, so far less intrusive and hidden behind other buildings too, are not in an equivalent context. Hacketts is currently almost surrounded by trees and bushes but is still both visible from the High Street at the entrance and across past the rear of Woodbine and Dale Cottages at the junction of High Street and Lands End Road together with a view from the railway bridge, even at two storey format never mind any higher. Conclusion The complete change of character proposed for this property in order to release volume to enable a third level to be achieved is completely at odds with the character of this core area of the conservation area and affects the setting of five listed buildings, the approach to a sixth and the context of Barn Court, a group of four dwellings noted as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. Not only that, it is in an elevated position relative to most of the heritage assets, so an increase in height in such a brutal manner will have a disproportionately deleterious effect and stand out from the river too. Object.”
Ecology:	“I have reviewed the Preliminary Roost Appraisal report by ABR Ecology (February 2024). The building was assessed to have negligible bat roost potential. A bat friendly lighting strategy and a precautionary working method for hedgehogs and great crested newts have been recommended as mitigation. Built-in swift nest boxes on the eastern elevation have been recommended as biodiversity enhancements. I support the recommendations in the report. If the works have not started 18 months from the time of the original survey, an update walkover will be required to check for any changes in the condition of the building.”
Old Bursledon Action Group:	Object. Proposals fail to accord with requirements of the Special Policy Area policy (BU7), including the 25% volume increase limit.

Site Visit:	Yes ☐	No ☒
No formal site visit was undertaken as the application site and surrounding area are well known to the case officer. It is for this reason, together with the comprehensive site photographs from the previous case officer, up to date images available via Google Earth/Street View, within the supporting statement submitted with the application, and from neighbours, that a site visit was not deemed necessary to adequately assess and determine the application.		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policies are S1 (sustainable development), S2 (approach to development), S5 (new development in the countryside), S7 (The Coast), S8 (Historic environment), DM1 (General criteria for new development), DM11 (Nature Conservation), DM12 (Heritage assets), DM14 (parking),

DM26 (residential extensions in the countryside), and BU7 (Residential Extensions Old Bursledon SPA).

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals; Old Bursledon Appraisal and Management Proposals.

Assessment:

Site Context:

The application site benefits from a spacious plot, with a large driveway to the north-west. The dwellinghouse itself dates from the 1970s but has been recently remodelled in a more contemporary appearance; finished in white render, light grey fenestration and a slate roof. It has an 'L' shaped footprint consisting of the larger two storey element running east/west, and a single storey element running north/south, with the corner of the L pointing south-east towards the River Hamble. Immediately to the north of the dwelling is a detached garage.

The house sits broadly centrally within the site which itself is reasonably open, i.e. any trees of note are on the site's boundaries. The northern boundary with High Street is marked by a line of mature trees, albeit views of the dwelling are visible through the main entrance and during the winter months when the trees are not in leaf. The eastern boundary is a mix of mature trees and hedgerow, as are the south-eastern and western boundaries, although these both have sizable gaps between trees. In terms of topography, the dwelling sits on the top of a natural rise which slopes away towards the river in a north-easterly and south-easterly direction.

The site lies outside the urban edge and within the heart of the Old Bursledon Conservation Area. It also forms part of the Old Bursledon Special Policy Area where Policy BU7 applies. In terms of other heritage assets, the site neighbours a number of listed buildings; Lattice Cottage (west), Woodbine Cottage and Dale Cottage (east), Yew Tree Cottage and Rosewood (north). The area is generally residential in nature, except for the boatyards along the river. Whilst residential, the area has retained the semi-rural character of the historic village. Hence its conservation area designation.

Proposals & Planning History:

This application is the latest in a series of applications seeking to provide additional accommodation within a new second floor. The first (H/21/91597) was for an enlarged roof with dormer projections, which was withdrawn due to concerns expressed by officers. The second (H/23/96533) was for a large flat roof second floor addition to replace the current pitched roof. This was refused in February 2024 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its disproportionate size, flat roofed form and design would result in an incongruous and unacceptably bulky addition which would appear at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling, which in turn would have an adverse impact upon the setting of 3no. listed buildings and the wider surrounding Conservation Area. The proposals are therefore contrary Policies S8, DM1, DM12, and DM26 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), Quality Places SPD (2011), and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
2. The proposed development would result in an unacceptably bulky addition, resulting in an exceedance of 25% volume increase, thus would be contrary to Policy BU7 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

That now proposed is a reduced version of the refused scheme, i.e. still proposing the addition of a flat roof second floor addition in place of the current pitched roof, albeit of a reduced floor area which covers one side of the dwelling rather than its full width. The

proposals also include removing the pitched roof from the current single storey projection to the north of the dwelling, as well as remodelling its external appearance by introducing sections of grey horizontal composite cladding, as well as grey uPVC windows.

