

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/98280

Site Address: 311 MARKET STREET, EASTLEIGH, SO50 5QE

Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best

Description: Single storey rear/side extension (Amended description and plans)

Particular Site Constraints	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the Urban Edge Within Established Residential Area SGN Pipeline – To the front of the site 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.		
Eastleigh Town Council:	<u>No Objection:</u> Eastleigh Town Council reviewed this application at its meeting on 6 November 2024. While the council has concerns regarding the distance to the neighbouring property and the potential impact on light and privacy, it trusts that any planning regulation breaches will be appropriately addressed by the planning authority. As such, the council has no objection to the application.		
Ecology:	<u>Comments on amended plans received 20/12/24:</u> <u>No Objection:</u> The single storey extension will not affect the roof, the hanging tiles on the dormer or any potential bat roost features, so a bat survey will not be needed. Some biodiversity enhancement is still required. <u>Comments on review of site photos received 11/12/2024:</u> <u>Holding Objection:</u> The site photos show several potential bat roost features which could be affected by construction. I cannot see all of the roof of the existing building or close up photos of the dormer due to the angle of the roof and the small ground area available for taking photos. if any bats were roosting under the hanging tiles of the existing dormer they would be affected by dust, noise and vibration during the construction phase. A preliminary bat roost appraisal will be required. The report must contain a precautionary working method to prevent disturbance to any bats roosting under the hanging tiles. <u>Original comments received 30/10/2024:</u> The photo of the rear of the house available on Google Maps shows a rear dormer clad in hanging tiles. Comparison of the existing and proposed plans appears to show that the roof and dormer area would not be affected by construction of the		

	proposed two storey extension. Please could you clarify this and provide close-up photos of this area. 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)
Southern Water Services:	No objection – guidance leaflet provided.
Southern Gas Networks:	No objection – guidance leaflet provided.
Scottish and Southern Electric Networks:	No objection – guidance leaflet provided.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 28/11/2024 – 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; Character Area Appraisals (ELAC 15).

Assessment:
<u>Site and Surroundings</u> The application site contains a Victorian/Edwardian mid-terrace two storey dwelling with a rear dormer window situated in a linear plot. There is a two storey and single storey outrigger to the rear of the property, which is typical with this type of dwelling. The rear garden is enclosed with fencing, at the end of the garden there is a detached garage. The surrounding area is predominately residential in nature, characterised by similar dwellings arranged in a grid formation. <u>Proposal</u> This application seeks approval for a single storey rear and side extension following the removal of the existing single storey extension. The proposed extension project from the rear wall of the two storey rear outrigger as well as infilling the space between the outrigger and boundary shared with 309 Market Street. The extension would have a flat parapet roof, measuring approximately 6.3m in depth from the original rear wall (3m from the two storey outrigger), 4.2m in width, and 2.6m in height. The extension would

accommodate an enlarged kitchen and snug and would be finished in materials that would match the host dwelling.

Initially, this application proposed a two storey side and rear extension which raised concerns with regards to the design of the extension and the impact upon the neighbouring amenity at 309 Market Street. Consequently, amended plans were submitted, reducing the scheme to a single storey extension and neighbours and the Twon Council had a further opportunity to comment on the revised scheme. This revision has addressed the primary concerns, as will be detailed in the report below.

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 Layout

- The design of the single storey side and rear extension is now considered appropriate for the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale, and appearance. Being single storey and located to the rear of the property, the extension is not visible from the public realm, resulting in minimal impact on the street scene.
- It was noted during the site visit, there were examples of single storey side/rear extensions along the terraced row demonstrating that the proposal is consistent with the surrounding development. Furthermore, the use of matching materials ensures the extension integrates harmoniously with the host dwelling and does not detract from the character of the area.
- Overall, the design of the proposal upon receipt of amended plans, is considered appropriate in relation to the existing building and surrounding area in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

- The neighbours most impacted as a result of the proposal would be the immediate adjoining neighbours, nos. 309 and 313 Market Street.

Impact on 309 Market Street

- The neighbouring property to the north has a single storey rear and side extension that fills the recess up to the shared boundary. This extension does not feature side-facing windows toward the application site; however, the rear elevation includes fully glazed patio doors serving a kitchen and breakfast area, as well as a bathroom window.
- The proposed single storey side element infills the space between the outrigger and is positioned close to the shared boundary. The rear element extends beyond the rear building line of No. 309, potentially impacting the light and outlook of the kitchen/breakfast area served by the patio doors.
- The Quality Places SPD provides a 45-degree daylighting test for primary rear windows of neighbouring properties. This test evaluates whether a proposed development crosses the 45-degree line, drawn from the midpoint of the primary window, on both elevation and floor plans. If the line is crossed, it indicates a likely reduction in light to the habitable room.
- The daylighting test was applied to the patio doors and passed, as the proposed development did not fail the test on the elevation plan. Additionally, as the window faces west and as the proposed extension is single storey with a flat roof, it is considered that the room will continue to receive a reasonable amount of light, particularly during the afternoon.
- In conclusion, the amended scheme is not expected to adversely impact this neighbour to an unacceptable degree in terms of their outlook, light or privacy.

Impact on 311 Market Street

- The neighbouring property to the south has a single storey rear extension that accommodates a ground-floor bathroom.
- The proposed single storey side and rear extension is not expected to adversely impact this neighbour. While the extension would alter the outlook and reduce light to the ground-floor rear window, it has been confirmed that this window serves a bathroom, which is not considered a habitable room.
As such, the proposed extension is not expected to result in any unacceptable impact on light, outlook, or privacy for this neighbour.

Ecology

- The Council's Ecologist was consulted due to the nature of the proposed works. Initially, in response to the two storey proposal, the Ecologist requested site photographs to assess the potential for bat roosts. These photographs were provided, and upon review, several potential bat roost features were identified that could be affected by the construction works.
- Consequently, the Ecologist recommended that a Preliminary Bat Roost Appraisal (PRA) be conducted prior to determination. However, following the submission of amended plans reducing the proposal to a single storey extension, the Ecologist confirmed that a PRA was no longer required.
- The Ecologist recommended the inclusion of biodiversity enhancements, to be secured through an informative.

Other Considerations

- The proposal would not be an overdevelopment of the site in that it would retain sufficient amenity space for a property of this size. There would also be no increase in bedrooms; the property would remain a three-bedroom dwelling and parking would be accommodated either by the garage to the rear of the property or on-street as the immediate area is controlled by permitted parking.
- There are no protected trees on the site and the proposal is not considered to have an adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention. The householder extension would not have a likely significant impact 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: This application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

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