

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/99146

Site Address: 6 ROMAN CLOSE, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 2AW

Case Officer: Rebecca Altman

Description: Two storey side extension; part two storey and part single storey rear extension (amended description)

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Urban Edge - Scatabout and Peverells Wood Character Area - Surface water flood risk (front of site)		

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒
No planning history associated with the site. Relevant history relating to neighbouring properties: 4 Roman Close – H/21/918798 – First floor side extension – permitted 16/12/2021 3 Roman Close – F/10/66754 – Two storey side and single storey rear extension to include annex following demolition of existing garage and sun room – permission 21/04/2010 1 Roman Close – Z/37982/000/00 – One and two storey side extensions – permission 12/09/2001		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	One representation received, objecting to the proposal on the following grounds: - Loss of light to neighbouring property; - Imposing blank wall and sense of enclosure to neighbour; - Loss of trees and shrubs along boundary; - Overdevelopment of the plot; - Out of keeping with other properties in the area; - Extension is not subservient to the main dwelling; - Concern about increased surface water runoff and flooding; - Concern about encroachment of foundation footings in neighbouring land. Following submission of amended plans, one further representation of objection was received from the same neighbouring resident, raising the following points: - Concerns remain about the potential for footings to impact on the neighbours boundary; - Concerns remain about the depth of the extension along the northern boundary, and the impact on light and outlook for the neighbouring residents; - Overdevelopment of the plot; - Loss of trees and shrubs along the boundary; - Concerns about increased flood risk.		
Parish Council:	It is unusual to build in the front garden and we have concern both for this application and in terms of setting a possible precedent. We ask that the planning officer gives particular consideration to this matter. No particular concerns over the house extension.		

Ecologist:	No objection. There are records of bats in the area but the site photographs do not show any potential bat roost features. The garden has potential habitat for nesting birds and hedgehogs. Recommend informative to explain process should bats be found. Recommend a condition for a CEMP, to include protection of existing trees, shrubs and hedges, and precautionary methods for protection of wildlife. To include: • All building materials to be stored on hard standing or on pallets, as far as possible from hedgerows, scrub or potential habitat; • Excavations to be covered at night or fitted with small animal escape ramps; • No fires to be lit on site; • Waste to be stored in a skip and not accumulated in piles; • Any animals found should not be handled but allowed to move away to a place of safety on their own; • Any vegetation to be removed outside of bird nesting season (March to August), or checked by a suitability qualified ecologist up to 24 hours before start of works. If nests are found, work must stop and a 5m buffer must be erected around the nest to protect it from disturbance until after the birds have fledged and left the nest. Biodiversity enhancements can be conditioned. Bat boxes should be avoided on the rear elevation above the roof lights.
------------	---

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 23 April 2025 – 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 S1 (Sustainable development), DM1 (General development criteria), DM14 (car parking) and DM23 (Residential development in urban areas). Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Scantabout and Peverells Wood Character Area Appraisal. The Character Area document sets out the following guidance for development in the area: • The style and design of any new building work, including extensions, is compatible with the character of good quality adjacent properties; • Sufficient garden depth and area is retained by existing or replacement dwellings, commensurate with their size and character, which can accommodate appropriate tree planting in keeping with the character of existing plots.

Assessment:
Site and proposal

The application relates to a two-storey detached dwelling located on the east side of Roman Close, at the southern end of the cul-de-sac. The property has a single-storey garage on its northern side, and a conservatory to the rear, and to the front there is a long driveway and garden.

Roman Close is characterised by detached dwellings which would originally have been of a similar design to No.6, but some of them have had side extensions which have altered their appearance within the streetscene (e.g. Nos. 1, 3 and 4 Roman Close). No.5 Roman Close to the north of the site has not been extended and is of a similar style to No.6 with a garage on its southern side.

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a part single, part two-storey side and rear extension. The scheme originally proposed a larger extension along with a car port at the front of the site, but was amended during the course of the application to remove the car port and reduce the size of the extension.