Note: The submitted existing elevations and roof plans (Drg.No. 'PG.8175-20-02A') are not considered to be an accurate reflection of the existing dwelling, in that the eaves height shown on the drawings is too high, resulting in the existing roof pitch been shown as too shallow. In addition, a number of windows are not drawn to the correct proportions. If the submitted drawings of the existing dwelling are not accurate, it raises some concerns at how accurate the proposed drawings are, and whether the built development would accurately reflect the submitted plans.

Policy & Principle:

The application site lies outside the urban edge where the principle of development is not usually considered acceptable. However, Policy DM26 does allow the extension or replacement of existing dwellings in the countryside provided *"the extension or replacement dwelling will not be disproportionate in size to the existing dwelling, neighbouring properties or in relation to its plot, or involve any extension to its curtilage"*.

Also of relevance is Policy DM1, which requires all new proposed development to be of a good design standard which takes appropriate account of site context and that of the surrounding locality. It also requires development to minimise or appropriately mitigate any impact upon neighbouring properties, occupiers and uses, as well as provide a good standard of internal and external accommodation for future occupiers of the development. In addition, it requires natural features worthy of retention to be retained and protected, as well as provide appropriate landscaping, parking and servicing.

Of specific reference to this application are Policies DM12 and BU7. DM12 relates to heritage assets, and states that *"Development of a heritage asset or within its setting will be permitted provided it does not harm or detract from the significance or special interest of the asset and sustains and enhances its special character and qualities."* Whilst the application dwelling has no historic significance or architectural interest, it nonetheless lies within the heart of the Old Bursledon Conservation Area and is clearly visible from a number of listed buildings which surround the site. As such it needs to be demonstrated that the proposals will not harm the setting of these listed buildings or the wider conservation area.

Policy BU7 relates to residential extensions and replacement dwellings within the Old Bursledon Special Policy Area, setting out a number of criteria which must be met for a development to be considered acceptable. The first of these criteria limits the volume increase of any extensions or additions to no more than 25% of the volume of the original dwelling or as it was in 1982 when the conservation area was designated. Whilst no exact calculations have been undertaken, it is clear when looking back at the known planning history of the application dwelling that this 25% volume limit has been reached or exceeded. As such, any increase in volume resulting from that proposed would be unacceptable and contrary to Policy BU7. Indeed, this formed one of the reasons for refusal of the previous planning application.

However, this revised scheme would result in a slight overall reduction in the current total volume of the dwelling. This is principally achieved by reducing the scale of the proposed second floor addition, together with the removal of the existing pitched roof elements of the dwelling. According to information provided by the applicant, the volume of the existing roof equates to approximately 180 cubic metres, where as the volume of that proposed equates to 172 cubic metres. In reality this overall reduction may be greater, given the issues with the submitted existing drawings noted above.

Whilst the resulting dwelling may well still result in an overall volume in excess of the 25% volume limit of Policy BU7, given that proposed would be a reduction from the present situation, it is considered somewhat unreasonable to refuse that now proposed on these grounds given that the additions to the current dwelling were undertaken prior to the

adoption of BU7. As such, the second reason for refusal of the previous scheme has been addressed to some degree, at least in respect of the 25% limitation.

Notwithstanding, the 25% volume limitation may have been overcome, Policy BU7 also requires a number of other criteria to be met:

- b. have regard to the impact of the development on the space between buildings and the openness of the area, ensuring that the character of the undeveloped landscape between buildings is conserved and enhanced;*
- c. do not create a dwelling disproportionately larger than the one that is being extended or replaced;*
- d. are subservient to and in proportion to the existing building in form, scale and design;*
- e. do not contribute to the cumulative urbanisation of the area; and*
- f. are not otherwise detrimental to the character of the area as viewed from the River Hamble.*

In simple principle terms, extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling may be acceptable. However, the approval of any planning application will be dependant upon how well that proposed is considered to accord with the requirements of the above policies.

Layout, Form, Scale, Design, Street Scene & Area Character:

That proposed will have no impact upon the general site layout, only upon the form, height and visual scale of the dwelling. Whilst the existing dwelling is of no particular architectural merit, it does at least have a more traditional pitched roof form which is characteristic of the area. Whilst a number of other flat roof examples in the wider area are highlighted within the application's supporting statement, as has been clearly pointed out by the Council's Heritage Consultant, these are in very different situations to that of Hacketts, being of a lower height – generally seen as being single storey – and outside of the historic core of the village.

