

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/25/100449

Site Address: 1 OAKMOUNT AVENUE, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 3AB

Case Officer: Katie Lasham

Description: Single storey front extension and roof amendment to approved plans F/13/72696.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Woodland TPO on site		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
F/15/76637: Construction of five-bedroom dwelling with annexe accommodation & detached garage, following demolition of existing dwelling. Approved October 2016. F/13/72696: One and two storey side extensions, two storey rear extension and single storey front extension and detached garage (amended design to F/12/71763). Refused Jul 2013 (Allowed at Appeal Nov 2013 reference: APP/W1715/D/13/2205511). F/13/72350: One and two storey side extensions, two storey rear extension and single storey front extension (Amended design to F/12/71763). Withdrawn May 2013. F/12/71763: One and two storey side extension, two storey rear extension, single storey front extension and detached single garage with erection of 1No. detached 4 bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity area. Approved Mar 2013.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Parish Council:	No Comment		
Trees	No objection		
Ecology	Ecology officer requested site photos of areas of the dwelling that are to be developed. The ecology officer explained that photos of the site provided by the agent showed potential for roosts. No Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) has been submitted in support of the application and must be provided prior to a decision to appropriately demonstrate that no protected species would be harmed with any development proposal.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 18/12/2025		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) 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 Appraisals.

Assessment:

Summary of site and proposal

Oakmount Avenue primarily consists of detached two storey dwellings set back from the road frontage. To the south is 1960s/70s two storey terraced housing, as well as the fire station. To the north on the other side of Oakmount Avenue is the Eastleigh to Romsey railway line and to the east on the other side of Oakmount Avenue is the M3 motorway. The surrounding area is well treed, with a large Tree Preservation Order woodland located within the site and within its surroundings.

The existing dwelling is a large 1930s two storey detached dwellinghouse located on a corner plot. The property fronts onto Oakmount Road despite being an Oakmount Avenue address, with both the pedestrian and vehicular entrances directly accessing Oakmount Road. To the east of the dwelling is a gravelled parking area with a detached garage to the north. To the west of the dwelling is a raised garden area laid to patio that faces onto the neighbouring property, Sewadar House, and to the south is a garden space that is mainly laid to lawn which then slopes down into the TPO (Tree Preservation Order) woodland to the west.

The application site has a lot of planning history, most recently of which included the demolition of the existing dwelling with a replacement five-bedroom dwelling including annexe accommodation and a detached garage that was approved in 2015. A recent site visit showed that works to this permission have not been undertaken with the original house not demolished and no footprints of the proposed new dwelling appearing to be dug. A householder application was also allowed at appeal in 2013 which sought extensions and alterations to the dwelling, with the inspector finding that *"the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the area or the street scene"*. It is not clear that works have begun to the 2013 planning permission as to whether it is an extant permission. Regardless of whether it is an extant permission, the fundamental reasons for refusal and the allowed appeal are still within current policy, albeit new policies of the current adopted Local Plan.

This householder application proposes a single storey front extension, a ridge height increase of over 1 metre and roof alterations from that of the approved permission F/13/72696 which was allowed at appeal.

Principle of development

The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable and as such an extension to an existing residential dwelling development complies with Policy S2 of the Local Plan.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

This application proposes an amended scheme to that of the allowed appeal scheme including an increase in ridge height of up to 1 metre, the varied eaves and ridge heights of the appeal scheme have also been altered and now all align, which were features of the appeal scheme that offered subservience to the host dwelling. The setback first-floor extensions have also been removed which had broken up the massing of the main dwelling. The maximum height of the appeal scheme was 8.1metres and the maximum height of the proposed scheme measures 9.1metres.

Whilst it is accepted that the street comprises a variety of architectural styles and scales of building, this property is on a prominent corner location visible from Oakmount Avenue and Oakmount Road and as such design and scale of the dwelling is of significant importance. This scheme removes any subservience previously proposed in the 2013 scheme, which was justified by the inspector as part of the reason for the scheme not being unduly bulky or dominating and therefore acceptable. Furthermore, with the appeal scheme proposing

set down eaves heights of the first floor extension and a similar ridge height, it allowed the main dwelling to remain as the dominant feature.

The appeal inspector stated that the 2013 scheme was acceptable for reasons in part as follows (bold for emphasis):

*"Whilst I accept that the appeal site forms a prominent corner plot, the host dwelling is set back into the appeal site from both roads and would be further separated from Oakmount Avenue by the proposed garage. **The flank wall and hipped roof would also be set at a lower level to the existing roof.** I am also mindful that the general building line of Oakmount Avenue would be maintained. As a result, I consider that the addition of the flank wall and hipped roof would not result in the proposal being overly large or bulky in appearance and would not be dominant against the host dwelling or within the street scene."*

Whilst it is noted that the general building line is maintained and separation distances to the curtilage is maintained, the sheer bulking and additional roof height increase will create substantial massing harmfully impacting the visual appearance of the dwelling and street scene by way of bulk and creating an over dominant extension.

Furthermore, the existing dwelling comprises a cat slide sloping roof on the elevation fronting onto Oakmount Avenue that architecturally minimised bulk onto the street scene, and the appeal scheme also respected this by ensuring the proposed first floor extension to this side remained set down from both the ridge and eaves height. This scheme removes any subservience to this side and will create considerable bulking and massing visible from the roadside and instead increases the height of the ridge to this side, further harming the character and appearance of the area.

The proposed roof alterations and extensions offer no architectural detailing to help break up the massing with no set down eaves / ridge lines or set back building lines, and the main dwelling is thus dominated by the proposed extensions and the significant height increase of the roof, creating a monolithic appearance to the dwelling.

Compounding matters, the application site is set at a lower level than the neighbouring dwelling to the north of the site with land levels sloping upwards heading north along Oakmount Avenue. The proposed expansion of the roof height will create a visually dominant roof form when viewed from the neighbouring dwelling, Sewadar House, and will appear more aligned with the ridge line of the neighbouring dwelling despite the land levels of the application site being set much lower and therefore appearing unduly prominent.

Overall, it is considered the proposed scheme will significantly increase the bulk of the dwelling and will appear over dominant and monolithic, significantly harming the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy DM1 of the Local Plan and the aims of the Quality Places SPD.

Impact on residential amenity

The most impacted neighbour by this proposal is Sewadar House to the north of the application site. The roof to the extension will appear more substantial in its form against this neighbouring dwelling with a higher ridge line and eaves heights proposed than that of the original dwelling and the appeal scheme, however due to the separation distances between these two neighbouring dwellings and with no existing side windows on the affected side of the neighbour, residential amenity is not considered to be significantly impacted. Due to the separation distances and land levels, the scheme is also not considered to create undue harm by way of loss of light or overshadowing to this neighbouring property.

For these reasons the development accords with 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 and is thus in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Local Plan.

Impact on trees

The TPO woodland to the rear of the site is not considered to be impacted by this proposal due to the trees and their root protection areas being set significantly lower in topography than that of the dwelling and proposed extension. The tree officer was consulted and confirmed there are no tree concerns with the proposed extension in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Local Plan.

Impacts on ecology

The ecology officer requested photos of the site which were provided by the applicant. The officer found that the site has potential for roosting and as such a Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) should be provided as the presence of protected species is a material consideration and is not possible to be conditioned. No PRA has been provided to allow the ecology officer to ensure that there are no roosts impacted by this proposal and as such the scheme is contrary to Policy DM11 of the Local Plan.

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; (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 ☒

Comments ...