

Application Number: H/22/92946
Case Officer: Claire Campbell-Best
Received Date: 20 April 2022
Site Address: 8 Precosa Road
Applicant: Miss K Fisher
Proposal: Two storey side extension after removal of existing car port (Re-submission)

Recommendation: REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

1. The proposed development by reason of its siting and design would result in a loss of space around the dwelling. It would create an unattractive and incongruous feature, creating a staggered terraced effect with the neighbouring property and gain an undue level of prominence in the street scene. Overall, it would be detrimental to the character and pattern of development within the locality. As such the proposed development is contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan [2016-2036] and the Council's Quality Places SPD and the NPPF.
2. In the absence of a certified bat survey to clarify whether bat roosts are present, it is considered that insufficient evidence has been submitted to prove bats are not present and that the development proposals could have a harmful impact on Ecology. As such the proposal is contrary to policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan [2016-2036]. In addition, bats are a protected species and the proposal is also contrary to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended).
3. The proposed development fails to provide adequate provision for on site car parking which would encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway and so interrupt the free flow of traffic and cause a hazard to road users. As such the proposal is contrary to policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan [2016-2036].
4. Note to Applicant: The application was refused following the assessment of the following plans: LOC 01, Drawing 1 of 2 and Drawing 2 of 2. 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 Councillor House, Councillor Kyrle and Councillor Kinloch.

Site Characteristics and Character of the Locality

2. The application site is a two-storey semi-detached chalet style bungalow located on the north-western side of Precosa Road between the junctions of Sovereign Drive and Sengana Road.
3. The dwelling itself is set back from Precosa Road with a front garden and a paved driveway and has an existing car port to the side (northeast) elevation, combined this amenity space can provide off-road parking for 3no. vehicles. The dwellinghouse is constructed of brickwork with a tiled, sloping roof with front and rear dormers inserted into the roof space. To the north-west of the dwelling is pedestrian access to the rear garden (accessed through the car port) which is enclosed with close board fencing.
4. Precosa Road is within a well-established residential area with chalet style bungalows, bungalows and two-storey semi-detached dwellings near the application site. Further to the south of Precosa Road, there is a mixture of detached, link detached and terraced housing.
5. Precosa Road is generally open and spacious with most dwellings set back from the road with front amenity space and spacing between dwellings.

Description of Application

6. The application proposes a two-storey side extension to extend the property up to the side boundary shared with no. 6 Precosa Road. The proposed extension would have a depth of approx. 8m and a width of 2.3m. The proposed two-storey extension would have a sloping pitched roof with an extension to the front and rear dormers, the eaves height would measure approx. 2.7m and have an overall height of 7.6m. The proposal would be finished in materials to match the existing host dwelling.
7. This application proposes an extension to the existing dropped kerb to provide wider access in order to provide 2no. off-street vehicular parking spaces. This would be subject to a Section 278 application with Hampshire County Council.

Relevant Planning History

8. H/22/92793 – Two storey side extension after removal of existing car port – Withdrawn – 05/04/2022

Representations Received

9. No representations received

Consultation Responses

10. EBC Ecology:

Due to the hanging tiles on the rear of the house some potential gaps in the flashing and fascia, and the records of bat roosts nearby and the work required to the roof, a preliminary bat roost assessment is required.

11. Botley Parish Council:

No objections, subject to the following comments:

The proposed side extension is very close to the neighbouring property and members were concerns that this will prevent rear access to and from the garden.

12. Hampshire County Council Highways:

Holding objection – Hampshire Highways have requested measurements of the length of the drive from the proposed development to the highway edge (minimum length is 4.8m). It is confirmed the length from the development to the highest and it's shortest length is approx. 4.3m and the longest length is 4.7m. This falls below the minimum standard; Hampshire Highways have been notified and an objection will be made.

Updated comments after clarification of driveway plan measurements:

Plans show that the in order to accommodate the side extension, the building line comes forwards and effectively reduces the existing parking space to 4.3m on its northern side. The minimum standard car

parking space is 4.8m, and so this is very likely to result in the parked vehicle overhanging the footway causing an obstruction to pedestrians and other footway users. This would not be permitted as footways need to be clear of obstruction at all times.

