

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/99446

Site Address: 13 THE COPSE, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 2HW

Case Officer: Charlie Vallis

Description: Single storey front extension following removal of existing porch.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☐	No ☒
• Within the urban edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• EAB0807500000 – Erection of porch – Permit – April 1973 • Z/14012/001/00 – Single storey rear extension – Permit – April 1997 • H/25/98966 – Single storey front extension following removal of existing porch – Refuse – April 2025		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	Two letters of support were provided as part of the applicant's submission from neighbours at No.'s 11 and 17 The Copse.		
Parish Council:	Objection - This property had a similar proposal refused in April, H/25/98966. The scale of this new proposal is still a significant departure from neighbouring properties, particularly by extending forward of the existing building line. It would therefore still be incongruous and have an adverse impact on the surrounding area.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 31.03.25		

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.

Assessment:
<u>Principle:</u> • The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is acceptable, with any formal approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of the proposal being in accordance with the relevant policies within the adopted local plan and supplementary planning guidance. • Policy DM1 sets out that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance: residential amenities of both new and existing residents; and the character and appearance of urban areas. • The 'Quality Places' SPD (p47) outlines that "the design and appearance of the fronts of houses, and the distance between the buildings and the street are important aspects in defining the character of residential areas." Therefore, front extensions should be modest and in keeping with the character of the existing house.

Site and surroundings:

- The application site contains a two-storey terraced property located on the southern side of The Copse. The dwelling is set back by a front garden with steps leading up to a small box porch.
- The immediate locality is characterised by dwellings with uniform frontages, with a common feature being their modest box porches and sloping front gardens.

Proposal and background:

- The application proposes the construction of a single storey front extension with a hipped roof, measuring approximately 3m in depth, 4m in width and 3.5m in height (2.75m to the eaves).
- A previous application at this site for a flat roof single storey front extension was refused (H/25/98966). This proposal measured approximately 3.5m in depth and 3m in height, with its scale, design and positioning deemed incongruous to the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Impact on character and appearance:

- Although reduced slightly in depth and with an altered roof form to the previously refused application (H/25/98966), the scale of the porch continues to represent a significant departure from the character and appearance of the locality and the consistent frontages present amongst adjacent properties.
- Due to its scale and positioning to the front of the host dwelling, the development is likely to be incongruous with the street scene.
- The proposal would significantly encroach into the host dwelling's front garden, representing overdevelopment of the front of the site and interfering with the spacing between dwellings and the public realm.
- In addition, the proposed hipped roof would be out-of-character with the prevailing roof form, character and appearance of neighbouring properties.
- The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to both policy DM1 (Local Plan 2016-2036) and the guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that the design, scale and siting of the proposed porch is such that it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the locality.

Residential amenity:

- The development is considered to accord with the 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 most likely properties to be affected by the proposal would be adjacent dwellings no.11 and no.15 The Copse.
- In terms of privacy, the proposed impacts of the proposal are unlikely to be significant. There is potential for overlooking into no.11 The Copse, however obscure glazing to the proposed front door would sufficiently mitigate these impacts. Similarly, impact on the privacy of no.15 The Copse is unlikely, providing that the high-level window serving the proposed shower room is obscure glazed. The proposed front window to the porch would face the public realm where overlooking is accepted and expected.
- With the height to the eaves and depth of the proposal reducing in comparison to the previous application, the front extension is unlikely to significantly affect neighbouring light and outlook.
- Having applied the 45-degree daylighting test outlined in the Quality Places SPD (p33), the proposal is unlikely to significantly reduce daylight to adjacent dwellings. The modest height of the proposal is such that that the proposal would pass the 45-degree test on the elevation plans, and as such is unlikely to cause a noticeable reduction in light received to a neighbouring habitable room.

Other matters:

- There will be no adverse impact on 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.

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 ☒
-----------------	--	---

The scale and design of the proposed front extension would represent a significant departure from the prevailing design and appearance of neighbouring properties, creating an extended dwelling which would be incongruous to the street scene and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such the proposed development is contrary to policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review [2016-2036] and 'Quality Places' SPD [2012].