

CFH – Chandler’s Ford and Hiltingbury Local Area Committee, 16 September 2020

Application Number: H/20/87573
Case Officer: Kitty Budden
Received Date: 12/02/2020
Site Address: 32 Randall Road, Chandler’s Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 5AL
Applicant: Michael Ingram
Proposal: Two storey front, side, rear extensions; and single storey side and rear extension and addition of flue (amended description)

Recommendation: Grant planning permission

CONDITIONS AND REASONS:

1. The development hereby permitted shall start no later than three years from the date of this decision. Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the following plans numbered: 2552/02 01 Rev G; 2552/02 02 Rev A. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. The materials to be used must match as closely as possible those shown on plan 2552/02 01 Rev G, re-using the original roof tiles were possible. Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing, and to the surrounding area.
4. No construction or demolition work shall start until a Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Demolition and construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved method statement which shall include:
 - a) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt generated by demolition and construction works, including measures to prevent mud on the highway;
 - b) a scheme for controlling noise and vibration from demolition and construction activities [including details of any piling, if necessary];
 - c) the arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works, loading/ unloading of plant & materials and restoration of any damage to the highway [including vehicle crossovers and grass verges].Reason: To limit the impact the development has on the amenity of the locality.

5. No construction, demolition or deliveries to the site shall take place during the construction period except between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays or 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby dwellings.
6. No burning of materials obtained by site clearance or any other source shall take place during the demolition, construction and fitting out process. Reason: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties.
7. The single storey flat roof rear projection shall not be used as a balcony without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests of amenity for the neighbouring property, no. 30 Randall Road.
8. The development must accord with the arboricultural report dated 7th April 2020. No excavation, demolition or development related works shall commence until the tree protection fencing and ground protection has been installed as per the tree protection plan contained within the report. Once installed, no access by vehicles or placement of goods, chemicals, fuels, soil or other materials shall take place within the protected area. Tree protection measures shall be retained in their approved form for the duration of the work. Reason: To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality.

Note to Applicant: In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019), Eastleigh Borough Council takes a positive approach to the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome and to ensure all proposals are dealt with in a timely manner.

Report:

- 1) This application has been referred to Committee at the request of Councillors.

Site Characteristics and Character of the Locality

- 2) The application site comprises a large residential plot containing a two-storey dwelling with good sized front garden area, on-curtilage parking and a substantial rear garden. The property remains in its original form and architecturally displays one of several house designs originating from when the dwellings in Randall Road were first constructed. The distinct character of these designs has been diluted over time as a wide range of alterations and extensions have taken place along the length of the street.

- 3) The road has an attractive character with generally large detached dwellings in large plots, set back from the highway with front gardens and parking areas. The area contains many mature trees, often in rear gardens, and the presence of wide verges, limited street furniture, front gardens and distance between opposite houses gives a spacious and open character. The building line is fairly uniform and the spacing between dwellings varies. Along the length of the street there is a mixture of elevational treatments comprising white render and different colours of red brick. Roof tiles are predominantly red clay.

Description of Application

- 4) The proposal comprises two storey front, side, and rear extensions; a single storey side extension and a small single storey rear extension; and the addition of a flue.
- 5) Three gable front projections are created with the centre gable projecting to the same depth as the existing gable. To the south, a gable projection replaces an existing small dormer, projecting approx. 0.4m beyond the central gable at first floor and 0.8m at ground floor. The porch canopy projects approx. 1.5m beyond the first floor.
- 6) To the north, a two storey side extension projects approx. 1.9m beyond the existing side elevation (towards no. 30 Randall Road) and forward approx. 0.8m. The roof design has been amended to hip the roof away from the neighbouring property and the ridge line is raised to match the existing main roof ridge. A flue projects approx. 0.4m above the main ridge.
- 7) South of the main body of the house, a single storey side extension projects approx. 1.6m towards the neighbouring property, no. 34 Randall Road. The roof design has been amended to include a half hip. This extension extends approx. 6.7m back from the front elevation and then continues as a flat roof extension with roof lantern approx. 4.5m further.
- 8) To the rear, a two storey extension is proposed across the width of the main house to a depth of approx. 4.0m, a reduction in depth from the original proposal (approx. 5.3m). The roof design has also been amended to hip the roof back from the rear and in from the sides. In addition, the depth of the extension closest to no. 30 has been reduced by a further metre at first floor, creating a flat roof element. French doors are proposed with a Juliet balcony.
- 9) The proposals increase the number of bedrooms by one to five, create additional living space at ground floor including study and open plan kitchen/dining/family area and larger garage; and increase the internal floor area by 111%. (145 sq.m to 306 sq.m, an increase of 161 sq. m.)

