

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/99458

Site Address: 13 GRANADA ROAD, HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 4AL

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Single storey front/side extension. Single storey side extension following demolition of existing garage. Single storey rear extension. Extended dropped kerb. Front canopy (Amended description)

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within the Urban Edge • Within Established Residential Area • Within Built-up Area Boundary		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/13772/001/00 - Erection of concrete garage in rear garden - Permit - 17/10/1974 • F/09/65242 - Single storey rear extensions and provision of car park space to front - Permit - 10/07/2009 • H/25/99079 - Single storey front/side extension.1.5 storey rear extension with a single storey side extension. Alterations to fenestration. Side dormer. - Refuse Planning Permission For - 03/07/2025		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>Original Scheme</u> Two objections were received to the original scheme. Concerns included loss of daylight to neighbouring living areas; excessive scale and massing resulting in overdevelopment and harm to the street scene; overlooking from the rear gable window; and impacts on privacy, drainage, and flood risk. <u>Amended Scheme</u> One comment and one objection were received to the amended scheme. The comment acknowledged significant improvements following discussions with the applicant, supporting the reduced garage height and repositioning, the lower pitched roof to the rear extension, and agreed boundary clearance for maintenance. Conditions were requested on construction hours, noise control, and restrictions on future upward extensions or dormers. The objection raised concerns about the proximity of the side extension to an electricity pole, potential overlooking from certain windows, and privacy from the snug window. Suggested solutions included confirming clearance to the electricity pole, removing a side-facing window, increasing the boundary fence height, and agreeing to restricted working hours and noise control.		
Parish Council:	The Parish Council objected to the original scheme on the grounds of overdevelopment and that the proposal was not in keeping with the		

	street scene. No further comments were received in respect of the amended scheme. In addition, comments were received from Members requesting that the application be referred to the September HEWEB Committee for determination. This request was based on the need for a clear and definitive position on whether any proposed works would fall within permitted development rights, given the site's planning history, and for consistency and transparency as the previous application was determined at committee. Following discussions, Members noted that the revisions addressed the concerns raised by neighbours. Subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions (including removal of certain permitted development rights), Members were satisfied for the application to be determined under delegated powers.
Ecologist:	<u>Original Scheme</u> Do not see any obvious potential bat roost features. A precautionary working method must be used to prevent harm to wildlife that could be using this site. <u>Amended Scheme</u> No further concerns.
Hampshire Countryside Service:	General information, no comments specific to application.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 7 th April 2025.		

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 Appraisal for Hedge End, West End and Botley (HEWEB 28)

Assessment:
<u>Site context and surroundings</u> The application site comprises a detached, single-storey, two-bedroom bungalow situated within a long, rectangular plot. The site lies on a gentle slope descending towards the northeast, resulting in a slight difference in levels between adjoining plots. The neighbouring property at 15 Granada Road to the west sits at a marginally higher elevation than No. 11 to the east. The dwelling benefits from a rear conservatory and a detached garage positioned along the shared boundary with No. 15. The property is set

well back from the highway, with a front garden and a driveway that provides off-street parking. The surrounding area is residential in character. The southern side of Granada Road, where the application site is located, is predominantly made up of detached and semi-detached bungalows of varying designs and scales. No. 15 shares a similar architectural style with the application property, while other dwellings along the street display more individualised features. In contrast, the northern side of Granada Road is largely characterised by two-storey, semi-detached, brick-built dwellings.

Proposal

This application is a resubmission following the refusal of planning application H/25/99079. Planning permission is now sought for the erection of a single storey front/side extension, a single storey rear extension, and a single storey side extension following the demolition of the existing garage. The proposal also includes the installation of a front canopy and the extension of the existing dropped kerb to facilitate improved vehicular access.

During the assessment, the proposal was revised several times in response to consultation feedback. The original design incorporated a loft conversion with a higher rear extension continuing the existing ridge line. This element has been omitted, and the revised design now proposes a lower ridge height and an elongated rear extension to accommodate an open-plan ground floor family kitchen and dining area, with no loft accommodation. The previously proposed single storey front/side extension was of a smaller footprint, providing a snug and one bedroom. This element has been extended in length to create an additional ground floor bedroom. In addition, the single storey side extension has been altered, with its ridge height reduced to below the eaves level of the host dwelling, thereby lowering its overall scale.

