

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address: 3 Bladon Close, Havant, PO9 2QA
Proposal: Single storey rear extension, first floor side extension, covered porch addition, replace existing tile hanging with cladding.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00956 Expiry Date: 23/01/2025
Applicant: Mr Pragnell
Agent: Mr Foreman Case Officer: Selina Donophy
 Critchley Architecture And
 Design (CAAD) Ltd
Ward: St Faiths

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

This application site comprises a two storey , detached dwellinghouse located on the south side of Bladon Close, Havant. This property has hanging tile and brickwork to the elevations and is separated from the road by a driveway allowing for on site parking. The area is residential in character.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Single storey rear extension, first floor side extension, covered porch addition, replace existing tile hanging with cladding, balcony proposed over flat roof (partially existing).

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)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014
AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Daniel Berwick

No comments received

Councillor Gillian Harris

No comments received

Councillor Phil Munday - St Faiths

No comments received

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: 10

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4 comments received in objection

Comment	Officer Comment
Comment:I have looked at the application plans and I am very concerned about the proposed balcony on the rear elevation. I am concerned that this elevated vantage point would lead to the undue overlooking of and loss of privacy to my rear garden and rear windows. This does not seem to accord with Core Strategy Policy CS16 that requires new development to not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through the loss of privacy and overlooking. In my opinion, the proposed balcony should be removed from the application proposals.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report . Please also note that the balcony has been removed from the proposal.
Comment:I have concerns regarding the balcony and intrusion on privacy of my home and garden due to being overlooked. I am also concerned about the amount of	Comment has been noted - the balcony has since been removed from the proposals. Concerns are noted in regards to

inconvenience caused by construction/delivery vehicles in the road adjacent to my home and access to my driveway/garage.	construction vehicles - this is outside of planning control .
In general we support this plan. Our specific objection is the 'proposed balcony' over the flat roof, at the rear of the property. The main concern will be the complete loss of our privacy, in our garden. To put a 'walk out' balcony at this first floor level will allow a direct viewing platform over our garden and all neighbouring gardens, none of which are currently, directly overlooked. This proposed 'walk out' balcony will definitely have a detrimental effect on the privacy currently enjoyed by us and neighbouring properties. We would also add that a 'walk out' type balcony would be entirely out of character with the current, visual rear aspect of all the surrounding properties. We suggest French doors with a Juliette style balcony (and no 'walk out' area) may be more suitable and would retain the privacy we currently enjoy.	Balcony comment has been noted and this has been removed from the proposal.
Comment:As a resident who has their rear garden backing on to 3 Bladon Close, along with 5 others. I have concerns that a balcony to the back of this property may infringe on the privacy of the surrounding gardens as we will be overlooked due to being so close and the way the gardens are laid out. There is no issue with the extension and other works, its just the balcony.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report . Please also note that the balcony has been removed from the proposal.

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) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (v) Parking

(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

- 7.3 This proposal comprises a first floor side extension, single storey rear extension , porch and changes to materials. To the rear of the property the existing conservatory would be removed and replaced with a single storey rear extension - this would add an additional 30cms approximately to the depth of the existing conservatory. The rear extension would have a monopitched roof with a window to the side and a door to the rear. It would be set off the west boundary to the same degree as the conservatory. The rear extension would extend to the rear of the garage , creating a store , the existing garage would become a workshop and the store would become a garage following an extension to the front whereby it would be squared off. The proposed first floor extension would be set back and located above the workshop - it would come level with the existing first floor rear elevation wall and would be set back from the existing first floor front elevation wall by approximately 7 metres. It would have a width of approximately 2.65 metres. The ridge line would come level with the existing lower ridge of the roof and would create an office accessed via the existing bedroom. Proposed windows include one to the front elevation and one to the rear elevation. Proposed materials include roof tile and brickwork both to match existing however with fibre cement cladding to replace the existing tile hanging.

- 7.4 The proposed rear extensions would not be visible from the public realm . They would not add significantly to the footprint which already exists given the existing conservatory is to be removed . The design is considered to be in keeping with the host dwelling and they would result in overdevelopment of the plot. The first floor side extension would be set back from the front elevation , with the roof design and height according well with the existing roof. This is deemed to be a subservient addition to the property and due to the set back , it is not judged to result in a terracing effect . The proposed changes to materials notably comprise of the change from hanging tile to cladding . Hanging tile would be preferable as this is the material commonly used in the streetscene, however there is an existing variation in colour and design of roof tile used in the vicinity and cladding is not considered to be so different to result in harm to the streetscene . It is noted the brickwork at ground floor is to be retained. For this reason, the changes in material are deemed to be acceptable.

- 7.5 The design and appearance of the proposal is 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). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.6 To the east of the application site is no 1 Bladon Close- No 1 is angled away from no 3 . The proposed first floor extension would be sited on the side of the property adjacent with no 1 and would project slightly further back than the rear elevation of no 1 however it would retain approximately 4.5 metres gap between the side elevations of both properties. It would be set back behind the side elevation windows at no 1 and

overall is not considered to result in harm to the amenity of no 1 due to the siting and generally modest size of the extension. The office windows would not offer direct views back towards the private amenity spaces of no 1.

- 7.7 To the west of the application site is no 5 Bladon Close. The single storey rear extension would be separated from the shared boundary and is not deemed to result in harm to the amenity of this property.
- 7.8 To the rear (south) of the application site is no 33 Blenheim Gardens. Previously a balcony at first floor level was proposed to the area of flat roof to the rear. This has since been removed from the proposal due to case officer concerns of overlooking. Whilst there would be an additional first floor window to the rear serving the office, there are already first floor rear windows at no 3 and this window is not deemed to add any additional harmful views.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.9 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(v) Parking

- 7.11 No additional bedrooms are proposed however 3 cars would be parked on site which would exceed the requirements for parking on site.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and would have a limited and acceptable impact on the 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/24/00956

subject to the following conditions

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

25056_101 A AMENDED SITE PLANS
25056_401 D AMENDED PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
25056_501 D AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
25056_502C AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
Application form - 'materials' uploaded on the 28.11.2024

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 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.