

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97219

Site Address: MICHANN, ALBERT ROAD, HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 0DJ

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Two storey rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory and utility room, covered front porch and alterations to fenestration

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☐	No ☒
Within the Urban Edge Within Established Residential Area		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Reference No.	Description	Decision
H/23/94832 (Kilburn)	Raise ridge height of roof to create first floor with dormers and alteration to fenestration	Permit – 14/07/2023
H/20/88160 (Hounslow)	Raising of roof to provide enlarged first floor accommodation, two storey rear extension incorporating raised decking and balcony, single storey front extension and alterations to fenestration	Permit – 10/09/2020
Z/34251/003/00	Single storey side and rear extension and replacement front porch	Permit – 02/07/2002
Z/34251/002/00	Addition of rear conservatory	Permit – 08/12/2000

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None were received		
Hedge End Town Council:	No objection		
Ecology:	<u>Comments on Bat Scoping Survey received 17/09/24:</u> I have reviewed the Bat Scoping Survey by Crossman Associates (Issue 2, September 2024). The property was assessed to have moderate bat roost potential, due to lifted roof tiles and other gaps within the roof. Two emergence surveys were done in July and August. No bats were seen emerging from the building, however there were common pipistrelle bats seen and heard during the surveys. A precautionary working method for bats involving soft stripping the roof was recommended in section 4.5. This is appropriate and can be conditioned. This is not listed in the recommendations summary box which only mentions the precautionary work for birds. All works will proceed under a precautionary approach. Tiles and roof panels will be removed in a vertical rather than horizontal sliding motion. Roof timbers, leadwork, roofing felt, soffits and masonry will be dismantled using a 'soft' approach taking care with cavity walls where present. All site workers must always be vigilant for bats or signs of bats and in the unlikely event that a bat is found, then works must stop immediately and advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist and from Natural England. Additional information is available on the Bat Conservation Trust website at		

<https://www.bats.org.uk/advice/im-working-on-a-building-with-bats/ive-found-a-bat-during-works>

Any vegetation to be removed to facilitate the development must be removed outside of bird nesting season (which is usually between the beginning of March and the end of August) or if this is not possible then only after being checked for nesting birds by a suitably qualified ecologist. If any active nests are found, work must stop, and a 5 m buffer must be erected around the nest to protect it from disturbance until after the birds have fledged and left the nest.

As potential bat roost features of moderate value are being removed from this building, at least one bat box/brick is required within the two-storey extension as compensation for loss of these features. This was not addressed in the report. Built-in boxes/bricks are preferred to externally mounted boxes as they do not require maintenance and cannot fall off. Alternatively, a raised tile-type feature for crevice dwelling bats can be built into the roof of the extension.

A sparrow nest box has been recommended to be installed below the eaves as a biodiversity enhancement. I would also recommend integral boxes if possible and/or a swift nest box/brick, which can be used by other species when swifts are not in residence.

A review of the amended proposed elevations shows that there are suitable eaves available for bat and swift boxes on the east and west elevations. The site photos show space under the eaves for externally mounted boxes on the existing side elevation (labelled southeast). Bat and bird boxes must always be located away from alarm boxes and security lights. The locations of at least one bat and one bird box on the appropriate elevations must be marked on a plan and agreed either before determination or before the start of works. Precautionary working methods for hedgehogs and stag beetles will be required. This must include the following:

Any excavations or open pipes will need to be covered at night or provided with an escape ramp (rough board at a shallow angle) to allow hedgehogs to escape if they fall in.

All chemicals and hazardous materials must be stored safely in lockable cabinets to prevent them from being accessed by hedgehogs. Waste must be kept in locked containers or removed from site daily. No fires can be lit on site.

Any long grass, piles of vegetation, dead wood, fallen leaves, or building materials which could shelter small mammals must be dismantled/cleared by hand to ensure that no animals become trapped.

If hedgehogs are found on site, they must be allowed to move away to safety. If any hedgehogs appear to be in distress, a hedgehog rescue worker should be contacted. Information is available on the website of the British Hedgehog Preservation society at <https://www.britishhedgehogs.org.uk/found-a-hedgehog/>

Any stag beetles or stag beetle larvae must be moved to a place of safety along with any decaying wood they were living in.

Lighting must not be left on at night.

