

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: PN/25/99969

Site Address: 41 ARCHERS ROAD, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9AQ

Case Officer: Sarah Douglas

Description: Prior Notification for the construction of a single storey rear extension (depth 6.0m, height to eaves 2.70m and maximum height 3.0m)

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Urban edge.		

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒
No planning history.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations: 39 Archers Road	We have received notification of this planning application for a single storey rear extension. Here are our comments; Looking at what is being proposed we object due to a strong visual overbearing impact to our property because of the proposed depth of the building being 6m and a height of 3m. This would impact the amount of light entering our kitchen and also have an impact on our garden due to it hindering plants and vegetable growth. This extension will also be significantly larger than any other extensions in our locality. We also wonder why it has to be 6m in depth as this could be a reason for creating an HMO by the backdoor. We have a fear that the building work will encroach into our garden area and also may damage our own property in some way e.g, rainwater coming off the proposed building thus causing external/internal damp issues at the rear of our house. Likewise we have also a concern of the potential for damage to the underground waste pipes which could result in blockages and any onward problems that may result from this. We also believe depending on where windows are sited that we have a loss of privacy.		
43A Archers Road	I wish to object to the application of the proposed single storey rear extension. While the structure is at ground level, its excessive depth and three metre ridge line would still have a pronounced visual impact from the elevated first floor position of 43A. The extension would dominate the rear outlook, reducing the open aspect that currently contributes to the character and enjoyment of the property. I'm particularly concerned about the cumulative effect this would have on the sense of space and privacy, not just for this flat, but for all neighbouring properties. The plans submitted are vague and lack sufficient detail to properly assess the full impact of the proposal, making it difficult to understand how the extension will relate to existing boundaries and neighbouring windows. I am genuinely worried about the long-term impact this development would have on the character of our terrace and the quality of life for residents. The loss of garden space, the potential for future conversion into an HMO, and the erosion of privacy and light all point to overdevelopment.		
43B Archers Road	We object to this application for a variety of reasons. A structure of this size is not in keeping with the other houses within the street, and we feel would fall into the overdevelopment of the		

	plot category. The length and height would also affect the visual outlook and enjoyment of the area. Due to the vague nature of the plans submitted, the more sceptical side can't help feeling that this is leading to an HMO application.
43C Archers Road	I wish to object to this planning application. The size of the proposed extension is far too large and roof ridge is also high, it would certainly affect the outlook and reduce the sense of openness at the rear of the terrace. I'm concerned about the loss of light, increased enclosure, and the precedent this oversized extension could set in a tightly packed residential area. The plans submitted are vague making it difficult to assess the full impact. I also worry about future intensification of use, such as conversion to an HMO, which would further affect privacy. I urge the planning authority to consider the cumulative impact on neighbouring properties and reject the proposal.
43D Archers Road	As the resident of the adjoining ground floor flat, I wish to formally object to the proposed 6-metre single-storey rear extension. The size of the development, particularly the 3-metre roof ridge, would severely impact my living conditions. My primary living space directly faces the proposed structure, and I am deeply concerned about the substantial loss of daylight and outlook this would cause. The extension would dominate the rear boundary, creating an oppressive sense of enclosure and spoiling the enjoyment of my garden and home. The proposal appears to conflict with Eastleigh Borough Council's Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document, which emphasises the need for development to respect the character of the area and avoid harm to neighbouring amenity. The document also highlights the importance of avoiding overbearing impacts and loss of light to adjacent properties. This extension exceeds the scale of any comparable development in the area and risks setting a precedent for disproportionate rear additions. I am also concerned about the potential for the property to be converted into a House in Multiple Occupation, which would intensify residential use and further erode privacy and tranquillity in this tightly knit terrace. The loss of garden space and increased built footprint contradict the principles of sustainable development outlined in Eastleigh's Local Plan, which encourages the protection of green space and residential amenity. This proposal would have a lasting and negative effect on my quality of life, and I respectfully urge the planning authority to reject it in line with its own guidance and commitment to protecting the character and liveability of our neighbourhood.
Parish Council:	n/a

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out on 24 September 2025, and access was also available from neighbour at No.39 Archers Road.		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: - The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policy being Development Management Policy DM1.

Supplementary Planning Documents:
Quality Places.

Assessment:

Legislative Background:

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2015 allows for the construction of single storey rear extensions up to 6 metres in depth on non-detached properties, subject to compliance with a number of other requirements and a specified prior notification process being followed.

It is stated within these regulations, that where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development within a 21 day minimum period, the prior approval of the local planning authority is then required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any of the adjoining premises. In this regard and in assessing such impact, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states: "If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

This legislation was amended on 25 May 2019 by virtue of The Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development, Advertisement and Compensation Amendments) (England) Regulations 2019 to allow for the previously temporary Permitted Development rights for larger homes extensions to become permanent.

