

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/100061

Site Address: ST GEORGES, KEW LANE, BURSLEDON, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 8DG

Case Officer: Gregg Chapman

Description: Front and rear extension, new pitched roof, front and rear dormers, rear balcony, new open porch, front decking and level/step changes

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Outside Built-up Area Boundary (Countryside) • Within Designated Conservation Area • Old Bursledon Special Policy Area		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
H/20/88626 - Erection of Wooden Garden Studio to replace Wooden Shed and Greenhouse – Permitted, 28.01.2021.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	3 letters – Objection • The proposed forward extension and addition of front decking would project beyond the existing building line, disrupting the established alignment with the adjoining property 'Longwood', detrimentally affecting the visual balance and mutual privacy of both dwellings. • External cladding proposed to three elevations should be restrained in colour and material to ensure it remains sympathetic to the surrounding properties and conservation area character. • The external alterations should not increase the overall height of the dwelling beyond the existing ridge height, as any increase could result in loss of privacy and visual dominance. • The submitted plans should clearly show the north elevation and party wall relationship to neighbouring land, to demonstrate visual and physical impacts at ground level and safeguard boundary stability. • Works on the north side, including new steps and foundations, are adjacent to a poorly supported bank and essential services (telegraph pole, water supply), raising risk of subsidence and service disruption; suitable structural assessment and protective measures should be required. • A tree survey should be submitted to assess potential impacts on protected trees within the conservation area, including those overhanging the site and within adjacent properties; reliance on the builder's judgement for tree protection is not sufficient. • Surface water drainage from the proposed roof and external works should be self-contained within the site, ensuring no runoff or discharge onto neighbouring land. • Any gate or access shown onto the adjoining private path should be removed from the plans, as there are no lawful rights of access, and encroachment or damage to neighbouring land must be avoided.		

	• A construction management plan should be required to control parking, access, dust and noise during building works, given the site's constrained location and proximity to residential properties. • The duration and timing of construction works should be controlled to minimise prolonged disturbance from noise and dust to adjacent occupiers who will remain in residence during works. • The limited on-site parking and narrow road network at the junction of Kew Lane and Hungerford Bottom raise safety concerns for residents and pedestrians, including children attending nearby schools; on-street parking by construction vehicles should be prohibited. • No mature or protected trees, particularly mature oaks within the conservation area, should be felled or damaged without appropriate consent; pruning of the neighbouring ash tree may be acceptable subject to arboricultural advice and permission. • Prior to commencement, a survey of the north boundary bank and adjacent footpath should be undertaken to assess risk of collapse or subsidence affecting neighbouring services and boundaries. • A traffic and access assessment should be carried out to evaluate potential disruption to local traffic using the narrow lanes and access to the Fox and Hounds public house. • If occupied during work request confirmation that the studio has proper foul and surface water drainage to prevent run-off or contamination affecting neighbouring properties.
Parish Council	Bursledon Parish Councillors had no objection to the application but requested conditions be added should approval be given with regards to No obstruction to the highway during construction, re-instatement of any damage to the access road and restrictions around site delivery times during construction as this is an access road for the local school.
Ecology	No objection - I have reviewed the Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA, March 2025) and the PRA & Bat Activity Surveys report (August 2025) by Vesper Conservation and Ecology. The building has been confirmed as a non-maternity day roost for a small number of soprano pipistrelle bats. A European Protected Species Mitigation license will be required. This can only be applied for after planning permission has been granted and the proposed works can only proceed as authorised and specified by the license. The mitigation proposed in section 5 of the report is satisfactory. As a replacement for the loss of these roosts two inbuilt bat tubes are proposed to be added into the new gable walls one on the east and one on the western elevations. A post-completion license compliance check by the ecological consultant specified on the license is required and must be conditioned. This must ensure that all mitigation features have been installed correctly before the contractors leave the site, according to current guidance from Natural England. In addition to mitigation for loss of these bat roosts, biodiversity enhancements are required by local plan policy DM11 and NPPF (December 2024) paragraphs 187d and 192 b. Enhancements can be agreed before determination or can be conditioned. A suitable enhancement would be the addition of more plants for pollinators, especially night-scented flowering plants to attract insects as food for bats.

	Alternatively, additional provision for nesting birds including swifts could be provided.
Historic Environment	No objection - The proposed reincarnation of this property with result in a more suitable and interesting building, more in keeping with its only immediate neighbour.
Trees	No objection subject to condition

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 24/09/25		

Policy:

Legislation - Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a statutory duty on local planning authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area when determining planning applications.

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 (EBLP) The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1, S5 and S8; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM12, DM13, DM14, DM26 and BU7.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards (October 2025); Old Bursledon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals (February 2012).

Assessment:

Principle of Development

The site lies within a countryside location where policies S5 and DM26 of the EBLP apply. Policy DM26 supports extensions to existing dwellings outside settlement boundaries provided they are proportionate to the original dwelling and respect the character of the countryside. The principle of development can therefore be considered, subject to the detailed considerations below.

