
Site Address: 162 Park Avenue, Waterlooville, PO7 5HF
Proposal: Following the removal of existing South facing flat roofed rear extension, erection of a North facing flat roofed rear extension. Changes to fenestrations.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00597 Expiry Date: 20/09/2024
Applicant: Mr Saunders
Agent: Mrs Styles Case Officer: Robert Riley
 Styles Architecture
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 162 Park Avenue, Waterlooville, is a semi-detached bungalow located to the east side of Park Avenue. The property comprises of brickwork and pebble dash render with concrete roof tiles. Vehicular access is from Park Avenue with parking to the front.
- 1.2 The property is located within a residential area with surrounding properties being a mixture of one and two stories.

2 Planning History

APP/24/00066 - Application for Lawful Development Certificate relating to existing rear extension., WD,19/02/2024
APP/24/00153 - Single story rear extension - Retrospective Planning Permission, REF,09/05/2024

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Following the removal of existing South facing flat roofed rear extension, erection of a North facing flat roofed rear extension. Changes to fenestrations.

Officer note

- 3.2 The existing plans show the existing south facing rear extension addition to the original rear extension. This was assessed under APP/24/00153 and subsequently refused retrospective planning permission. This addition was being removed as of the site visit that took place as part of this application (APP/24/00597).

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)
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

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

This work will require Building Regulation consent

Please note the new window on side elevation (bedroom) should be no larger than 1m sq if within 1m of the notional boundary. Should you wish a larger window it should have a fire rated frame and glass and be non opening (30 minutes fire protection needed).

Officer note:

The applicant following communication between the officer and the agent has amended the plans to show the window to be 1sqm. The agent has confirmed in an email that the applicants will be made aware of these building control requirements.

Councillor Antonia Harrison

No comments received

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No comments received

Councillor Paul Tansom

No comments received

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre

Within 50 metres: Notable and protected species: West European Hedgehog

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

Arboriculturist

No trees on site, however there is a small Cordyline tree in an adjacent garden – the area allocated for development on the plan shows an existing hard surface and as such there is no negative impact on the tree. The tree is not of a TPO quality.

I raise no objection on Arb grounds.

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: 7

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) Planning history
- (iii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iv) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (v) Ecology
- (vi) Arboriculture

(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) Planning history

7.3 The application site as of the site visit still featured the south facing rear extension addition (attached to the original rear extension) which was to be assessed as part of APP/24/00066 (withdrawn) and was assessed as part of APP/24/00153 (retrospective) and is shown on the existing plans. As of the site visit, the rear extension addition on the south facing side was being removed. This rear extension addition was right up to the boundary of No.160 Park Avenue and though was assessed to be acceptable regarding overshadowing impacts, was refused due to *"dominant and overbearing impact and causes unacceptable harm to the outlook from the rear bedroom window at No.160 Park Avenue (nearest to the extension) and their outdoor living environment"*.

This application following the removal of this rear addition refused under APP/24/00153 on the southern facing side, proposes to extend the original rear extension to the north facing side.

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

Character, bulk and the streetscene

- 7.4 Due to the proposed development being located to the rear of the property it is considered to have a limited and acceptable impact upon the street scene. Furthermore, the proposed extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling being of an appropriate size to the plot and the retained amenity space. Therefore, it is considered to be in keeping with the character of the area. The proposed side bedroom window is also considered to be acceptable with regards to the dwelling and visual amenities.

Materials

- 7.5 This application proposes to use materials that match the existing dwellinghouse which is considered acceptable.
- 7.6 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 2011). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iv) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.7 To the northern and southern sides of the application site are properties No.164 Park Avenue and No.160 Park Avenue. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to this properties. Due to the location, nature and scale of the works, properties to the front and rear of the application site are not considered to be impacted.