- 10) The application is accompanied by the necessary application form and plans, together with a street scene plan and an arboricultural report. These documents have been updated during the course of the application where necessary.
- 11) The proposal has been screened out under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2011 due to the nature of the proposed development. In addition, screening under the Habitats Directive was not required due to the nature and scale of development.

Relevant Planning History

- 12) No planning applications have been submitted in relation to this site. A number of applications for tree works have been previously submitted, the most recent of which in 2002.

Representations Received

- 13) 15 letters of objection were received to the original proposals, which included 3 duplicate representations. Letters were received from residents in the Randall Road and the surrounding Nichol and Lakewood Roads, and further afield in Broxburn Close.
- 14) Objectors raised the following points (summarised):
- Not in keeping due to modern design and use of white and grey;
 - Materials choice at odds with street character;
 - Design and appearance not compatible with character of adjacent properties;
 - Impact on street scene;
 - Does not reflect existing character;
 - Does not reflect Character Area Appraisal guidance;
 - Would spoil the unique charm of the road;
 - Inconsiderate and unneighbourly development;
 - Important that development fits with character and does not have an adverse effect of Randall Road neighbours;
 - While original houses are too small for modern standards, and so have been extended extensively, the building line has been maintained. Extending beyond the building line will destroy the rural character of the street;
 - Could extend further to the rear to avoid extending into small front garden;
 - Will impact neighbour's outlook;
 - Will be close to neighbouring properties;
 - Separation between buildings identified as characteristic of local distinctiveness in Character Area Appraisal;
 - Will set precedent;
 - Loss of light and outlook to landing window;
 - Impact on light to landing; bathroom; stairwell; hallway; WC;

- Believe proposal may constitute an infringement of rights afforded by the Prescription Act of 1832;
- Impact on view and light to side kitchen window;
- Loss of light and sunlight to front and rear garden;
- Loss of outlook;
- Rear extension is intrusive;
- Rear extension is dominating;
- Overbearing affect to rear aspect of property;
- Over-development due to proximity to boundaries;
- Overall size not appropriate for width of plot and constitutes overdevelopment;
- Significant increase in footprint;
- Development on this scale would not be commensurate with the size and character of the existing property or the surrounding properties;
- Potential tree damage;
- Porch not shown on plans;
- Overshadowing;
- Question whether extensions or demolition and replace;
- Numbers 30 and 34 impacted by construction phase, eg. scaffolding location, material movements to rear;
- Inadequate space at boundary to allow for servicing;
- Cannot accommodate off-road parking for a family that will later have teenagers with cars.

15) A number of representations state that there would be no objection to improving the property if it was more in keeping with the character of the property and the street.

16) 1 letter of support was also received, stating:

- Completely support application;
- Large number of houses have been extended and altered so in no way would this look out of place;
- Great to see young families living in these houses and making full use of their property and its potential;
- Proposals are not imposing on neighbouring properties any more than other houses in the road;
- Will greatly add to the character of this beautiful area.

17) Following the submission of revised plans, a re-consultation was undertaken. 25 representations were received, 21 of which were objections. Two residents sent in two letters of objection, expanding on initial comments. Letters were received from residents in Randall Road and nearby roads, and further away in, for example, Keepers Close and Rosemoor Grove. Representations were also received from residents in Cheltenham and Lyme Regis who stated that they have relatives in Randall Road.

