

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97690

Site Address: 3 ORCHARD ROAD, FAIR OAK, EASTLEIGH, SO50 7AS

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Single storey front/side extension; single storey rear extension and erection of outbuilding following demolition of existing outbuilding

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the Urban Edge Within Established Residential Area Southern Water Sewers 2m Buffer – Foul Sewer		

Planning History	Yes ☐	No ☒
The site appears to have no planning history		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None were received		
Fair Oak Parish Council:	No objection		
Ecology:	No objection – Informative advised		
Southern Water:	No objection – Informative advised		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 15/07/2024 – 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 and DM14.
Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area Appraisals (BIFOHH 46).

Assessment:
<u>Site and Surroundings</u> The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached property with a rear conservatory located on the southwestern side of Orchard Road. The site has an open frontage with a garden and hardstanding driveway. To the rear is an enclosed garden containing an outbuilding along the northwestern boundary. The surrounding area is residential in nature featuring properties of similar design, some of which have been extended to the side at single storey level. <u>Proposal</u> This application seeks permission for a single storey front and side extension, a single storey rear extension following removal of the existing conservatory and the erection of an outbuilding in the rear garden following demolition of existing outbuilding.

The single storey front and side extension would wrap around the northwestern corner of the host dwelling. It would measure approximately 5.4m in width (incorporating both elements), 8.1m in depth and would have a maximum height of 3.4m (2.8m to eaves). The extension would have a part pitched, part flat roof and would extend 1.5m beyond the front building line. The extension would accommodate a front porch and garage/storage area; the porch element would have a door and window, the side extension would have 2no. up and over garage doors to the front and rear elevations. An existing ground floor kitchen window to the western side elevation to the property would be replaced with a smaller window to accommodate the proposed side extension.

The single storey rear extension would be set in slightly from the boundary shared with no. 1, it would have a flat roof and measure approximately 3m in depth, 5.6m in width and 2.8m in height. The extension would form part of an open plan kitchen and dining area and would be served by bi-folding doors to the rear elevation and a roof light. All the extensions proposed would be finished in materials that would match the host dwelling.

The proposed outbuilding would be located in the rear garden and sited along the entire southwestern boundary shared with 8 Summerlands Road. The outbuilding would have a pitched roof and would measure approximately 8.3m in width, 3.3m in depth with a maximum height of 2.85m (2.4m to eaves) and would be finished in white render.

Principle

The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.

Design and Layout

- The design of the proposals overall are suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- Starting with the front and side extension; this element of the scheme is single storey in nature and considered a modest and subordinate addition to the host dwelling. At the time of the site visit it was noted properties within Orchard Road have extensions of a similar design, as such this element of the proposal would not be unduly prominent. It is therefore considered the front and side extension is respectful to the character area and would be in keeping with the existing development within the locality.
- The single storey rear extension would replace a conservatory of a similar size. It would extend a further 0.2m into the rear garden but would have the same height (2.8m) and width (5.6m). The proposed extension is considered to be more cohesive than the existing conservatory due to the use of matching materials and will improve the appearance of the rear elevation to the host dwelling. This extension would not be visible to the public realm from Orchards Road; views of the extension would be seen from Summerlands Road but the extension is not considered to a prominent feature due to its single storey nature. Equally, it is acknowledged there is already similar built form in the same location, an extension with similar proportions is not expected to cause adverse harm to the street scene.
- The proposed outbuilding would have a shallow pitched roof and is not expected to be a dominant feature within the locality. Like the rear extension, it would not be visible from Orchards Road but there would be views in Summerlands Road. The outbuilding would mostly be screened by existing neighbouring boundary treatment and the garage to 8 Summerlands Road. Additionally, it is noted an outbuilding of this size could be constructed under applicant's permitted development rights with a slightly reduced height. The use of white render is not considered to be harmful as this material is already seen on the host dwelling. As such, the outbuilding is considered acceptable in terms of design.

Residential Amenity

- The neighbours most impacted as a result of the proposed development would be the immediate adjoining neighbours, nos. 1 and 5 Orchard Road and the neighbour to the south, no. 8 Summerlands Road.
- **Impact on no.1:**
No. 1 is located southeast of the site and has a single storey rear extension. The proposed single storey extension would marginally extend beyond this and as such is not expected to adversely impact the light and outlook to this neighbour. The proposed rear extension would not have any side facing windows that would directly face this neighbour, as such there are no loss of privacy concerns. The single storey front and side extension would be positioned away from this neighbour and as such, this element is not expected to impact upon this neighbour. The proposed outbuilding is also considered to be sufficiently distanced away from no. 1 and due to its siting, the outbuilding would not impact upon the light and outlook to the main private space to the garden of no. 1 to an unacceptable degree.
- **Impact on no. 5:**
No. 5 is located northwest of the site and has a single storey side extension sited right up to the shared boundary which has no side facing windows. The proposed single storey side extension would project 2.7m closer to this neighbour; the extension would be set in slightly from the boundary and almost extend the full depth of the property.
- The main part of the house to no. 5 is set in 2.5m from the shared boundary and there are 2no. side facing windows which face the side elevation to the no.3, these windows serve a kitchen/diner and family room. The family room is to the rear of the property and is also served by fully glazed doors to the rear elevation which face south. This is considered the main source of light and outlook to this room, with the side facing window being considered a secondary window. Therefore, the proposed side extension is not expected to impact upon this room to a harmful degree.
- The kitchen/diner window is southeast facing and is the only source of outlook and light to this room; the outlook being fairly limited as the window already faces the side elevation to no. 3. The main consideration will be the amount of light the window would receive with the side extension in place. The site plan indicates the proposed side extension would finish approximately halfway between the kitchen/diner window. This combined with the orientation of the window, the separation distance and the flat roof form of the proposed extension would ensure there would not be an unacceptable loss of light to the kitchen/diner window of no. 5 as this room is still expected to receive a reasonable amount of light with the extension in place.
- The proposed single storey rear extension is sufficiently distanced from no. 5, in addition there are no side facing windows that would face this neighbour. Therefore, this element of the proposal is not expected to impact this neighbour's outlook, light or privacy.
- **Impact on no. 8:**
The proposed outbuilding would be sited right up to and along the whole of the southwestern boundary shared with no. 8, the majority of the outbuilding would be screened by the wall along the boundary. The pitched roof to the outbuilding would slope away from this neighbour reducing any perceived overbearing and dominance.

The closest rear ground floor window to no. 8 that could be impacted by the proposal appears to serve a kitchen. A daylighting test was applied to this window in relation to the proposed outbuilding and appeared to pass this test. Therefore, the proposed development is not considered to cause unacceptable harm to the daylight or outlook to this room.

It is noted as the outbuilding is fairly large in size and due this and its siting, a condition will be applied to ensure it would be ancillary to the host dwelling in order to ensure the amenities of this neighbour and nearby residents are protected.

Highways Safety and Parking

- The proposals would not result in any additional bedrooms. The host dwelling will remain a three-bedroom property which requires two off-street parking spaces as set out in the Residential Parking Standards SPD. The site plan indicates the required parking can be accommodated by the driveway to the front of the site. As such, there are no highway safety or parking concerns.

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: This application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