
Site Address: 16 Sandy Brow, Waterloo, PO7 5JP
Proposal: Construction of single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear extension.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00574 Expiry Date: 20/09/2024
Applicant: Ms Green
Agent: Loretta Taylor Case Officer: Robert Riley
 Thorns - Young Ltd
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in Widley, Waterloo. The application site contains a paved driveway to the front of the dwellinghouse and a garden to the rear of the dwellinghouse. The application site contains a blue blockwork design to form its external walls, with brown concrete tiles in a pitched gable roof design.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that could be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the road featuring semi-detached and terraced housing in pebbledash and brickwork designs.

2 Planning History

APP/23/00991 - Construction of annex following demolition of existing garage.,
PERM, 07/02/2024

3 Proposal

- 3.1 This application seeks the construction of a single-storey rear extension with 2 No rooflights following the demolition of the existing rear extension and the existing detached garage. The rear extension would have an approximate maximum height of 2.5 metres, a proposed depth of approximately 7.7 metres and a proposed maximum width of approximately 5 metres.

Officer note

- 3.2 During the application process, the proposed rear extension has been reduced in height from approximately 2.9 metres to 2.5 metres and has been significantly reduced in depth from approximately 13 metres to a proposed maximum depth of approximately 7.7 metres. The demolition of the garage measuring less than 50m³ falls within the exemptions of the Town and Country Planning (Demolition - Description of Buildings) Direction 2021 and therefore is not development under Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Antonia Harrison

No comments received

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No comments received

Councillor Paul Tansom

No comments received

HBIC

Within 100m: Priority Habitat: Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland

Within 100m: Sinc: Sandy Dell

Within 100m: Watercourse

Officer Comment: The proposed works will be of a reasonably modest scale and kept at ground floor level. It is not therefore anticipated that there would be a negative impact on protected species and watercourses.

6 **Community Involvement**

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
We are concerned about how far the extension will go out from the back of the property and the amount of light and view this will block from (redacted) window, as the extension is very close to the fence line. The shower room and bedroom would be acceptable, but the studio room added on the end makes it very long - halfway down the garden. Would it not be possible to convert the garage into the studio and extend behind the garage if necessary?	Comments about scale of the proposed rear extension, its neighbourly impacts and its proximity to neighbours are noted. The rear extension has been reduced in height and significantly reduced in depth during the application process, and its impacts are assessed in section 7.
I refer to the above application for a single storey rear extension for 16 Sandy Brow. My name is [redacted text]. I recently have been in contact with one of your colleagues re this matter I believe she has previously emailed you. My concerns about this application are as follows. [Redacted text] The reason I am raising this concern is that on some occasions people visiting the property have blocked access [redacted text]. [Redacted text] I have never had any issues in the past with neighbours [redacted text]. All in all if planning does go ahead I would ask that they and their visitors have consideration [redacted text]	This is not a material planning consideration.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking
- (v) Ecology

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

Character bulk and the streetscene

7.3 The works would be visible in the streetscene with regard to the intention to remove the garage and to remove the rear extension, however both these elements are considered acceptable. The rear extension work would only be readily visible at certain vantage points on the street with limited views being afforded to the rear addition.

7.4 The extension would be a reasonably deep addition to the original dwelling, with a long proposed flat roof section extension connecting to the original rear of the dwelling. It would however feature a single storey nature, a flat roof design and modest height, resulting in an addition that on balance can be seen as a subservient addition to the main dwelling, thereby meeting the requirements of Policy CS16. It is considered that due to the extension works only being readily visible at select vantage points on Sandy Brow and due to its proposed single storey nature and modest height this extension on balance would be seen to have an acceptable impact regarding the character of the area and the streetscene.

Materials

7.5 The extension would feature render and windows to match the existing dwelling, and would use flat roof construction for the roof of the extension. Officers consider these materials to be acceptable.

7.6 The design and appearance of the proposal is on balance deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy 2011). It is considered that the scheme on balance would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.7 To the northern and southern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 18 and 14 Sandy Brow. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these two properties. Due to the location and scale of the works, properties to the front of No.16 are considered to be acceptably impacted. Furthermore due to a sufficient separation distance and that rear fenestration of the proposed rear extension would face rear boundary treatment, officers consider that properties to the rear of No.16 Sandy Brow would be acceptably impacted by the works.