18) In addition to issues previously raised, the following comments have also been made:

- Note the steps that have been taken to address concerns raised by objectors, don't feel they go far enough;
- Discrepancy in plans showing balcony on elevations and not shown on floor plans;
- Suggest view modern building on the corner of Randall and Nichol Road and consider impact of such a building in Randall Road;
- Property deeds specify that building line must be retained;
- Shocking that the two of the three front gables will project approx. 80cm beyond the building line and the porch canopy a further 80cm;
- Original plans for nos. 28, 34 and 36 show bay windows and porch canopies within building line. Nos. 30 and 32 designed with integral porches therefore clear realisation on part of developer that forward extensions would not suit aesthetic of road;
- Impact on light levels to study;
- More suitable to Hocombe Road or Lakewood Road due to plot size;
- Due to smaller plots, properties in Randall Road positioned closer together than those in Lakewood or Hocombe;
- More suitable for larger plot;
- Out of scale with other properties in street;
- Nearly all houses in Randall Road have been extended. The fact area is designated as a Character Area is recognition of the work of the original planners and sensitivity applied by all with later extensions;
- Question how walls can be constructed close to boundaries;
- Submitted street view is misleading as does not show set back to study extension;
- Flat roof element to rear gives the ability to build a balcony at any time that will overlook garden;
- Very hurt that new neighbours would move into the road and purport to appreciate the beauty of the area but wish to change it completely and destroy the environment that have enjoyed for so long;
- Better for residents to move if they need space rather than impacting neighbours and character of the street;
- Danger if local plans are ignored that all towns, villages and cities will not be protected from inappropriate development;
- Residents will park on road with inherent danger of being on a blind bend;
- Electric car charging points are set to be a necessity and parking/garaging on the property should be important to the occupier;
- Front garden already probably smallest in road and to reduce further seems unnecessary.

19) 4 letters of support have been received, with the following comments:

- Aware of concerns of some in the community however believe the proposed extensions would be a notable improvement to the property and create an enviable family home;
- Wonderful to see young families moving in, breathing new life into the community and making their house their own;
- Consider benefit to all when people invest in properties and keep them up to date;

- Revised design and reduced size and scale further minimising impact on neighbours;
- Randall Road is full of sizeable properties, so don't see how these plans can have an adverse impact on character or appearance of street;
- Lots of extensions of this style in Hiltingbury and sure will be many more to come as reflects how people what to live these days;
- Proposals great improvement to property and will enhance quality of residences in local neighbourhood;
- Tasteful refurbishment and well considered extension;
- In keeping with many adjoining properties;
- Most of complaints in objections are unjustified and should be quantified;
- Proposed plan almost falls within permitted development;
- Applicants and architect have designed something fitting, modern and eco-friendly which meets all Local Plan and National Framework, and Character Area criteria;
- This area is under change, can't stop progress;
- Tasteful development in keeping with street;
- Very similar to other developments in road;
- Noted leaflet dropping in the neighbourhood to generate objections.

Consultation Responses

20) Chandler's Ford Parish Council – no comments received.

21) Tree Consultant – Following the submission of arboricultural information, I am satisfied with the proposed level of tree protection. No objection, subject to a condition requiring compliance with the submitted arboricultural report.

22) Head of Environmental Health – no comments received.

Policy Context and Designations Applicable to Site

- Within Built-up Area Boundary
- Within Established Residential Area
- Blanket Tree Preservation Order (TPO 58)

Development Plan Saved Policies and Emerging Local Plan Policies

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) Saved Policies:

- 25.NC (Promotion of biodiversity);
- 34.ES (Reduction of greenhouse gases/ Sustainable construction);
- 37.ES (Energy efficiency);
- 59.BE (Design criteria).

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014

23) The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 was submitted for examination in July 2014 but the Inspector concluded that insufficient housing was being provided for in the Plan and that it was unsound. While this has not been withdrawn and remains a material consideration, it can therefore be considered to have extremely limited weight in the determination of this application.

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

24) The 2016-2036 Local Plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 31st October 2018 and the examination hearings concluded in January 2020. The Council received the Inspector's post-Hearing advice on 1 April 2020. The Council is progressing with modifications to the Local Plan to enable its adoption, anticipated in late 2020/early 2021. Given the status of the Emerging Plan, it is considered that overall moderate weight can be attributed to it. The most relevant policies are:

Strategic policies:

- S1 (Sustainable Development);
- S2 (Promotion of New Development).

Development Management policies:

- DM1 (General Development Criteria);
- DM2 (Environmentally Sustainable Development);
- DM3 (Adapting to Climate Change);
- DM11 (Nature Conservation).

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Quality Places (November 2011);
- Residential Parking Standards (January 2009);
- Biodiversity (December 2009);
- Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Areas (January 2005).