	Planting additional flowering plants in the garden will attract pollinating insects which are also food for bats and birds. <u>Review of site photos received 23/05/2024:</u> I have reviewed the site photos. The rear dormer has hanging tiles, a few of which have slipped, providing a potential bat roost feature. There are a few roof tiles which appear to be slightly raised particularly close to the existing utility room extension and near the dormer. There are also broken and missing ridge tiles and raised roof tiles on the roof ridge near the dormer over the conservatory. There are a few slipped tiles on the front roof near the front door and some slightly raised tiles near the chimney. There are some slipped tiles showing near the ridge line behind the tree in the photo labelled side elevation to the south-east. There may be gaps behind the wooden fascia facing northwest at the side of the house. A preliminary bat roost assessment is required before determination, and further activity surveys may be needed. Precautionary working methods for hedgehogs and stag beetles will be required and can be conditioned. <u>Original comments received 30/04/2024:</u> This site is in a green impact risk zone for great crested newts. There are records of bats and stag beetles nearby and hedgehogs in the wider area. The proposals will affect the existing roof. Photos are required to determine whether a survey will be required. The photos should be taken up close, in good light, and include all areas of the roof, soffits, fascia, cladding, flashing, and areas around the windows. Biodiversity enhancements will be required in accord with Local Plan policy DM 11 and NPPF paragraph 180. A bat brick and a swift brick may be appropriate for this building. The Bat Conservation Trust recommends installing a bat brick/box at least 4 m above the ground, away from artificial light sources, sheltered from strong winds and exposed to the sun for part of the day, facing south, south-east or south-west. (https://www.bats.org.uk › our-work › putting-up-your-box) Swift nest boxes are best positioned under the eaves or on walls facing north, northeast or north-west out of direct sunlight, five metres above the ground, with clear adjacent airspace so swifts can access them in a high-speed direct flight. (https://www.swiftconservation.org/Nestboxes%26Attraction.htm)
--	---

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: site visit carried out 22/05/2024 – 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; Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area Appraisals – HEWEB 28.

Assessment:

Site and Surroundings

The application site contains a detached bungalow with a rear facing dormer window located on the northeastern side of Albert Road. The property is set back from the road by a front garden and driveway, to the rear there is a private enclosed garden. Albert Road slopes down to the southeast which results in the application property being set on lower ground levels to the neighbour to the northwest (St Brelades) and on higher ground levels than the neighbour to the southeast (Roma). The surrounding area is predominately residential and most of the properties along Albert Road feature a mix of architectural styles, some of which have been extended at roof level and to the rear at first floor level. The application site forms part of a sub character of three detached bungalows with barn hipped roofs and rear dormers and are fairly traditional in form.

Proposal

This application seeks approval for the construction of a two storey rear extension with 1no. rear dormer window following the removal of the existing single storey rear extension and conservatory, a covered front porch and alterations to the existing fenestration. The fenestration changes include replacing the existing front door with a window and repositioning the front door to the eastern elevation of the proposed front porch, 3no. rooflights to the front roof slope and replacement ground floor window to the western elevation with a window that is smaller in size and the insertion of a utility door. The two storey rear extension would be finished in a combination of matching brickwork and horizontal cladding (colour unknown). The front porch would be finished in matching brickwork, the covered element would be flat roofed and supported on posts. The fenestration to the entirety of the property would be white uPVC framed (replacing the existing casement windows).

Over the course of the application, amended plans were received which show the two storey rear extension scaled down in scale due to size and massing concerns. The amended plans while still sizeable appear to address the initial concerns which will be outlined in the report below.

Principle

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.

Character and Design

The design of the two storey rear extension, front porch and fenestration alterations following receipt of amended plans are suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.

While it is acknowledged the two storey rear extension is fairly sizeable, it would be sited to the rear with a hipped roof and modest dormer window reducing the perceived bulk when compared to the original submitted plans. Albert Road features a mix of properties, however, it is noted some of the dwellings within the road have been extended fairly significantly to the rear at first floor level. Taking this into account, the proposed two storey extension while visible from some public vantage points due to the sloping topography is not expected to be overly dominant within the surrounding street scene when considering the existing development within the locality.

The two storey extension would not extend beyond the existing rear building line of the host dwelling or the immediate neighbouring properties and therefore not considered an overdevelopment of the site. As the extension is sited to the rear and maintains the ridge

line to the main house, the proposal is not considered to disrupt the general pattern of development between the sub character of bungalows and the frontages will remain largely similar in appearance, respecting the sub character area.

The two storey extension is proposed to be finished in matching brickwork and horizontal cladding. The colour of the cladding has not been disclosed but it would be mainly to the rear of the property and a relatively small expanse. Cladding is seen within the locality and as such it is considered cladding of an appropriate colour will compliment the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Therefore, a condition will be applied to provide details of external materials to ensure high quality and appropriate materials are used.

The addition of the front porch with the associated canopy flat roof is considered a modest and low-key addition to the host dwelling and is not expected to be a prominent feature in the street scene or the sub character area. The proposed fenestration alterations are also considered low-key and non-obtrusive to the host property.

Overall and to conclude, on balance, while the two storey extension is a sizeable addition, due to its location and roof form and taking into account the context of development within Albert Road, the proposals are considered acceptable in terms of design.

Residential Amenity

The neighbours most impacted by the proposals would be the immediate adjoining neighbours St Brelades to the northwest and Roma to the southeast.

