

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/98407

Site Address: 24 KINGSWAY, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1EN

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Amendments to existing garage to provide accessible undercover secure vehicle parking, resurfacing of driveway and vehicular field gates (Retrospective Application).

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the Urban Edge Nature Conservation – SSSI Impact Zone & HRA Screening Criteria Flood Zones 2 and 3 Tree Preservation Orders Nature Conservation – Great Crested Newts Amber Zone		

Planning History	Yes ☒	No ☐
Reference No.	Description	Decision
H/23/95576	Garage extension	Permit – 03/10/2023
H/22/93137	Erect double garage at front	Withdrawn - 03/08/2023
H/22/92884	Single storey front extension, new roof to rear and demolition of existing garage	Permit – 22/06/2023
Z/04602/004/00	Single storey rear extensions	Permit – 14/04/2003
Z/04602/003/00	Single storey side extension and erection of detached garage to front	Permit 19/03/2003
Z/04602/002/00	Single storey side extension	Permit – 26/02/1986

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	One objection received from 26 Kingsway (summarised): • Original garage extension was modest, the amended design is not. • Garage is overbearing. • Significant increase to garage height. • Garage is wider than what was approved. • Detrimental to the street scene • Impact on visual amenity. • Retrospective planning should not be granted.		
Chandlers Ford Parish Council:	No comments were received.		
Ecology:	<u>No objection – subject to condition:</u> I have reviewed the photos of the existing and proposed works to the garage. Horizontal timber boarding which may have had potential as a bat roost feature was removed from the front gable end. The roof was raised to enable the enlarged front opening. The posts for the field 5 bar gate were installed within the root protection zones of the trees at the entrance of the driveway. There are records of bats and hedgehogs near this site. As this is a retrospective application, mitigation for loss of potential bat roost features and biodiversity enhancements are the only remaining options.		

	A bat box should be installed on the garage as mitigation for loss of potential bat roost features. 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) Biodiversity enhancements will be required in accord with Local Plan policy DM 11 and NPPF paragraph 180. Planting a wide variety of plants for pollinators including night scented flowering plants would be a good enhancement in this area. Bird boxes or a hedgehog house in a quiet corner of the garden would also be appropriate.
Trees:	No objection
Environment Agency:	No comments were received.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 27/11/2024 – 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

Assessment:
<u>Site and Surroundings</u> The application site comprises a detached bungalow on the southern side of Kingsway close to the junction of Brownhill Road. The property itself is set well back from the highway within a good-sized plot. There is a large front garden with parking provision for several vehicles. To the east of the host dwelling there is a detached single garage (which is the subject of this application) and to the rear, there is a sizeable garden. The surrounding area is predominately residential, comprising mainly of detached dwellings including both two storey houses and bungalows. <u>Proposal</u> Planning permission was granted in 2023 for the existing garage within the site to be extended. These works have been undertaken but with some differences from the approved plans. The current application seeks to authorise the scheme as built. The main difference between the plans previously approved and the garage extension built are as follows: • The extended part of the garage is higher than the existing ridge line to the garage and also wider to accommodate vehicles. The maximum height would be 4.25m (original approved height was 4m) and the maximum width would be 3.7m (original approved width was 3m); • The roof form has changed from pitched to a half-hipped roof to the front elevation; • New roller shutter garage door to the front elevation. • Existing garage door inserted to the rear elevation of the garage.

In addition to the revised garage design, the application seeks retention for;

- Resurfacing of driveway with concrete hardstanding;
- 1.4m high vehicular field gates across the driveway access supported on oak posts (1.5m in height).

Principle

The site is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the details of the development complying with the relevant planning policies.

Design and Appearance

- The amended design of the garage has resulted in changes to its size and appearance, leading to a slightly bulkier design. The garage has been widened in order to park a vehicle and allow sufficient space for doors to be opened and exit the vehicle. The alterations are still considered to be appropriate in size and overall, the garage remains a subservient addition to the host dwelling.
- The concerns raised by the neighbour regarding the impact of the garage and its negative visual impact upon the character area are noted. However, the garage is set well back from the highway and has only increased slightly in size. Therefore, the garage is not considered to be so unduly dominant or cause significant material harm within the street scene that the application warrants refusal on this basis.
- Turning to the replacement hardstanding; this is considered acceptable as this driveway has already had hardstanding in place for several years which has become worn and damaged over time. The replacement hardstanding has improved the appearance of the frontage to the site.
- The vehicular field gates are appropriate with regards to their size and appearance and would not create a sense of enclosure. Furthermore, there are similar sized gates in the vicinity and are considered to be in keeping within the locality. It should also be noted that gates of a slightly smaller height (1m) can be installed without the need for formal planning permission.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site and would retain sufficient amenity space.
- To conclude, while the garage is slightly bulkier in appearance, on balance, the amendments are acceptable as it would still be a subservient addition in relation to the main property and not be an unacceptable overbearing presence with the wider surroundings.

Residential Amenity

- The neighbour most affected by the amended garage design is No. 26 Kingsway, located to the east of the application site. This neighbour has expressed concerns that the garage has moved closer to their boundary, resulting in an oppressive structure.
- While these concerns are noted, a site visit and review of the plans have confirmed that the height of the garage has marginally increased by 0.22m, and the width has increased by 0.7m. This adjustment has caused the garage to project closer to the shared boundary. However, as the garage skews away from this boundary, the extended portion is set back by a minimum of 0.35m and a maximum of 0.79m.
- Although the amended design creates a closer relationship with the boundary, the extended portion of the garage is positioned toward the front of the property, away from the neighbour's private rear garden, and is screened by substantial hedging and vegetation.
- Given these mitigating factors, the revised garage design is not considered unduly oppressive.
- It was also noted during the site visit, no. 26 has 1no. window to the front elevation that has the potential to have a reduced outlook and light as a result of the revised

design to the garage. It has been established this window to no. 26 serves an en-suite bathroom which is considered a non-habitable room and is obscured glazed.

- As such, due to the above factors, 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.

Ecology and Trees

- Due to the nature of the works and the presence of protected trees on the site, consultations were undertaken with the Council's Ecology and Tree Officers.
- In the previous application (H/23/95576), the Council's Ecologist requested a preliminary bat assessment. This assessment concluded that the garage had negligible bat roost potential and recommended biodiversity enhancements to be included as an informative. For this application, the Ecologist has noted that, as this is a retrospective application, any potential bat roost features would already have been lost. While this advice slightly conflicts with the response in the previous application, the Ecologist has maintained their recommendation for biodiversity enhancements by way of informative measures to attract wildlife back to the site.
- With regard to the protected trees on the site, the Tree Officer has reviewed the submitted plans and raised no arboricultural objections to the application.

Highway Safety and Parking

- The garage and sizeable gravel driveway to the front of the property provide sufficient off-street parking for a dwelling of this size.
- The vehicular gates are designed to open inwards within the site boundary. There is adequate space within the curtilage of the site to park a vehicle and operate the gates without encroaching on the public footpath or highway.
- 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.

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, given the factors outlined in this report, this application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