National Planning Policy Framework

25) At national level, the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'NPPF' or the 'Framework') is a material consideration of significant weight in the determination of planning applications. The National Planning Policy Framework (the 'NPPF' or the 'Framework') states that (as required by statute) applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; and sets out a general presumption in favour of sustainable development unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A deliverable 5-year supply of housing within each local authority area is required, and if this is not demonstrated a tilted balance in favour of the development applies.

- 26) Three dimensions of sustainability are to be sought jointly: economic (supporting economy and ensuring land availability); social (providing housing, creating high quality environment with accessible local services); and environmental (contributing to, protecting and enhancing natural, built and historic environment) whilst local circumstances should also be taken into account, so that development responds to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.

National Planning Practice Guidance

- 27) Where material, the Planning Practice Guidance which supports the provisions and policies of the NPPF should be afforded weight in the consideration and determination of planning applications.

Assessment of Proposal: Development Plan and / or Legislative Background

- 28) Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require a Local Planning Authority determining an application to do so in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan comprises the Saved Policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013 (which is not applicable in this case). The NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance constitute material considerations of significant weight.

Principle:

- 29) The property is located within the urban edge and within an existing residential area. The principle of development is therefore established, subject to the proposed works being acceptable in scale and design, and in accordance with local and national policy.

Sustainable Development:

- 30) Section 2 of the NPPF (February 2019) states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
- 31) Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives – economic, social and environmental (which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways) that should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of the policies in the Framework.

- 32) Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.
- 33) Each of the three dimensions of sustainable development is considered below.
- 34) National legislation and guidance, together with local policy ensure that all planning applications are tested for their resilience to and impact on the environment. Details elsewhere in this report set out the Climate Change and Environmental implications of this application and their proposed mitigations.

Economic Sustainability:

- 35) Section 2 of the NPPF, when discussing economic sustainability, seeks to 'help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure'.
- 36) Due to the scale and nature of the proposal, there is limited economic benefit to the proposed scheme, aside from the potential for local firms to be employed during the construction phase. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be neutral/slightly positive with regards to economic sustainability.

Social Sustainability:

- 37) Chapter 5 of the 2019 NPPF 'Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes' states that, 'it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay'.
- 38) The proposed development would result in the modernisation of a fairly large family home with a substantial increase in size, which would limit the range of families to whom this property would be financially accessible in the future. However, the location and current size of this property means this is already limited. It is not considered that the alteration of this property, as proposed, would have a notable impact on the mix of properties available in the locality. On balance, it is considered that the proposed scheme is neutral with regards to social sustainability.

Environmental Sustainability:

- 39) There are a number of different components to Environmental Sustainability, including consideration of site-specific planning matters and the impacts of the development on its surroundings. These are considered below under the relevant subheadings.

Design, Scale and Appearance:

- 40) Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, provision for refuse and cycle storage and for development to avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.
- 41) In relation to this site, the Hiltingbury Road West Character Area Appraisal as identified in the Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury Character Areas SPD, is also applicable. While this document is 15 years old, it remains relevant and provides guidance to support Local Plan policies.
- 42) The guidance recommends that sufficient garden depth and areas are retained; no healthy mature trees are felled or damaged; the design of any new building work is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and fits well into the street scene; and that the building line is respected.
- 43) The existing dwelling is a characterful property of its time, in need of modernisation. Modernisation and home improvements have taken place along the length of Randall Road and in the area in general, and the extensions and alterations that can be seen are reflective of the architectural style of the periods in which they have been constructed. Many properties have evolved over time to have significantly increased in size from the houses as originally built, as is typical in residential areas of this nature.
- 44) The application proposes substantial increases to the size of the property and changes to the appearance of the house, reflective of the current design trends emerging in the wider area. Rather than undertaking piecemeal development over a long period of time, the applicants have taken the decision to seek consent to carry out significant extensions to create a property they can grow into, thereby avoiding the disruption of multiple construction works over a longer period. However, the scheme has generated a fairly large number of objections in relation to the design and size of the proposals (together with a smaller number of letters of support).
- 45) In seeking to create a family home that reflects a more modern living arrangement, the proposed development results in a 111% increase in internal floor area. While it is a significant increase in floor area, this does not automatically mean the scheme can be considered as over-development.
- 46) The dwelling sits within a substantial plot, characteristic of the properties along Randall Road; and the proposal does not detrimentally impact the amount of front or rear garden available.

