

Site Address:	204 Park Avenue, Waterlooville, PO7 5EZ		
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension with external alterations including replacement flat roof to existing rear conservatory.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00791	Expiry Date:	10/12/2024
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Harding		
Agent:	Mr Harding	Case Officer:	Robert Riley
	BH Architecture Ltd		
Ward:	Purbrook		
Recommendation: GRANT PERMISSION			

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a semi-detached two-storey dwellinghouse located on Park Avenue in Purbrook. To the front of the dwelling, is a paved driveway and planter boxes. To the rear of the dwelling is the application site's rear garden, which features a TPO woodland to the rear. The property's materials feature a grey slate in a gable pitch to form the roof and white render and tudor framing for the external walls.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that would be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the street featuring both traditional and contemporary designs in evidence

2.1 None relevant (several applications relating to trees under Tree Preservation Order's (TPO's)).

3.1 Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension. External alterations including alterations to external materials and replacement flat roof with 1No rooflight. Removal of a Holly Tree in the rear garden.

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

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

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

Developer Services, Southern Water

Southern Water has no comments in regard to this Planning Application at this time

Ecologist

Original comments from the Council's Ecologist:

The roof of the main dwelling is in poor condition, with various slipped/missing tiles evident in August 2023 Streetview imagery. Cannot discount the potential for e.g. bat species to be present and affected by proposed works – the two storey extension will tie-in to the main building and potentially (?) impact roof materials and any void.

If they come back demonstrating that the main roof structure would not be affected then I think it would be OK overall.

With regards to this, the agent has stated:

We can confirm there was no evidence of bats within the roof space during our recent survey operations. The existing roof will be separated from the proposed extension roof via the gable end which will remain. As illustrated the gable window will be removed & blocked up. As you mention there are some loose tiles on the main roof slopes these will be replaced during the construction operations.

We would envisage that the last course of tiles on the edge of the rear roof slope will be removed to allow the proposed extension roof to be tied into the existing. The front part of the main roof will be unaffected. If during this process any bats are found the appropriate action will be taken in contacting yourselves / ecologist to agree the appropriate course of action.

With regards to this, the Council's Ecologist has further commented:

I think this will be a sensible precautionary way forward. If we can add an informative note to the permission, just clearly setting out that avoiding impacts to protected species is their legal responsibility.

Bats and their roosts are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. All work must stop immediately if bats, or evidence of bat presence (e.g. droppings, bat carcasses or insect remains), are encountered at any point during development works - should this occur, further advice should be sought from Natural England and/or a professional ecologist.

Arboriculturist

Based on our desk top survey and discussion the TPO woodland to the rear of the site is not a constraint to development in this instance.

As a requirement to ensure that the woodland and any other principal trees on site are protected, we would like to see a very basic tree protection plan in the form of temporary fencing across the garden at a point where construction is unimpeded, but there is sufficient distance away from the trees so as materials or plant is not stored within any tree RPAs.

I would suggest that as a condition we request that a TPP is submitted and agreed in writing prior to any development taking place.

With regards to this, the agent submitted a Tree Protection Plan (TPP), and the Council's Arboriculturist further stated:

My suggestion for a condition is as follows:

No work shall commence on site until the Heras protective fencing is erected in line with the BH Architecture submitted Tree Protection Plan. Once installed the applicant must send photographic evidence to HBC for an agreed discharge of conditions.

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: 8

Number of site notices: 1.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
[Redacted] object to the potential removal of the pseudo-Tudor framing at first floor level of the west elevation of number 204. The 'framing' is a major architectural feature of 202 and 204 and defines the appearance of both homes whilst providing a pleasing symmetry and presence. It would look most odd if they were to be removed from just one dwelling. The 'frames', whilst not structural form part of the structure [Redacted] they should remain as a defining feature of both dwellings and as part of the street scene. I otherwise have no objections to the development proceeding and offer my full support.	Objection to alteration to proposed materials is noted.

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) Ecology
- (vi) Arboriculture
- (vii) 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 The proposed 2 storey side extension and alterations to external materials would be visible on the streetscene.

7.4 The proposed replacement rear flat roof with 1No rooflight and proposal to fell 1No Holly tree is considered acceptable with regards to the character of the dwelling and upon visual amenities.

