
Site Address:	7 Brook Gardens, Emsworth, PO10 7JY		
Proposal:	Single storey rear and side extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00685	Expiry Date:	09/10/2024
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Ritson		
Agent:	Mr Masterman	Case Officer:	Robert Riley
	Helyer Davies Architects Ltd		
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in Emsworth. The application site features a front and rear garden, with parking mainly provided to the side of the dwelling and to the adjoined side garage. The property's materials features mainly brickwork for the external walls, with white cladding for the first floor aspect of the front elevation. The roof features brown concrete tiles in a gable pitched design.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that would be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the street mainly featuring similarly sized dwellings in evidence with some variety of external materials.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant history.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Single storey rear and side extension with 2No rooflights. This application also proposes a garage conversion, a rear patio and a side glass canopy.

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

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
-----	--

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Tree Team

Attractive Magnolia located in the rear neighbour's garden that is unlikely to be impacted on by the proposed development. The tree is not of a TPO quality.

I raise no objection on Arb grounds.

Councillor Charles Robert

No comments received

Councillor Grainne Rason

No comments received

Councillor Reuben Mychaleckyj

No comments received

Emsworth Residents Forum

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: 16

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Arboriculture
- (v) Parking

(i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

- 7.3 The works would be readily visible on the streetscene with regards to the side extension aspect of the works.
- 7.4 The garage conversion aspect and rear patio aspect of the works are both able to be built under permitted development rights and are considered acceptable. The glass canopy to the side elevation is also considered acceptable
- 7.5 The side extension aspect of the works would be readily visible on the streetscene and would feature an approximate width of 2.6 metres an approximate depth of 4 metres and a proposed maximum approximate height of 3.1 metres. The side extension aspect of the works would part replace the existing side-adjoined garage, would be approximately 0.7 metres taller and feature the same width and depth. The side extension would feature both front and rear fenestration. The side extension aspect of the works with consideration of that it would replace the existing side-adjoined garage and would remain single storey is considered to still be subservient to the main dwelling and is considered acceptable and in keeping with the character of the dwelling and visual amenities.
- 7.6 The proposed rear extension aspect of the works would extend approximately 2 metres from the existing rear elevation. The proposed rear extension aspect would have a width of approximately 8.6 metres and have a maximum height of approximately 3.1 metres. The rear extension would not be visible from the street scene and due to its flat roof and single storey nature and modest depth would be considered subservient to the existing dwelling and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of its design.

Materials

- 7.7 The works would feature single ply membrane for the flat roof which is considered acceptable. The works would feature red facing brick, grey render and timber cladding for the external walls. The red facing brick aspect is considered in keeping and acceptable. The grey render would be visible on the streetscene, but in consideration of a moderate variety of materials used in the streetscene such as white cladding and brown tilework is not considered to be unduly prominent. The works would also feature timber cladding, this would be located on the rear of the rear extension aspect, and would not be visible on the streetscene, and is considered acceptable upon the dwelling and visual amenities.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.8 To the northern, southern and eastern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 5 and 9 Brook Gardens and No.10 Maisemore Gardens.. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these three properties. The proposed garage conversion and rear patio aspects of the works are both able to be done under permitted development rights and are considered acceptable. The glass canopy to the side elevation is also considered to be acceptable. Due to the scale, location and nature of the works and that front fenestration would face the public realm, properties to the front of No.7 Brook Gardens are considered to be acceptably impacted.

No.5 Brook Gardens

- 7.9 The side extension aspect of the works would feature shielding from the existing dwelling and the proposed rear extension and would acceptably impact No.5 Brook Gardens. The rear extension aspect of the works, would feature no fenestration to the side facing No.5 Brook Gardens which is considered acceptable. It would feature rear fenestration, however these views would face No.7's rear garden, and any oblique views would face the shared boundary treatment between Nos 7 and 5. Regarding this, the rear extension is considered acceptable on this dwelling regarding overlooking concerns. The rear extension would feature a proposed maximum approximate height of 3.1 metres, at this height, its single storey nature and that it protrudes past No.5 Brook Gardens rear wall by approximately 2.5 metres it is considered acceptable regarding overbearing concerns. Regarding overshadowing concerns, the extension is noted to propose to protrude approximately 2.5 metres past No.5's rear wall, though it is noted that there may be an impact of overshadowing of No.5's rear room, in consideration of the depth beyond the rear wall, and that the fenestration on No.5's rear room is centrally located, officers do not consider that the proposal would unacceptably increase overshadowing of No.5's rear room.

No.9 Brook Gardens

- 7.10 The proposed side extension would not feature any side fenestration facing No.9 Brook Gardens, and is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. The side extension would be approximately 0.7 metres taller, but it would face No.9's side adjoined garage and driveway, and is not considered to unacceptably increase overshadowing or overbearing concerns on this property. The rear extension aspect would not feature any fenestration facing No.9 Brook Gardens, which is considered acceptable. The rear extension would feature rear fenestration facing the rear garden of No.7. Any oblique views facing No.9 Brook Gardens would face existing boundary treatment, which is considered acceptable. The rear extension aspect of the works would feature a separation distance from No.9's curtilage of approximately 1 metre. At this distance in consideration of the modest heights of the proposed extensions, it not considered that it would be unacceptably overshadowing or overbearing on No.9 Brook Gardens rear amenity space and rear sun room.

No.10 Maisemore Gardens

- 7.11 The side and rear extension aspects of the works would feature a minimum separation distance from No.10's curtilage of approximately 7.5 metres, at this distance, overshadowing and overbearing impacts would be acceptable. The rear extension would feature rear fenestration, this would face the rear shared boundary treatment for No.7 Brook Gardens and No.10 Maisemore Gardens and the large tree overhanging the boundary and is considered to be acceptable regarding overlooking impacts. Regarding these concerns, the impact upon No.10 Maisemore Gardens, is considered acceptable.
- 7.12 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 2011). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Arboriculture

- 7.13 Due to a large tree located on No.10's Maisemore curtilage, overhanging the boundary the Council's Arboriculturist was consulted during the application process. The Council's Arboriculturist stated "*Attractive Magnolia located in the rear neighbour's garden that is unlikely to be impacted on by the proposed development. The tree is not of a TPO quality, I raise no objection on Arb grounds*". In light of this comment, this proposal is considered to accord with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(v) Parking

- 7.14 Due to this proposal seeking to convert the garage which would remove a parking space, parking issues have been assessed during the application process. In light of this the application site is considered to feature sufficient parking space to the front and side of the dwelling to be able to accommodate 3 cars on the curtilage on the application site, and this proposal is considered to accord with the Havant Parking SPD and Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

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/24/00685 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:

Drawing Number: 24027 02 Rev A: PROPOSED ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS AND LOCATION PLAN: Uploaded 9/9/24

Drawing Number: 24027 01: EXISTING FLOOR PLAN, ELEVATIONS AND BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 9/9/24

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT : Uploaded 9/9/24

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.