Character and Appearance

The dwelling occupies a prominent elevated position within the western part of the Old Bursledon Conservation Area, where Policies S8 and DM12 of the EBLP and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require development to preserve or enhance the area's character and appearance. Policies S5, DM1, DM26 and BU7 of the EBLP are additionally relevant in respect of the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal would replace the dated chalet-style roof with a more traditional pitched roof and gable form, introducing dormers more sympathetic to the local vernacular. The rebalancing of the front elevation, combined with high-quality materials and improved articulation, results in a design more consistent with the character of the adjoining dwelling, "Longwood."

The additional mass of the building is calculated at 25.1%, which is marginally and immaterially larger than the 25% increase set out within policy BU7 of the EBLP. The proposed works would retain the overall height and general proportions of the existing

dwelling, with the bulk of new floorspace and volume concentrated to the rear where it would not be clearly seen from the public realm.

As the site sits well above the level of Kew Lane, the stepped arrangement of the extensions and external decking would follow the natural slope of the land, maintaining the dwelling's low profile within the wooded backdrop (subject to appropriate tree protection/ as considered below) that defines this part of the conservation area.

As a result, the development would not appear unduly prominent or intrusive within its setting. The established verdant character and tranquil qualities of the conservation area would be preserved, and the proposal would not contribute to any cumulative sense of urbanisation. The scheme represents a well-considered enhancement and would maintain the spacious, semi-rural qualities that characterise this part of Old Bursledon.

Subject to control over external materials, the development would enhance the appearance of the existing building and preserve the character of the Conservation Area, in accordance with Policies S5, S8, DM1, DM12, DM26, and BU7 of the EBLP and the Old Bursledon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals (2012).

In respect of other heritage assets the nearest listed building is that of The Old Rectory north of the site in School Lane, just north of its junction with Kew Lane. There are three local buildings that are unlisted but considered to make a positive contribution to the area, the closest of which is the Fox and Hounds public house with the Lone Barn just across the allotments between the two lanes. The other two are at the top of Kew Lane on the west side and the Old School in School Lane on the east side of Kew Lane.

Given the separation from the nearest listed building, together with the substantial intervening vegetation and topography, the proposal would have no adverse impact on its setting. Similarly, the development would not harm the significance or setting of those unlisted buildings which contribute positively to the conservation area.

Trees

Policy DM1 of the EBLP sets out that, in relation to trees, proposals should avoid the loss of, or damage to, existing trees, woodlands, hedgerows, or other landscape features that are important for their contribution to the character, appearance, and biodiversity of the area.

The site lies within the Old Bursledon Conservation Area, where all trees are subject to protection. The property is surrounded by mature vegetation, including several large trees within both the application site and adjoining gardens, which together make a significant contribution to the wooded character of the area.

A Tree Report and Survey was carried out with regard to the proposed development, following a request from the Tree Officer (given the age of the originally submitted report). The report identifies several mature and early-mature trees within and adjacent to the site, including oak, ash, birch and maple, most of which are situated on neighbouring land but contribute positively to the Old Bursledon Conservation Area.

The assessment confirms that the proposed extensions and external works can be implemented without the removal of any significant vegetation. Tree protection fencing and, where required, temporary ground protection would be installed in accordance with BS5837:2012 prior to commencement and retained throughout construction. Minor pruning works are recommended to achieve suitable clearance from overhanging branches of adjacent trees, which would not harm their health or amenity value. The pruning is discussed further below and not expressly authorised by this application.

The relationship between the proposed development and surrounding trees is considered sustainable and will not lead to undue pressure for future tree works. The Tree Officer has no objection to the proposed development. Notwithstanding that the tree works are not consented through the application, subject to compliance with the submitted

Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan in other respects, the scheme is acceptable with regard to trees and complies with policy DM1 of the EBLP.

Protected Species

Policy DM11 of the EBLP requires planning applications, to protect, conserve and enhance all international, national and local nature conservation designations; and networks of natural habitats and features, including the Local Ecological Network, Priority Biodiversity Areas and Priority Biodiversity Links, watercourses, wetland complexes, woodland trees, and trees and hedgerows important to biodiversity and local character; and facilitate their adaptation to climate change wherever possible; and seek a net gain of biodiversity on all development sites.

The submitted Preliminary Roost Assessment identified that the dwelling supports a confirmed bat roost. The Council's Ecologist reviewed the PRA and the subsequent Bat Activity Surveys confirming that the building is used as a non-maternity day roost by a small number of soprano pipistrelle bats.

A European Protected Species Mitigation Licence from Natural England (outside of the planning system) will therefore be required prior to works commencing. The proposed mitigation—installation of two integrated bat tubes within the new gable walls—is considered satisfactory, subject to a post-completion compliance check by the appointed ecologist.

Subject to this, the proposal complies with policy DM11 of the EBLP. The Ecologist recommends further biodiversity enhancements, but this is not considered to be necessary given the householder scale of the proposed development.

Residential Amenity

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016–2036 requires that all new development should avoid having an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of both new and existing residents, and should, where possible, enhance them.