No.18 Sandy Brow

- 7.8 To the northern side of the application site is No.18 Sandy Brow. Regarding overlooking concerns the rear extension would feature fenestration for the utility room, it would face No.18's curtilage, however it would be in approximately the same location as an existing window serving a family room and would not be able to provide views of No.18's rear amenity space, with regards to this, it can be seen to be acceptable. Regarding the rear fenestration, it would face the rear garden, and any oblique views facing of No.18 Sandy Brow would be blocked by the proposed rear ensuite aspect of the rear extension. The rear extension would be located approximately 1.2 metres from the shared boundary and approximately 2.3 metres from the southern (side) elevation of No.18. Regarding these separation distances, and the proposed 2.5 metre height of the proposed rear extension and that impacts would mainly be felt on the shared drive for Nos 16 and 18 Sandy Brow, officers do not consider that this property would be unacceptably overshadowed or have an unacceptable increase in the sense of overbearing.

No.14 Sandy Brow

- 7.9 To the southern side of the application site is No.14 Sandy Brow. Regarding overlooking concerns the rear extension would feature fenestration for the utility room, it would face No.18's curtilage and would not impact No.14. The rear extension would feature rear fenestration (door and window) to serve a bedroom. It would face the rear garden and any views towards No.14's curtilage which features a lower level fence would be oblique and on balance would be considered acceptable.
- 7.10 Regarding overbearing and overshadowing concerns, the rear extension would go right next to the boundary of No.14 Sandy Brow. The proposed bedroom aspect of the rear extension would feature an approximate 0.1 metre separation distance from No.14's curtilage. It would extend approximately 2.5 metres beyond No.14's rear elevation. The proposed bathroom aspect of the rear extension would extend a further 2 metres from the rear of the proposed bedroom addition but would feature a separation distance from No.14's curtilage of approximately 2.7 metres. Officers consider that the proposed ensuite aspect of the rear extension at this distance would not unacceptably overshadow or increase a sense of overbearing upon No.14. Officers have considered it important to assess the impact of the proposed bedroom aspect of the rear extension and its impacts on overshadowing and a sense of overbearing. Officers note, that the proposed rear extension is approximately 0.8 metres taller than the common boundary fence for Nos 16 and 14 Sandy Brow.

Officers though noting that a sense of overbearing would be increased by the proposal, in consideration of the 2.5 metre protrusion beyond No.14's rear wall do not consider the proposal to unacceptably increase a sense of overbearing of this property. Regarding overshadowing concerns, officers note that this rear extension regarding the rear window of No.14's rear kitchen room would fail the light test set out in the Havant Borough Design Guide regarding depth, though it is noted that it does not significantly fail the test. Officers do however note, that light is provided through rear doors of the rear kitchen room. Officers also note that as No.14 is to the south of No.16 Sandy Brow that impacts upon sunlight would be reduced due to the orientation of the two dwellings regarding the movement of the sun. Officers consider that regarding these considerations that on balance, that although there will be an increase of overshadowing of No.14's rear kitchen room, that on balance, it is not so unacceptable that it would warrant a refusal of this application.

- 7.11 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal on balance would not appear overbearing and on balance would not lead to an unacceptable loss of light and would on balance have an acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site thereby meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy 2011). It is noted 2 letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Parking

- 7.12 This application seeks to remove a parking space via the removal of the garage. In light of this, this dwelling is a two bedroom dwelling which would become a 3 bedroom dwelling, and this would require 2 parking spaces to conform with the Havant Parking SPD. In light of this, the application site can fit two cars on site to the front of the dwelling and would conform to the Havant Parking SPD's requirements and therefore conform with Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(v) Ecology

- 7.13 The application site has been found to be Within 100m of a Priority Habitat: Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland, Within 100m of a Sinc: Sandy Dell and Within 100m of a Watercourse. With regards to this and the scale of the works and that they are at ground floor level, officers are satisfied that this proposal would be likely to have an acceptable impact upon the ecology of Havant Borough and that it would accord with Policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is on balance acceptable in principle and on balance would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00574 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

LOCATION PLAN: Uploaded 29/7/24

AMENDED BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 3/10/24

Drawing Number: 8089 · 24 · 1 Rev C: AMENDED EXISTING AND

PROPOSED PLANS: Uploaded 11/10/24

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 2 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.