Policy and 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.
- The site is also part of the character area of Hedge End, West End and Botley (HEWEB 28) which provides the following guidance on developments and that they should ensure that:
 - i) Maintain the importance of the recreation ground and the associated semi-mature/mature broadleaved tree planting.
 - ii) Maintain the importance of the views to the Church of St. John the Evangelist.
 - iii) Mitigate the effects of the heavy vehicular traffic on St John's Road and Bursledon Road in new development using measures such as boundary planting, set backs, transition spaces and orientation of internal spaces.

Layout, design, and impact upon the character of the area

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of urban areas, 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 in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design, and siting.
- This part of Granada Road is characterised predominantly by single-storey bungalows of modest scale and simple form. The amended proposal removes the previously proposed upper-floor element in its entirety, retaining only single-storey extensions. This reduction in height and massing ensures the development sits more comfortably within its context and integrates more sympathetically with both

the host dwelling and surrounding properties. As a result, the dwelling will continue to present as a single-storey property when viewed from the street, avoiding any incongruity with the established character of the area.

- While the proposed rear extension and front/side extension increase the overall footprint compared to the original submission, both elements remain single-storey and are designed with materials and detailing to match the existing dwelling. The overall plot size is sufficient to accommodate the proposed footprint without appearing cramped or resulting in an overdeveloped appearance.
- Overall, the amended scheme is considered to respect the scale, proportions, and character of the host property and the wider area. The revisions made during the course of the application have addressed previous concerns regarding excessive scale and impact on the street scene, and the proposal is now considered acceptable in design terms.

Impact on residential amenity

- Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulate that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.
- The neighbouring properties most directly affected are Nos. 11 and 15 Granada Road. Both neighbours raised objections to the proposal, citing concerns over loss of daylight, loss of privacy, overbearing impact, and disruption during construction.
- The previously proposed higher rear extension with loft accommodation has been removed. The rear extension now has a lower pitched roof with rooflights, significantly reducing its massing and visual impact. A side-facing window within the rear extension shown on the earlier plans has also been removed to prevent overlooking towards No. 11.
- While the amended plans include a new snug window within the proposed single storey front/side extension facing No. 11, it is positioned at ground-floor level, and provision has been made for an increased fence height along part of the boundary to further protect privacy.
- The single storey side extension replacing the existing garage along the boundary with No. 15, now has a reduced height of approximately 2.4m at the frontage (lower than the eaves height of the main house), with the increased height section set further back. This change reduces the overall bulk and overbearing effect when viewed from the adjoining property.
- While construction-related disturbance is temporary and not normally a material planning consideration, the applicant has indicated a willingness to accept conditions controlling construction hours and limiting noise. A Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted, setting out measures for site access, parking, noise and dust control, waste management, and safe working practices. The CMP specifies working hours of 08:00 – 17:00 Mondays to Fridays and 09:00 – 13:00 on Saturday, with no works on Sundays or Bank Holidays. These weekday hours are shorter than the Council's standard condition, which permits works until 18:00, and are therefore considered reasonable, enforceable, and consistent with the Council's standard approach for similar proposals. Although neighbours suggested more restrictive working hours, given the modest scale of the proposal and the absence of site-specific justification for stricter controls, no further restrictions are considered necessary. A condition will secure compliance with the submitted CMP.

- Concerns were also raised regarding future works under permitted development rights. The proposed development itself would utilise much of the permitted development allowance, leaving limited scope for further alterations without planning permission. Nonetheless, it is considered justified to impose a condition removing certain permitted development rights, including those allowing dormer construction, to ensure any further extensions or alterations are subject to full planning control.

Ecology

- Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough.
- The Council's Ecologist raised no objection to the proposal. Site photographs confirmed there were no obvious potential bat roost features, and therefore no further surveys were required.
- A precautionary approach is recommended during works, including measures such as storing materials on hardstanding or pallets, covering excavations overnight or providing escape ramps, prohibiting fires on site, and managing waste appropriately to avoid harm to wildlife.
- Biodiversity enhancements are recommended. Suitable measures for this site include the installation of a bat box and a swift nest box on appropriate elevations.

Highways and parking

- Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires residential development to provide off-highway parking which is adequate in terms of highway safety/traffic management.
- The proposal includes the extension of the existing dropped kerb to facilitate improved access to the on-site parking area. The works would enhance the accessibility and usability of this space, thereby reducing reliance on on-street parking and having a positive impact on highway safety.
- The scale of the dropped kerb extension is modest and is not expected to adversely affect pedestrian safety, visibility, or the operation of the local highway network. Works to extend the dropped kerb would require separate consent from Hampshire County Council under the appropriate licensing process.

Other Material Considerations

- There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention.
- 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.

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.

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:

Permit subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