The proposed extensions and alterations would not add significantly to the scale or bulk of the dwelling, and the new front and rear facing windows and extended decking are sited in locations where there would be a significant distance between dwellings. No first floor side windows are proposed. To the front there is a significant level change, but given that the relationship already exists, that this is across the public domain, and the significant distance, no significant harm is identified from any additional overlooking, overbearing, or dominance in respect of this elevation, which is true for other elevations also. The proposal complies with policy DM1 of the EBLP.

Highways Matters

Policy DM13 of the EBLP requires that development is or could be well served by public transport, cycling and walking and it includes measures which minimise its impact on the existing highway network. Policy DM14 of the EBLP requires that an appropriate level of car parking be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards. The policy provisions are consistent with the requirements of the NPPF and in particular those of paragraphs 107 and 108.

The dwelling benefits from a large parking area to the front of the property accessed directly from Kew Lane close to the junction with Hungerford. There is no formal parking arrangement marked out but it is evident that space exists for at least four cars (in addition to a garage), although this arrangement negates turning on site. This exceeds the maximum number of spaces required for any size dwelling. The lack of turning opportunity is an existing situation, and as the property would remain a family home it is not considered that there would be any significant uplift in movement. As such the proposal would comply with policies DM13 and DM14 of the EBLP.

Construction Management

Third party objectors have raised concern regarding the safety of users of the highway during construction works, given the location of the access, size of the parking area, and likely comings and goings of construction vehicles. The Parish Council request that a condition is imposed requiring deliveries to be managed including hours of work and reinstatement of any damage. The site is constrained, and the location is not conducive to significant parking on the highway (although unrestricted). As such a Construction Management Plan is considered reasonable and necessary to ensure that work can be carried out in a managed way to avoid significant harm to the free flow and safe movement of vehicles on the highway network.

Other material considerations

Sustainability Measures and 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 (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough (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.

Tree Works

Paragraph: 134 Reference ID: 36-134-20140306 of Government Guidance advises that an authority may treat a planning application for development in a conservation area that includes specified tree work as a section 211 notice if the applicant has clearly stated that it should be considered as such. This has not been stated. Furthermore, it is not evident from the submitted Tree Report whether, or not, the required works are "*necessary to implement the development*" (as per paragraph 134), it is only stated that;

“The overhanging lateral branches of Ash T2 and Oak T3 are potentially vulnerable to damage during construction.

To reduce the risk of accidental damage to acceptable levels, the lateral branches on the vulnerable sides of the crowns will be tip-reduced and / or crown lifted to improve clearance (see appendix 2 for more specific details).

The proposed pruning is minor, targeted and in line with the applicant’s common law rights. The pruning will not affect the health or appearance of the trees.”

Appendix 2 has little further information other than advising that, *“Tip-reduce overhanging, lateral branches on house-side of crown to create 3m clearance.”*

Risk of accidental damage is not the same as being *“necessary to implement the development”*. Furthermore, common law rights are not the same as the requirements when a tree is protected where *“actionable nuisance”* must be demonstrated to allow works. It is noted that the author did not identify the site as being within a Conservation Area.

Third Party Comments

A number of matters have been raised by neighbouring residents which, while understandable, do not constitute material planning considerations in the assessment of this application. These are set out below for clarity.

Concerns have been expressed regarding potential disturbance, noise and dust during the construction period. While such temporary impacts can be inconvenient to neighbours, they are an inevitable part of most building projects and are not a matter that can justify refusal of planning permission. Construction practices, and site management are instead controlled through separate environmental legislation and can, if necessary, be addressed by way of an informative or through Environmental Health under the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

Issues relating to potential subsidence, land stability, and the safeguarding of private water, drainage, or electricity supplies are civil matters between adjoining landowners and fall outside the scope of the planning system. The responsibility for ensuring that construction works are safe and do not damage neighbouring land or property lies with the applicant and, where relevant, the Building Regulations regime. Similarly, concerns about damage to or access over private land, including the erection or use of gates onto private paths or shared driveways, are private legal matters relating to land ownership and rights of way rather than planning issues. Notwithstanding this, it is not clear what works are proposed at/near to the northern boundary where excavation would occur to create steps and how this would be completed. A condition is therefore imposed to require this detail.

The proximity of existing utility services, such as overhead power lines or water pipes, is not a planning matter but one of health and safety and technical compliance, to be dealt with by the relevant statutory undertakers and the developer prior to commencement of works.

Concerns have also been raised about possible occupancy or use of the garden studio during construction and the adequacy of its drainage arrangements. The use of the existing outbuilding during temporary works and the routing of private drainage are matters of building control and environmental health, not planning. The method or duration of construction, including whether the applicants intend to vacate their property during the works, is not a material planning consideration. Planning decisions cannot control the personal circumstances or temporary living arrangements of the applicant.

Conclusion

The proposal represents a proportionate and well-designed enhancement that preserves the character and appearance of the Old Bursledon Conservation Area, safeguards trees and ecology, and would have no significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity or highway safety. The scheme accords with the relevant policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan and national guidance.

Conclusion:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒**REFUSE** ☐

Comments ...