

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/98294

Site Address: 71 LAKEWOOD ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5AE

Case Officer: Rachael Morris

Description: Proposed first floor extension to form additional living accommodation, single storey front and rear extensions

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

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Parish Council:	No Comment		
Ecology:	A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment was done in 2022 where c.80 droppings were recorded in the roof void, with one bat activity survey in September 2022 and two further activity surveys in June and July 2023. The presence of droppings makes the building a confirmed bat roost, although the bats do not appear to have been identified to species. No bats were seen emerging on either of the three dusk emergence surveys. The report states that any bats which may have roosted in the building are believed to have abandoned the roost, however as mentioned in section 2.2, bats are known to move between roosts and 3 emergence surveys are only 3 snapshots of roosting activity on those particular dates. The proposal involves extensive works to the roof. I am concerned that the mitigation recommendations could allow work to proceed without adequate ecological supervision. I am also concerned that the report does not provide photos of all elevations of the house, close up photos of the roof and photos of the interior of the loft. The Bat Conservation Trust recommends installing a bat brick/box at least 4 m above the ground (not 3 m), 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. The bat box recommended on a tree must be installed before the end of March 2025 to be in place before start of any works to the house. The demolition phase is recommended to take place between late March and late October. This must only be done when temperatures are above 10°C in dry weather and avoiding the maternity season (June and July) when bats are most vulnerable. If this timing is not possible, then a pre-works check by a bat licensed ecologist will be required. Before the start of work, all construction operatives must be briefed by a suitably qualified ecologist on how to recognise signs of bats, how to remove roof tiles sensitively in case a bat is roosting underneath and what to do if a bat is found during the roof strip. The report has not listed any specific potential bat roost features which will be removed during the development, but since this is a confirmed roost it is highly likely that there are features that attracted bats to this building. The proposed elevations show that there are suitable locations for bat and bird boxes/bricks to be built into the house. At least one bat box/brick/tube must be included in the building as mitigation for the		

	loss of potential roosting opportunities in the building. The other enhancements recommended in the report can be mounted on trees or on the building. In addition to nearby records of bats, this property is located in a green impact zone for great crested newts. There are records of stag beetles, and hedgehogs near this site with records of common toads and nesting swifts in the wider area. The aerial photos of the site available on Google Maps show many large trees on site which could be used by nesting birds. The proposal involves large front and rear extensions to the house which could affect hedgehogs, toads, terrestrial newts, nesting birds and stag beetles or their larvae. Precautionary working methods are required to protect these species during construction. A Precautionary Working Method Statement can be conditioned.
Tree Officer:	<u>Nov 2024 (update):</u> We are satisfied with the proposal and the arboricultural impact stated. We require the arboricultural report, and all of its instructions, to be condition, along with details of a replacement tree (1no.) following the removal of T7, as per the Trees and Development SPD. <u>Oct 2024:</u> There are some significant, protected trees on site, both to the front and the rear of the application property. TPO 250-E protects a number of oak trees to the front, 3 of which are in very close proximity to either the front extension or apparent driveway work; the same TPO also protects a number of larch, pine and oak to the rear of the existing dwelling. No arboricultural information has been provided. Fundamentally, therefore, we are unable to assess the impact on the trees, and would raise an objection based on lack of information demonstrating that the proposal can be implemented without significant harm to the trees present on site. Despite the lack of arboricultural information, it would appear that there would be an impact from the proposed development given the nature of the work and the location of the trees. This is especially true to the front. There is also, but to a much lesser extent, the potential impact from construction access and activities (indirect impacts), to both the trees to the front and the rear. Therefore, we raise a holding objection and request the submission of arboricultural information, as per British Standard 5837 and the Trees and Development SPD, demonstrating that the proposal can be implemented without significant harm to the trees present on site.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 01/11/2024		

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, DM11 and DM14. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals (Hiltingbury and Hocombe Park Special Policy Area).