No.164 Park Avenue

- 7.8 The rear extension would feature an approximate 0.8 metre separation distance between the extension and the shared boundary of Nos 164 and 162 Park Avenue. Officers have considered it important to assess the impact of overshadowing upon this property. Regarding overshadowing concerns, the agent sent amended plans showing the 45 degree angle test in figure Figure 5.12 of the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD. It is considered that if the rear extension would fail both tests, that it could have an unacceptable impact with regards to overshadowing of this dwelling. With regards to this, the rear extension did not meet the test's standards in regards to depth, but met the test's standards with regards to height upon No.164's rear fenestration. Officers note that if permission was forthcoming, regarding sunlight considerations, that morning sunshine is unlikely to be affected, that midday sunshine would primarily be affected during the autumn and winter months when the sunlight is lower. In terms of outlook, the affected window of No.164's rear extension would still retain views towards the east and north-east. With regards to these considerations, officers note that there would be an impact from this proposal, but consider that there would not be demonstrably unacceptable harm that would justify refusing the application on this basis.

- 7.9 Officers have also considered it important to assess overbearing concerns. Officers note that this extension would extend approximately 5 metres past the rear wall of No.164's rear extension which is currently under construction. Though it is noted that it would feature a reasonable presence upon No.164, in light of the existing boundary treatment, the proposed modest height of approximately 2.9 metres and that it is set off the boundary by approximately 0.8 metres, officers consider on balance that this rear extension addition would not increase unacceptably a sense of overbearing. Regarding overlooking concerns, the rear extension would feature no side fenestration facing No.164, which is considered acceptable. There would be rear fenestration on the rear extension, however, this would face the rear garden of No.164, and any oblique views would face the shared boundary treatment of Nos 164 and 162 which is considered acceptable. The works also propose a new side bedroom window. This faces towards a flank wall of the newly constructed rear extension of No.164 and were it to be constructed as a clear window may have permitted views into No.164's garden. This window has been marked as obscure on the plans and will be conditioned if permission is forthcoming and is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.164 Park Avenue. In light of these considerations, and that furthermore, no objection has been received from this property, No.164 Park Avenue on balance is considered to be acceptably impacted.

No.160 Park Avenue

- 7.10 The proposed side bedroom window would face No.164's curtilage and would not impact No.160 Park Avenue, which is considered acceptable. The rear extension addition would be shielded by the original rear extension and would not be overbearing or overshadow this property. The rear extension addition would feature rear fenestration, however it would face the rear garden of No.162 Park Avenue, and is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.160 Park Avenue. With regards to these concerns, No.160 Park Avenue is considered to be acceptably impacted.
- 7.11 Consequently, it is considered on balance 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 no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(v) Ecology

- 7.12 The application site has been found to be located within 50 metres of a notable and protected species; West European Hedgehog. However, in consideration of the scale of the proposed works, it unlikely to result in harm to this protected species. Regarding this, this proposal is considered to accord with policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable with this concern.

(vi) Arboriculturist

- 7.13 Due to a tree that would be located near to the proposed north facing extension, the Council's Arboriculturist was consulted during the application process. The Council's Arboriculturist stated " *No trees on site, however there is a small Cordyline tree in an adjacent garden – the area allocated for development on the plan shows an existing hard surface and as such there is no negative impact on the tree.*

The tree is not of a TPO quality. I raise no objection on Arb grounds". In light of this, officers consider this proposal to accord with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable with this concern.

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/24/00597 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:

Location plan (1:1250)

Drawing Number: A1030 100-A: SITE PLAN AS EXISTING: Uploaded 26/7/24

Drawing Number: A1030 101-A: SITE PLAN AS PROPOSED: Uploaded 26/7/24

Drawing Number: A1030 200-A: FLOOR PLANS AS EXISTING: Uploaded 26/7/24

Drawing Number: A1030 300-A: ELEVATIONS AS EXISTING: Uploaded 26/7/24

Drawing Number: A1030 310-C: AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 18/9/24

Drawing Number: A1030 210-C: AMENDED PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS: Uploaded 18/9/24

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used 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 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, the window serving a bedroom on the side elevation on the plans hereby approved shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

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