Material Considerations:

Permitted Development compliance:

The proposed rear extension is considered to conform with the provisions of Part 1, Class A of the Second Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 in that the proposed enlargement:

- is not on Article 1(5) land (land in a National Park, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a Conservation Area, the Broads or an SSSI or World Heritage Site
- is single storey
- when in place, no more than 50% of the area of land around the original house (as it was first built or as it stood on 1 July 1948) would be covered by additions or other buildings.
- would not be forward of the principal elevation or a side elevation fronting a highway.
- Would not be higher than the highest part of the roof.
- does not exceed the maximum height of a single-storey rear extension of four metres.
- does not exceed the maximum eaves height of an extension within two metres of the boundary of three metres.
- does not exceed the eaves and ridge height of the existing house.
- is to be built of materials similar in appearance to the existing house.
- does not include verandas, balconies or raised platforms.

The proposed single storey rear extension extends beyond the rear wall of the original attached dwelling by 6.0 metres (more than 3 metres but not more than 6 metres), has a height not exceeding 4 metres, and an eaves height not exceeding 3 metres within 2 metres of the site boundary.

This meets the criteria for permitted development under the prior notification process, however as an objection has been received, the prior approval of the local planning authority is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises.

Residential Amenity:

The development is within the urban edge where the principal of development is acceptable, subject to complying with the relevant development plan policies.

The proposed single storey rear extension will extend 6 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse, will have a flat roof with a maximum height of 3 metres and will be positioned close to the boundary with No.39 Archers Road. These dimensions meet the limitations of the permitted development regulations.

The site No.41 Archers Road is currently unoccupied, and the rear garden of the site is somewhat overgrown. There is screening along the boundary with No.43 Archers Road (the adjacent block of four flats), with a block wall and fencing approx. 2 meters in height next to the building line, and then reducing to 1.8 metre fencing until it reaches towards the rear of the site and their car parking area. There is currently no boundary treatment in place along the boundary line with the adjacent neighbour at No.39 Archers Road. The site back onto an access road at the rear. The topography of the site is fairly level and flat with little slope to the land.

The proposed extension is closest to No.39 Archers Road, being positioned just off the boundary, and is sited 3.1m away from the stepped side elevation of No.43 Archers Road. The neighbour at No.39 has a clear glazed door with slim window to the rear elevation facing onto their rear garden which serves the kitchen, with a secondary window in the side elevation of this same habitable room. The orientation of the properties is such that the rear gardens face to the West, and with the proposals not failing both daylighting tests for rear extensions as set out in the Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document, it is therefore not considered that the proposed extension would create an undue level of overshadowing or have an unacceptable level of loss of light to the neighbouring properties.

It is accepted that the proposed extension is a significant addition having a depth of 6 metres which is the maximum which is allowed under the permitted development regulations for the larger home extensions for attached properties. However, it is not considered that the detrimental impact in terms of overbearing impact and loss of outlook is sufficient to refuse the application. Similar properties within Archers Road have been extended or altered, with sizable single storey rear additions noted at 21 Archers Road and 75 Archers Road

There are no windows proposed within the single storey extension, with only one door to the rear elevation facing onto the rear garden. As a result, there will be no impact to neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy or overlooking under the current proposed development. However, in order to mitigate any loss of privacy or overlooking in the future because of the close proximity to the boundary with No.39 Archers Road, a condition will be imposed to restrict any windows being inserted in the side elevation facing this property.

The garden is of a good size, long and narrow, approx. 31m x 5m, and there are no other structures situated within the curtilage. As such, the development would not represent an overdevelopment of the site, and would retain ample amenity space.

For the reasons above it is considered that the development proposed would comply with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036, which requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site and to be appropriate in terms of mass, scale, design and siting both in themselves and in relation to adjoining buildings.

Other matters raised:

Potential for the property to be used as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO):

No information has been submitted as part of this application to suggest the alterations would facilitate an HMO. Notwithstanding this, permitted development regulations allow for a property to be used as a small HMO (Class C4) for up to six people without requiring planning permission.

Potential for the development to encroach during building work and cause damage to property and underground pipework:

- These concerns would be a civil matter relating to the Party Wall Act (1996), and it would be the remit of Building Control at Southampton City Council, or whichever Building Control body is appointed, to ensure that the construction of the extension complies with current Building Regulations.

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:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒**REFUSE** ☐

The proposed single storey rear extension is considered to be appropriate in its size and scale, and will not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

It is therefore recommended that prior approval is granted.