- 7.5 The proposed flat roof single storey rear extension would feature a proposed approximate width of 3.2 metres; a proposed approximate depth of 4.5 metres; and a proposed approximate maximum height of 2.8 metres. In light of its modest nature and modest height it is not considered to be out of keeping with the existing character of the dwelling, and would furthermore not be readily visible on the streetscene, and is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on visual amenities.
- 7.6 Regarding 2 storey side extensions, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states *"Two storey side extensions should be set back behind the main building line. The ridge height of the extension can also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage. The angle of the roof should be the same as or similar to the existing roof. Flat-roofed extensions are not normally acceptable, particularly at two storey height"*.
- 7.7 The proposed 2 storey side extension would feature an approximate width of 3.2 metres an approximate depth of 6.3 metres and an approximate maximum height of 8 metres. It would feature a pitched gable roof in keeping with the design of the host dwelling. It would be set back approximately 1.8 metres behind the main dwelling (excluding the front porch) and its ridge line would be approximately 0.8 metres lower than the existing dwelling. In light of this, it is considered to accord with the guidance from the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD.
- 7.8 Regarding the potential for a terracing impact, the 2 storey works would be located 3.6 metres from No.206a's garage and in light of this, there is not considered to be a terracing effect and the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this regard.
- 7.9 Regarding the potential for an unbalancing impact from the works, the 2 storey works would result in some loss of symmetry between Nos 204 and 202 Park Avenue, however, officers note this is already the case to a degree as No.204 features both a front garage and a large single storey extension to the side. Officers furthermore, note that there is an eclectic mix of designs and materials in the nearby streetscene.

Materials

- 7.10 The application forms state that the replacement rear roof and single storey flat roof would be EPDM which is considered acceptable. The forms state that the external walls would remove the tudor framing and would feature K render, which has been stated by the agent to be "Ivory, scrapped render range". In light of an eclectic mix of materials on the streetscene, this is considered acceptable. The third party representation objecting to the removal of the tudor framing is noted - however the removal of the tudor framing could be undertaken utilising the property's permitted development rights and therefore it is not considered there is a justification for resisting the proposals on this basis. The 2 storey side extension would feature a slate roof to match the existing roof, which is also considered acceptable.
- 7.11 Overall, the design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and streetscene and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy 2011) and the Borough Design Guide SPD. 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

- 7.12 To the northern and southern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 206a and 202 Park Avenue. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these two properties. Due to the proposed location, nature and scale of the works, properties to the front and rear are considered to be acceptably impacted by the works. The proposed removal of 1No Holly tree in the rear garden is able to be done without the need for permission and is considered acceptable.

No.206a Park Avenue

- 7.13 To the northern side of the application site is No.206a Park Avenue. The proposed new rear flat roof with 1No rooflight is considered to have an acceptable impact on No.206a Park Avenue. The proposed rear extension to the rear of the 2 storey side extension would feature bifold doors, however, any views would be of the rear garden of No.204 Park Avenue, and oblique views towards No.206a would be of boundary treatment, which is considered acceptable. The single storey rear extension would feature a window, however it would face a flank wall, hedging and boundary treatment which is considered acceptable. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, the single storey rear extension would be approximately 3.3 metres from No.206a's curtilage. In light of this, it is considered that any overshadowing and overbearing impacts from this extension would be limited and acceptable.

- 7.13 Regarding the 2 storey side extension, it would feature no side fenestration, and it is therefore considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. It would feature rear fenestration, however, this would face No.204's rear garden, and any views towards No.206a would be oblique, which is considered acceptable. In light of this, the 2 storey side extension is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, the 2 storey side extension would principally face No.206a's garage. It would extend approximately 2.4 metres ahead of No.206's garage, however in light of a sufficient separation distance from any windows on the ground floor front elevation of No.206a, this is not considered unacceptable. In light of this, the two storey side extension is considered acceptable regarding overshadowing and overbearing impacts.

No.202 Park Avenue

- 7.14 To the southern side of the application site is No.202 Park Avenue. The proposed new flat roof with 1No rooflight is considered to have an acceptable impact on No.202 Park Avenue. The proposed single storey extension would be shielded by the existing dwelling, and additional rear fenestration would face the application site's rear garden, which is considered acceptable. The proposed 2 storey side extension would also be shielded by the existing dwelling, and any rear fenestration would face the application site's rear garden, and any additional views towards No.202 would only be oblique, which is considered acceptable. With regards to this, No.202 is considered to be acceptably impacted.
- 7.15 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would 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 one letter of objection was received with respect to the scheme; the matters raised in it have been addressed at Paragraph 7.10 above.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.16 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