- 47) The addition of the side extension brings the south elevation to approx. 1.2m from the shared boundary with no. 34, and, at its closest point, approx. 1.8m from the corner of that house (a single storey garage). To the north, the side extension sits approx. 1.2m from the shared boundary with no. 30 and, at its closest, approx. 1.6m from the corner of the single storey extension (used as a study) which is set back approx. 5.0m from the main front elevation. It is notable that the separation distances vary along the length of Randall Road, with some properties very close together.
- 48) Generally, it is the spacing at first floor level that draws the eye and has a greater visual effect. While the proposed side extensions do extend the width of the property across the plot, a degree of separation is maintained at ground level, and, more significantly, the single storey projection at no. 30 results a greater separation at first floor where the proposed extension is two-storey. The single storey elements at nos. 32 and 34 similarly provide separation at first floor. On balance, it is considered that the site can accommodate the increased width. In addition, the spacing between the houses is not identified as a defining characteristic in the Hiltingbury Road West Character Area Appraisal, rather it is the distance between opposite houses that provides the 'fairly spacious and open character'.
- 49) It is also relevant that single storey side extensions (to a height of 4m) could be constructed in the proposed locations without requiring planning permission, utilising permitted development rights.
- 50) A number of objections have identified the projection of the front gables forward of the existing front elevation, and therefore the building line, as a particular concern due to the impact on the street scene. The agent has provided a Street Elevation and Street Plan to demonstrate the impact of the proposal.
- 51) The Character Area guidance does not categorically state that development forward of the building line is forbidden, rather it requires development to 'respect' it. In addition, it should be noted this is guidance to support policy rather than being enshrined in policy itself. It is therefore necessary to consider what is the impact of the proposed forward projection and whether this fails to respect the building line to an extent that the character of the street scene is detrimentally impacted.
- 52) The building line in Randall Road is fairly consistent, although there is a small degree of variation in places, particularly along the curves of the road, as might be expected. The existing property at no. 32 sits very slightly behind and at an angle to no. 30 and slightly forward of, and at an angle to, no. 34. The submitted street plan demonstrates that the front extensions do not significantly change the course of the building line and do not undermine the spacious and open character of the street by bringing the property significantly closer to the houses on the opposite side of the road. The proposals will change the relationship between nos. 32 and 34 Randall Road, which is a more visible interaction in the street when travelling north

due to the openness of the shared front boundary. On balance, it is not considered the proposals would impact the relationship between the fronts of these properties to such an extent that a refusal would be warranted.

- 53) With regards to concerns that granting permission for this development would create a precedent, each planning application is considered on its own merits, taking account of individual site circumstances. While it is considered the forward projection is acceptable in this case, it does not follow that granting planning permission for this scheme would therefore prejudice future applications in the locality.
- 54) Further concerns have been raised regarding the modern design of the front elevations, incorporating increased glazing, rendered walls, grey windows and doors and clay tiles.
- 55) The design of the proposals would create a property that is very different in character to the existing property, which has clearly divided local opinion with both support and objection to the design. This does not render the development unacceptable; rather, an assessment needs to be made of the impact of the proposal on the property and the character of the locality.
- 56) The attractive character of the area is something that has been commented on by objectors and supporters alike, with disagreement as to whether the proposals negatively impact the street or enhance it. While the area is attractive, it must be noted it is not designated as a conservation area, nor is it included as part of the Hiltingbury Special Policy Area, both of which are afforded more policy protection due to their character and appearance.
- 57) The built form varies through the street, as was the case when the properties were originally constructed. White render is seen along the road, and indeed the neighbouring property, no. 30, is rendered. Red clay tiles are also widely used, which helps to soften the crisp appearance of render. The applicant has agreed to use red clay tiles, as shown on the proposed plans. A condition can be imposed requiring the use of these tiles and the re-use of the existing clay tiles where possible. It is also relevant that the dwelling could be rendered in its current form under permitted development rights. Similarly, the replacement of existing doors and windows with grey-framed windows/doors would not require consent.
- 58) The use of increased glazing is a current architectural trend and can be seen increasingly in the general area. While this, combined with the gable projections, is not a characteristic that is currently seen in the street, there is existing variation in the street scene and it is not considered the design is discordant.
- 59) The rear extensions have a limited visual impact on the street scene due to their location at the rear of the property, although partial views will be available as is the case with other extensions along the street. The use of hipped roofs reduces the bulk of the extensions at roof

level and it is considered this element of the scheme has an acceptable visual impact in the street scene.