The side extension (as amended), would be constructed in place of the existing garage and would be constructed flush with the front wall of the main house. When measured from the elevation plan, it would have a total depth of 13m extending 5.6m beyond the rear wall of the main house at ground floor level and 3.65m at first floor level. It is noted that there appears to be a discrepancy between the elevation and floor plan as from the floor plan, the depth of the extension from the rear wall of the main dwelling measures 6.1m at ground floor level and 3m at first floor level. Possible drawing errors were also noted on the elevation plan in relation to the north side elevation and the rear roof form. These discrepancies were queried with the planning agent but no clarification or corrected plans were provided.

The ridge height of the side extension would match that of the main dwelling to the front (approx. 7.8m), and would step down in height to the rear (to approx. 7.1m). The single-storey element of the extension would extend across the width of the house at the rear and would have an eaves height of 2.3m and a ridge height of 3.6m.

Design and appearance

The side extension would be constructed flush with the front wall of the main house and to the same roof pitch. It would therefore quite substantially increase the bulk of the dwelling when viewed from the front of the site. It is noted that the side extensions to Nos. 3 and 4 Roman Close are set back from the front wall of the original dwellings, creating a more subservient appearance, but that No.1 Roman Close has been extended in a similar way to that proposed at No.6 with no set back. Given that the property is positioned well back from the road and that there are other examples of similar side extensions in the vicinity, it is not considered that the impact on the appearance of the front of the house would be so harmful as to warrant a reason for refusal. At the rear, the extension would be similar to other rear extensions in the area and brickwork is proposed to be used to match the main dwelling, ensuring a complimentary appearance. Therefore, in terms of design, the extensions are considered appropriate to their context, and in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Local Plan and the relevant character area guidance.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy DM1 of the Local Plan requires new development to not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents.

To the south of the site, there would be a distance of approximately 11m from the south side elevation of the single-storey element of the extension to the rear elevation of the nearest property. Whilst this is a relatively short distance, given the single-storey height of the extension, the intervening boundary treatment and the lack of any new windows on the southern side, it is not considered that these neighbouring residents would be adversely affected by the development in terms of loss of outlook, light or privacy.

To the north of the site is No.5 Roman Close. This property roughly mirrors the layout of No.6 with a single-storey garage on its southern side, separated from the garage at No.6 by a narrow walkway. The side garage on No.6 currently forms part of the boundary with No.5, with the rest of the garden boundary made up of fencing and hedges/shrubs on both sides.

The proposed side extension on No.6 would be set back from the boundary of No.5 by approximately 0.2m, but would be substantially bigger than the existing side garage in terms of height and depth. The two-storey element would extend at least 3m (and possibly up to 3.65m if the elevation plan is correct), beyond the existing rear wall of No.6, which is on a similar building line to No.5. Although the main dwelling at No.5 is set back beyond its side garage, due to its orientation to the north of No.6, and the significant depth and height of the extension proposed, it is considered that it would impact on light and outlook and appear visually overbearing and dominant when viewed from the nearest rear windows and garden of this neighbouring property. The proposal is therefore considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the neighbouring residents at No.5 Roman Close in terms of loss of outlook and light, contrary to Policy DM1 of the Local Plan. The extension would also impact on the light and outlook of two side windows of No.5, but these serve a hallway and staircase rather than habitable rooms (the impact on these windows alone would not be considered grounds for refusal).

It is recognised that there are two-storey extensions of a similar size on Nos. 3 and 4 Roman Close. However, the relationship and orientation of these extensions with the neighbouring properties were different to that being considered under the current application. This application has been assessed on its own merit, taking account of the specific relationship with the neighbouring properties.

Parking

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms in the dwelling, which would remain as 3. The Council's Parking Standards require a 3-bedroom dwelling to have 2 on-site parking spaces and, even with the conversion of the garage to living accommodation and the removal of the proposed car port from the scheme, there would remain ample space for the parking of at least 2 vehicles on the front driveway. The parking provision for the property is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Local Plan.

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 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: The proposed extension, due to its excessive height and depth adjacent to the northern boundary, would be visually overbearing and result in an unacceptable impact in terms of loss of outlook and light to the neighbouring residents to the north. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

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