Although it is accepted the site is reasonably well screened by mature trees along High Street and the railway line, this is only when the trees are in leaf. Even so, the existing dwelling is still visible through the trees at particular points, such as south along Station Hill and from the bridge where Lands End Road crosses the railway, together with the site access from High Street. This is principally due to the bright white render finish and light grey slate roof. Longer views are also available from the eastern bank of the River Hamble, albeit against a tree'd backdrop. This proposed flat roof form, together with the resulting three storey height and scale of the dwelling, which already sits atop a natural rise, as well as the light coloured render and cladding, will make the dwelling even more visible than it presently is, to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of this very sensitive part of the conservation area.

The proposed use of bright materials in an area of predominantly red brick and clay tiles is also out of keeping with the character of the locality. There is also some concern at the intended use of relatively inexpensive materials such as uPVC and composite cladding. Such materials, whilst having minimal maintenance issues do not express the quality of architecture and finish expected within a conservation area. The proposed elevations also appear to lack thought as to their resulting appearance and composition, which appears somewhat arbitrary.

Overall therefore, that proposed would result in a dwelling which is disproportionate in scale (i.e. height) to the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties, contrary to Policies DM26 and BU7 (c). It also fails to be subservient or sympathetic to the current dwelling and would also have an urbanising impact upon the character of the area, as well as views from the public realm, contrary to Policy BU7 (d), (e) & (f). By failing to meet the requirements of these policies, that proposed is also therefore contrary to Policy DM1, in that it does not take appropriate account of the context of the site and surrounding area.

Heritage Assets:

As has been clearly set out in the Conservation Consultant's conclusion, "The complete change of character proposed for this property in order to release volume to enable a third level to be achieved is completely at odds with the character of this core area of the conservation area and affects the setting of five listed buildings, the approach to a sixth and the context of Barn Court, a group of four dwellings noted as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. Not only that, it is in an elevated position relative to most of the heritage assets, so an increase in height in such a brutal manner will have a disproportionately deleterious effect and stand out from the river too." As such, that proposed is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy DM12 in that the proposals will "*harm...*" and "*detract from the significance or special interest of the asset and sustains and enhances its special character and qualities.*"

Residential Amenity:

Whilst the concerns raised by some objectors in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy are noted, in planning terms, there would be no adverse impact upon the privacy of any neighbouring properties despite the increased height of the dwelling and introduction of a second floor. This is due to the distances between the application dwelling and immediate neighbours which more than exceeds any minimum requirements set out in the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD. Equally, there would be no adverse impact in terms of loss of light or outlook to any neighbouring properties. As such, that proposed meets these relevant requirements of Policy DM1 of the adopted Local Plan.

Parking & Highway:

In terms of parking and highway matters, the application site can easily accommodate the minimum of three off-road parking spaces required by the 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD. It is also not expected that the proposals would result in any adverse highway impacts.

Trees & Nature Conservation:

As the proposals do not include any new footings and that any trees of significance are some distance away from the dwelling, it is not considered that there would be any impact upon trees within the conservation area.

The application is supported with a preliminary ecological report, including looking at potential for bats. This has been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist who is satisfied with its content and has raised no objection so long as the biodiversity enhancement measures set out within the report are undertaken as part of the development. As such, the requirements of Policy DM11 can be satisfied.

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.

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:

Recommendation:	PERMIT ☐	REFUSE ☒
-----------------	--	---

Whilst the second reason for refusal of the previous application may have been adequately addressed by reducing the size of the second floor extension proposed, the more important reason for refusal, i.e. the proposal's visual impact upon the locality has in no way been addressed. Although physically smaller, the introduction of a third floor in the unsympathetic form proposed on a dwelling which is already prominent and somewhat at odds with character and appearance of more historic surrounding development will only exacerbate the existing situation further. This would result in a wholly unacceptable and detrimental impact upon the visual amenity and character of the Old Bursledon Conservation and Special Policy Areas, the setting of neighbouring listed buildings, as well as upon the application property itself. As such, that proposed is considered to be contrary to Policies S8, DM1, DM12, DM26 & BU7 of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036, as well as the Council's 'Quality Places' and 'Old Bursledon Appraisal and Management Proposals' SPDs, and is recommended for refusal.