(v) Ecology

- 7.17 The Council's Ecologist originally stated " *The roof of the main dwelling is in poor condition, with various slipped/missing tiles evident in August 2023 Streetview imagery. Cannot discount the potential for e.g. bat species to be present and affected by proposed works – the two storey extension will tie-in to the main building and potentially (?) impact roof materials and any void. If they come back demonstrating that the main roof structure would not be affected then I think it would be OK overall*".
- 7.18 In light of this the officer asked for further information from the agent, who stated "We can confirm there was no evidence of bats within the roof space during our recent survey operations. The existing roof will be separated from the proposed extension roof via the gable end which will remain. As illustrated the gable window will be removed & blocked up. As you mention there are some loose tiles on the main roof slopes these will be replaced during the construction operations. We would envisage that the last course of tiles on the edge of the rear roof slope will be removed to allow the proposed extension roof to be tied into the existing. The front part of the main roof will be unaffected. If during this process any bats are found the appropriate action will be taken in contacting yourselves / ecologist to agree the appropriate course of action".
- 7.19 With regards to this, the Council's Ecologist further stated "I think this will be a sensible precautionary way forward. If we can add an informative note to the permission, just clearly setting out that avoiding impacts to protected species is their legal responsibility. Bats and their roosts are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. All work must stop immediately if bats, or evidence of bat presence (e.g. droppings, bat carcasses or insect remains), are encountered at any point during development works - should this occur, further advice should be sought from Natural England and/or a professional ecologist".
- 7.20 In consideration of a lack of objection from the Council's Ecologist, officers consider that unacceptable impacts on protected species would be considered unlikely, and an informative will be added if permission is forthcoming. In light of this, this proposal is considered to accord with Policies CS11 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(vi) Arboriculture

- 7.21 The works propose to fell 1 No Holly tree, this is able to be done without the need for the Council's approval, and the Council's Arboriculturist has provided no objection, and in light of this is considered acceptable.

- 7.22 Due to a TPO (Tree Preservation Order) woodland to the rear of the application site, the Council's Arboriculturist was consulted during the application process. In light of this, the Council's Arboriculturist stated " *Based on our desk top survey and discussion the TPO woodland to the rear of the site is not a constraint to development in this instance. As a requirement to ensure that the woodland and any other principal trees on site are protected, we would like to see a very basic tree protection plan in the form of temporary fencing across the garden at a point where construction is unimpeded, but there is sufficient distance away from the trees so as materials or plant is not stored within any tree RPAs. I would suggest that as a condition we request that a TPP is submitted and agreed in writing prior to any development taking place*".
- 7.23 In light of this, the agent sent over a Tree Protection Plan (TPP). The Council's Arboriculturist was reconsulted, whereby he stated " *My suggestion for a condition is as follows: No work shall commence on site until the Heras protective fencing is erected in line with the BH Architecture submitted Tree Protection Plan. Once installed the applicant must sent photographic evidence to HBC for an agreed discharge of conditions*.
- 7.24 In light of this, the works will be conditioned if permission is forthcoming in order to feature protective fencing in accordance with the submitted Tree Protection Plan and as a result damage to the TPO (Tree Preservation Order) woodland to the rear can be avoided.
(NB The Holly referred to in Paragraph 7.21 is not the subject of the TPO). In consideration of this, this proposal is considered to accord with Policies CS11 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(vii) Parking

- 7.25 The works would increase occupancy of the application site from 3 to 4 bedrooms. This would require 3 parking spaces on the application site to accord with the Havant Parking SPD. This has been shown on the plans, and the proposal is considered to accord with the Havant Parking SPD and Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

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/24/00791 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: 1: EXISTING FLOOR LAYOUTS AND ELEVATIONS:

Uploaded 11/10/24

Drawing Number: 2: PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR: Uploaded 11/10/24

Drawing Number: 3: PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR: Uploaded 11/10/24

Drawing Number: 4: PROPOSED WEST ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 11/10/24

Drawing Number: 5: PROPOSED NORTH AND SOUTH ELEVATIONS:

Uploaded 11/10/24

Drawing Number: 6: PROPOSED EAST ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 11/10/24

Drawing Number: 7: EXISTING AND PROPOSED ROOF LAYOUTS:

Uploaded 11/10/24

Drawing Number: 8 REV A: BLOCK PLAN WITH PARKING INFORMATION:

Uploaded 15/10/24

Drawing Number: 9: LOCATION PLAN: Uploaded 11/10/24

Drawing Number: 10: Tree Protection Plan: Uploaded 12/12/24

Design And Access Statement: Uploaded 11/10/24

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.

- 4 No work shall commence on site until:
- (i) the Heras protective fencing is erected in line with the BH Architecture submitted Tree Protection Plan; and
 - (ii) photographic evidence of that fencing has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

The approved fencing shall be retained in its approved position throughout the course of construction activity at the site.

Reason: To ensure that trees are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period in the interests of amenity. This is with due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.