Impact on St Brelades:

This neighbour is positioned on higher ground levels than the application site and there is a separation distance of approximately 2.6m between the buildings. This neighbour has two high-level ground floor side facing windows that face the application site which appear to serve a dining room and has also been extended. This room is also served by a set of fully glazed patio doors to the northern elevation and a bay window to the western elevation in the extended section; combined these windows are considered the main source of outlook and light to this room. As the two storey rear extension would not extend beyond this rear extension, the proposal is not considered to impact the outlook and light to this room.

Turning to the first floor rear windows located in the rear dormer; the closest first floor window to St Brelades appears to serve a bedroom. The proposed two storey extension does have the potential to impact upon the light and outlook to this rear facing window as it is set further back from the proposal. The Quality Places SPD sets out a 45-degree daylighting test for primary windows in the rear of neighbouring properties, noting that is a development crosses the 45-degree line on both elevation and floor plans than the development will probably cause a noticeable reduction in skylight received by the rear windows. The daylighting test has been applied to the bedroom window and passes the test. This demonstrates there would be no unacceptable impact to the outlook and light to this room.

In terms of privacy and overlooking; the windows to the two storey rear extension would mainly face the garden to the application site; there would be oblique views into the neighbours garden however this is unavoidable in urban settings. The change to the fenestration to the western elevation would result in a smaller window as well as a glazed door. The window would serve a shower room; therefore this window would naturally be obscured glazed alleviating any privacy or overlooking concerns. The door and proposed ground floor side window located in the two storey extension would face the flank elevation of which there are the high-level windows. Due to St Brelades being sited on higher ground it is not expected the proposed door and window would directly face these windows, therefore this is not expected to generate any privacy concerns.

Overall and to conclude, the proposal would not impact upon the light, outlook or privacy of this neighbour.

Impact on Roma:

This neighbour is positioned on lower ground levels and there is a separation distance of approximately 3.5m between the buildings. This neighbour has three ground floor side facing windows and a glazed door on the northwestern elevation that face the application site. Two of these windows serve a habitable room located to the front of the property, this room is also served by a front facing window which faces south and is considered the main source of light and outlook to this room; this window would not be disrupted by the proposed extension and therefore would not adversely impact upon the outlook and light to this room.

The remaining side window serves a kitchen; it is acknowledged this kitchen window is already limited in terms of outlook as it faces the flank elevation to the application site and light received due to its orientation (northwest facing). The proposed two storey extension is not expected to impact significantly upon the light received to this room due to its location to the northern elevation of the host dwelling. The window would still receive a reasonable amount of light in the afternoon as the front roof slope to the property would remain unaltered.

The daylighting test has also been applied to the closest primary first floor rear window to the application site and has also passed the test. Therefore, the outlook and light to this neighbour would not be impacted upon to such a detrimental degree that the application warrants refusal.

Much like the adjoining neighbour, the windows to the two storey rear extension would mainly face the garden to the application site; there would be oblique views into this neighbouring garden however this is unavoidable in urban settings and not considered harmful. Overall and to conclude, the proposal is not expected to cause a significant harm to this neighbour's outlook, light or privacy.

Impact on rear neighbours in Jubilee Court:

With regards to the neighbours to the rear of the site in Jubilee Court, there would be a separation distance of approximately 39m. The guidance set out in the Quality Places SPD states that a minimum back-to-back distance of 22m between first floor habitable room windows is required to maintain an acceptable level of privacy between properties to mitigate the potential for overlooking. Therefore, the separation distance between the application property and the rear neighbours is considered acceptable and would not create unacceptable overlooking to these neighbours.

Ecology

Owed to the works to the roof, the Council's Ecologist was consulted upon. Initially they requested site photos for review. Upon review of these photos a preliminary bat roost assessment was requested. The Bat Scoping Survey by Crossman Associates was submitted in September 2024. This was reviewed by the Council's Ecologist who was satisfied with the protection measures set out in the report and advised the installation of bat and bird boxes be secured via condition. Biodiversity recommendations and enhancements will also be added to the decision notice by way of informative.

Highways Safety and Parking

The proposal would include an additional bedroom which would result in a four-bedroom property. This would require three off-street parking spaces as set out in the Residential Parking Standards SPD. No parking plan has been provided as part of this application; it is noted that the front garden could be further utilised for parking under the applicant's permitted development rights which may not require formal planning permission.

Therefore, as it is considered there is sufficient space to the frontage to meet the parking standards. It was also noted during the site visit that Albert Road has fairly light traffic and

ample space for on-street parking. As such there are no significant highway safety or parking concerns as a result of the proposal that would warrant refusal of the application.

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 aims for the need for housing to be met, and policy S2 of the Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. 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 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: On balance, taking into account the considerations outlined in the report, this application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