- 60) On balance, therefore, while recognising the strength of feeling the proposals have generated, assessment of the impact of the scheme does not identify a significant detrimental impact that would warrant refusal on design or character grounds.

Landscape and Trees:

- 61) The resident at no. 30 Randall Road has expressed concerns regarding the potential impact on the protected Silver Birch at the front of their property.
- 62) An arboricultural report has been submitted as part of the application. This has been reviewed by the Council's Tree Consultant who has confirmed they are satisfied that the proposed tree protection measures, which will protect the Silver Birch. Compliance with the submitted report can reasonably be conditioned.
- 63) The property itself has limited landscape features that would be affected by the development and, the front and rear gardens will be shaped by the occupiers over time, as occurs with all residential properties. While it makes a contribution to the street scene, there are no landscape features within the front of the site that warrant protection through conditions.

Access, Parking and Transport Matters:

- 64) An objection has been received regarding the potential for residents to require additional parking space for cars as their family grows up.
- 65) The property is already a 4-bed dwelling. The Council's Residential Parking Standards SPD requires the provision of three parking spaces which can be accommodated within the site. The increase in number of bedrooms by one does not increase the parking requirements, therefore the scheme is policy compliant. The access is not proposed to change.
- 66) A condition has been recommended requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan which includes the reinstatement of grass verges should they become damaged as a result of the construction phase. Grass verges are a feature in the area and make a contribution to the attractive character. This management plan will also consider how to deal with mud on the road.

Noise, Air Quality and Land Contamination:

- 67) The scheme proposes extensions to a dwelling to provide additional living accommodation. As such, the development would not generate noise or air pollution, and the site is not in an area known to be subject to land contamination.

68) There is the potential to generate noise and air pollution during the construction phase, as a result of building activities. The Construction Management Plan will be required to demonstrate how noise, vibration and dust will be controlled to minimize the impact on surrounding properties.

Ecology:

69) The proposal extends into existing garden space, in close proximity to the existing dwelling. This land has a lower ecological value than land towards the rear of the garden. It is not considered that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on ecology.

70) In addition, the proposal is not considered to result in a likely significant impact on a European Protected site (SPA, SAC or Ramsar). HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) screening was not required for this development due to the scale and nature of development.

Residential Amenity:

71) Saved policy 59.BE requires proposed development to avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

72) Due to the length of the rear gardens, there is no impact on the amenity of residents to the rear of the site.

73) Residents at both nos. 30 and 34 Randall Road have objected to the proposals on the grounds of overlooking, loss of light and sunlight, and intrusion. Both properties have been visited by the case officer to view the proposals from their gardens. Due to the pandemic, it has not been possible to enter the dwellings, but sufficient assessment can be made from viewing the properties externally.

74) The proposed single storey side extension on the south side of no. 32 does not have a detrimental impact on amenity due to the height, design, position and relationship to habitable rooms at no. 34. Further the two-storey rear extension has limited limit due to the design, position and orientation. No additional side windows are proposed. In addition, under permitted development rights, it would be possible to construct a 3m deep two storey extension on the rear of the existing property without requiring planning permission. It is therefore the impact of the additional metre that must be considered. It is felt the impact of the proposed development on no. 34 does not warrant a refusal of the application.

75) The residents at no. 30 have contended that there will be a detrimental impact to their light to their windows on the southern elevation and to their study. The windows on the southern elevation serve a landing and bathroom which do not constitute habitable rooms. The impact on light levels to these windows is therefore not consider significant. No windows are present in the side elevation of the study extension and windows are inserted in the front and rear elevations.