As previously outlined, whilst there is potential for this issue to be overcome through a slight setting back of the side extension, and also movement of the second parking space which also appears to be below standards (angling of the vehicle may assist with the second space), plans fully showing adequate parking dimensions would be required for the objection to be withdrawn.

Should permission be granted, the following conditions are requested:

CONDITIONS:

PARKING PROVISION

Before use of the development is commenced provision for parking shall have been made within the site in accordance with the approved plans and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason - To ensure adequate on-site car parking provision for the approved development.

ACCESS CONSTRUCTION PROVISION

No development shall start on site until the access, including the footway and/or verge crossing shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason - To provide satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety.

Policy Context and Designations Applicable to Site

- Within Built-up Area Boundary
- Within Established Residential Area

Development Local Plan Policies

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036:

Strategic policies:

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

Development Management policies:

- DM1 (General Development Criteria);
- DM2 (Environmentally Sustainable Development);

- DM11 (Nature Conservation);
- DM14 (Car Parking);

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Quality Places (November 2011);
- Residential Parking Standards (January 2009);
- Character Area Appraisals Hedge End, West End and Botley (January 2008)

National Planning Policy Framework

13. 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.

National Planning Practice Guidance

14. 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

15. 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.
16. The Development Plan comprises the Policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2016-2036 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:

17. The application site falls within the urban edge, whereby alterations or extensions to, or within the curtilage of residential dwellinghouses are considered to be acceptable in principle, however, would be subject to the following considerations.

Design and Appearance:

18. The Council's Quality Places SPD and Policy DM1 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, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes. The proposed extension would continue the existing gable end roof with additional front and rear dormers, in line with the existing dormers. The ridge line of the extending roof would be the same height as the host dwelling and not subservient. The extension would be, flush with the front elevation and would have a depth of approximately 8 metres.
19. The proposed extension would allow reconfiguration of the of the first floor accommodation and would provide additional space for a larger third bedroom and the addition of a study/fourth bedroom. The ground floor element, would not include any internal reconfiguration of the host dwelling, there would be a store to the front, which would replace the existing cart port and a covered area to the rear of the property.
20. The property lies in a prominent position on the street scene and is positioned forwards of the neighbouring properties (Nos. 6 and 4 Precosa Road) to the north which are set back. The proposed two-storey extension would create a staggered terraced effect between the host dwelling and the neighbouring semi-detached properties. As the immediate area is predominately semi-detached properties, the proposed development would change the street scene and cause harm to the character and appearance of the locality.
21. The proposed two-storey side extension would infill the existing space between the host and neighbouring properties resulting in a loss of openness. This would result in an unwelcome and enclosing built form, disrupting the sense of space around the buildings and would be detrimental to the pattern of development with the locality.
22. It is acknowledged from the site visit and the Design and Access Statement submitted with this application there are similar two storey side extensions within the vicinity located at nos. 4 and 6 Precosa Road and nos. 35 and 36 Sengana Road. It is, however, important to note these developments retain the open space between dwellings and do not cause detrimental harm within the street scene and create an enclosed form of development in comparison to this proposal.
23. To conclude, the proposed two-storey extension by reason of its siting and design would result in a loss of space and openness around the dwelling. It would create an unattractive and incongruous feature,

resulting in a staggered terraced effect with the neighbouring property and gain an undue level of prominence in the street scene. Overall, it would be detrimental to the character and pattern of development within the locality and contrary with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan, the Council's Quality Places SPD, and the contents of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity:

24. Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that proposed development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents. The proposed two-storey side extension side (north) elevation would be sited tight to the shared boundary with no. 6 Precosa Road, there would be no proposed windows to the north elevation and the proposal would not result in any loss of privacy or overlooking.
25. It is considered that as result of the width of the proposed extension up to the shared boundary with no. 6, the siting of the application property which is positioned forwards in comparison to the neighbouring dwelling and the infilling of the gap between the two dwellings would result in the extension appearing overly dominant and give the impression of a terraced development as noted.
26. In addition, it is important to consider the setting back of no. 6 Precosa Road in relation to the application site and the proposed development. The proposed two storey side extension would project approx. 2m closer to the shared boundary of no.8 and 6. This would leave a small gap between the dwellings of approx. 0.3m at ground level and there are concerns this would prevent access to and from rear gardens. It is acknowledged there is an existing car port in situ of where the proposed extension would be located but this is considered to be a low-key and modest in comparison to the proposed development.
27. The proposed extension would project a further 2.3m forward of the principal elevation of no. 6 due to the existing staggered layout of the dwellings in the street scene. This projection would be especially prominent when travelling south along Precosa Road, against no. 8 and would therefore have an overbearing effect.
28. As a result, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the Council's Quality Places SPD.