Assessment:

The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that:

Principle

- The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.
- Policy DM1 states “All new development should:
 - a.) not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance: residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas...
 - c.) 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 with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.”
- Hiltingbury and Hocombe Park Special Policy Area Character Area Appraisal states “The local plan describes the area as well-wooded, consisting generally of large residential plots which are visually attractive and which help to meet a demand for such properties.
In order to protect the special character of Hiltingbury, the sub-division or redevelopment of plots will not be permitted unless all the following criteria are met:
 - i. the size of any proposed plot is not significantly smaller than those in the immediate vicinity of the site;
 - ii. the proposal does not involve the loss or prejudice the retention of existing healthy mature trees on the site;
 - iii. the design, siting, scale and proposed development is compatible with the Arcadian character of the locality and does not involve back land or tandem development; and
 - iv. the proposal is accompanied by a detailed planting scheme designed to assimilate the development into its surroundings.”. However, worthy of note is that the policy (181.LB) that was previously associated with this special policy area was not continued to the adopted local plan (2016-2036). As such, this holds limited weight.

Design and layout

- The design of the first-floor extension, single storey front and rear extension is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The proposed first floor extension would extend across the entire footprint of the existing dwelling. The first-floor extension is designed with a hipped roof and gable end accents to the front and rear elevation which sit subserviently from the main ridge of the roof.
- The side elevations show the dwelling to have a staggered, broken-up elevation which assists in ensuring the proposal will not be overly bulky.
- The proposed single-storey rear extension is proposed with a slightly sloping flat roof with sky light. This extends approx. 1/3 of the width of the main dwelling and approx. 3.3m further out past the rear wall of the existing sunroom.
- The most notable aspect of the proposed front extension is the proposed garage and two-storey porch. The other front extension is a minor addition to the front that extends past the principal elevation of the existing dwelling, to accommodate a utility room.
- The proposed garage is designed with a barn hipped roof which minimises bulk and, although coming forward of the principal elevation by approx. 7m, does not dominate the front elevation. In addition, the access to the house from Lakewood

Road, is positioned centrally to the plot and as such the proposed garage would not be an obvious feature from the street scene.

- The proposal lies within a large plot which can easily accommodate the proposed extensions with ample amenity space remaining and not result in an overdeveloped plot.
- The development would meet parking standards. The proposed development proposes an additional bedroom, to total 4.no bedrooms. This would require 3.no parking spaces, in accordance with the Residential Parking Standards SPD. This can be provided in the proposed double garage and driveway.
- The design and layout respect the character and appearance of the locality. The adjacent dwelling has a similar appearance to the proposed development and was approved in October 2021 (F/21/91336).
- The proposal accords with policy DM1 in that it takes account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality. The proposal would be well integrated in terms of scale, layout, and design in relation to itself and its surroundings.

Residential amenity

- The development accords with guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that there will be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.
- The southern elevation of the dwelling would be no closer to boundary than the existing dwelling. The proposed first floor extension would extend higher than the tallest point of the existing dwelling by approx. 3.5m. However, overall would extend higher by approx. 4m. Nonetheless, from 5m up, the proposed roof starts to recess into the site, and it is not expected this addition height with the proposed design would create an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property (no.69) in terms of overshadowing or a loss of light due to its northerly position.
- The proposed first floor side windows to the southern elevation would serve en-suites. Therefore, it is considered appropriate that these windows could be conditioned as obscure glazed to ensure the neighbouring property is not unacceptably overlooked. The other proposed additional windows are acceptable due to their ground floor location which is screened by boundary treatments, or the windows would only overlook the property's own amenity space or the public realm where overlooking is more accepted and expected.
- The proposal accords with policy DM1 in that it would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of both new and existing residents.

Other material considerations

- The proposal has the potential to harm protected trees on site through construction and implementation. As a result, the Council's tree consultant required arboricultural information, to include a tree protection plan. This has shown that the proposal can be carried out in an appropriate manner and as such is acceptable subject to a condition.
- The submitted Preliminary Roost Assessment demonstrates that although the dwelling appears to have been used a bat roost, this is now abandoned. The submitted report recommends limited mitigations, however the Council's ecologist has requested some further conditions.
- There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

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 ☐

Comments ...