- 76) While the side extension has the potential to reduce the light levels to the front window of the study, the proposal does meet the 45-degree test. The proposal also meets the 45-degree test for the rear study window. Further, the room is dual-aspected and so overall light levels would not be reduced to an extent that a refusal is warranted.
- 77) With regards to the two-storey rear extension, there is the potential for the extension to impact sunlight to the western section of the garden closest to the house.
- 78) In order to properly assess the impact of the proposal, it is necessary to consider what can be constructed under PD as a 'fallback' position. As discussed above, a two-storey extension of up to 3m deep and a single-storey side extension of up to 3m beyond the rear elevation can be constructed without requiring formal planning permission. In addition, rear/ side single storey extensions up to 4m in height can be constructed to a depth of 8m under the prior approval process. These elements have the potential to impact sunlight to the rear garden of no. 30, close to the boundary with no. 32. Due to the first floor addition to the side extension and the additional 1m depth to the rear extensions, this impact would be increased.
- 79) It is also relevant that a recent amendment to the General Permitted Development Order (The Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2020) confers the right to extend existing houses upwards, by way of the addition of up to 2 storeys (not exceeding the height of the highest part of the existing roof by 7m and not exceeding 18m in total). (This is subject to restrictions regarding materials, roof pitch and window position and falls under the prior approval process.)
- 80) While the proposal does not incorporate additional storeys to the property, it must be acknowledged that development of that nature would have a greater impact than the works currently proposed.
- 81) The garden to no. 30 is substantial and, due to the location on a curve in the road, flares out towards the rear, with the dwelling angled away from no. 32. Due to the orientation of the buildings, no. 30 will overshadow part of the garden itself during the afternoon. Substantial trees are located within the garden which cast much of the garden away from the house into shade through the morning and into the early afternoon. As the sun moves round, the shadow cast by these trees will move away from the house enabling more of the garden closer to the house to receive direct sunlight. The BRE guidelines regarding daylight and sunlight recommend that at least half of a garden can receive at least two sunlight on March 21st. (This does not have to be continuous sunlight or in the same part of the garden). In light of the substantial size of garden at no. 30, building orientation and amendments to the design of the application scheme, it is considered that this recommendation could be met.
- 82) It has been contended that the proposal may constitute an infringement of rights afforded by the Prescription Act of 1832. This is not a material

planning consideration and therefore is not required to be considered. Rather, issues related to the 'right to light' (the right that allows property owners to receive light from the sky through defined 'apertures' in their property) are civil matters that would have to be pursued by the property owner outside of planning.

- 83) Concern has been raised regarding the potential for a balcony to be constructed on the small flat roof element closest to no. 30 and the consequence overlooking. A balcony at first floor would require planning permission, which is unlikely to be granted were an application to be made. For the avoidance of doubt, a condition is suggested to clarify this point. The scheme proposes the use of a Juliette balcony which provides a safety barrier for the proposed doors but does not allow for people to step out.
- 84) Concerns have also been expressed that the rear extensions will be intrusive and dominating. It is recognised that the extensions will be visible to the neighbouring residents, as is typical for two-storey extensions in residential areas and will therefore change what can be seen by neighbours. It is considered that the size of the garden and the relationship between the two properties, and between no. 32 and 34, does not render the proposed scheme intrusive or dominating.
- 85) On balance, it is considered that the impact on the residents at no. 30 Randall Road is not sufficient to warrant a refusal of this application.

Human Health:

- 86) Human health relating to noise and ground conditions has been considered and no significant adverse effects are likely. Traffic and air quality impacts or any other possible impacts are also not considered significantly harmful to human health.

Sustainability Measures and Climate Change:

- 87) National legislation and guidance, together with local policy ensure that all planning applications are tested for their resilience to and impact on the environment.
- 88) The NPPF (paragraphs 95-99), Saved Policies 34.ES and 37.ES of the Local Plan, and emerging Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the submitted Local Plan require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use.
- 89) Due to the age and condition of the property, the construction of the extensions will improve the energy efficiency and sustainability credentials of the property through meeting current Building Regulations requirements.

Other material considerations

Equalities Implications:

90) 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.

91) 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

92) The application has been assessed with regards to local and national policy, taking account of material planning considerations raised by third parties. It is considered, on balance, that the proposed development broadly accords with local and national policy and guidance. As such, the application is recommended for permission, subject to conditions.



EASTLEIGH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Development
Management**

Title:
Planning Application

H/20/87573

Scale:
1:1250
Map Ref.
SU4322NE
Date:
07/09/2020