Access, Parking and Transport Matters:

29. Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan (2016-2036) requires residential development to provide off-highway parking which is adequate in terms of highway safety/traffic management. The Residential Parking SPD sets out the relevant parking provisions for dwellinghouses, which are dependent on the number of bedrooms.
30. The proposal will increase the bedrooms within the property from 3 to 4 as a result, this will increase the required car parking spaces from 2no. to 3no. spaces as per the Residential Parking Standards SPD for 4+ bedroom properties. The property would lose some existing parking provision through the loss of the existing car port; however, it is noted the existing car port does not meet the current standard sizing for garages/carports.
31. The Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans (Drawing 1 of 2) submitted show provisions have been made to use the grassed area in the front garden as an additional parking space alongside the paved driveway, providing a total of only 2no. parking spaces. There is some on street, unallocated parking provision in the locality.
32. The application also seeks the extension of the existing dropped kerb to provide wider access to the south in order to provide the proposed additional parking. As a result, Hampshire Highways were consulted to seek advice on the proposed widening of the dropped kerb and to ensure the proposed 2no. parking spaces met the minimum standard car parking space.
33. Hampshire Highways have made an objection to the proposals on highway safety grounds. Plans show in order to accommodate the side extension, the building line projects forwards and effectively reduces the existing parking space located on the front paved driveway to 4.3m on the northern side of the site. The minimum standard car parking length required is 4.8m and this is very likely to result in the parked vehicle overhanging the footway causing an obstruction to pedestrians and other footways users. This would not be permitted as footways need to be clear of obstruction at all times.
34. Hampshire Highways have advised there is potential for this issue to be overcome through a slight setting back of the side extension and also movement of the second parking space as this is also below the minimum standard (angling of the vehicle may assist with the second space). Plans fully showing adequate parking dimension would be required of a least 2no. parking spaces for the objection to be withdrawn.
35. Hampshire Highways have also advised a separate permission for the extension of the dropped kerb would be required from them as the Local Authority Highway to undertake the dropped kerns works.

36. As a result of Hampshire County Council's objection and the current parking provisions proposed is considered to be contrary to Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the Council's Quality Places SPD.

Ecology:

37. Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulate that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characters of the Borough.
38. The Council's Ecologist has been consulted as part of this application and requested site photos of the roof where the proposed development would be sited. They noted due to the hanging tiles on the rear of the house, some potential gaps in the flashing and fascia and the records of bat roosts nearby and the works to the roof proposed, a preliminary bat roost assessment is required prior to determination.
39. The applicant has advised they do not feel a preliminary bat roost assessment is required as they have not seen any evidence of bats within their property. They have confirmed if bats are found during the demolition or construction, all work would stop and Natural England would be informed.
40. In the absence of a certified bat survey to clarify whether bat roosts are present it is considered that insufficient evidence has been submitted and that the development proposals could have a harmful impact on ecology, contrary to policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036). Bats are a protected species and the lack of a preliminary bat assessment shows the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended).

Sustainability Measures and Climate Change:

41. 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.

42. 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 emerging 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 emerging 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.
43. 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.

Equalities Implications:

44. Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty.
45. Section 149 states:-
 - A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
46. 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

47. The proposed two-storey side extension would create a staggered terraced effect and would be detrimental to the character and pattern of development within the locality.
48. The proposed two-storey side extension would infill the open space at the side of the property with an unwelcome and enclosing built form disrupting the sense of space around the building and the neighbouring property no. 6 Precosa Road.
49. A preliminary bat assessment has not been submitted as part of the application contrary to the EBC Ecologist's advice and thus does not demonstrate compliance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended).
50. The recommendation is to Refuse the scheme

8 Prescoa Road, Botley, SO30 2NX



Department:	H/22/92946
Date: 18/05/2022	Scale: 1:1250