

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address: 15 Salet Way, Waterloooville, PO7 8QS
Proposal: Proposed part one storey and two storey side extension and garage conversion.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00818 Expiry Date: 03/12/2024
Applicant: Coleborn
Agent: Mr Peters Case Officer: Robert Riley
 ATP Architectural Design
Ward: Cowplain

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a two-storey dwellinghouse located in Waterloooville. The application site features a rear garden, and features a paved front driveway. The property's materials feature brickwork for its external walls, and brown concrete tiles in a pitched gable roof design for the roof.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that would be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the street featuring dwellings with the same materials, but mild variations in design in evidence.

2 Planning History

06/71198/000 - Part two storey and part first floor extension to the side elevation.,
PERM,16/03/2006

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Proposed part one storey, part two storey side extension with garage conversion.

Officer comment:

- 3.2 The proposed black timber cladding for the first floor of the extension has been amended to be Antique Composite Cladding during the application process. Officers also note that the proposed elevation plans have erroneously stated the rear elevation to be the front elevation and the proposed front elevation to be the rear elevation, however however, it is clear when looking at the drawings where the various elevations are and the impact on neighbouring properties is considered to be able to be readily assessed.

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 Andrew Briggs

No comments received

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

No comments received

Councillor Neil Bowdell - Cowplain

No comments received

Building Control

I have looked at the proposed floor plan (101.HOU) and elevation (102.HOU) drawings and would make the following observations:

The proposed plans appear to indicate that the notional boundary may be within 1m of the proposed extension. Therefore under Approved Document B Section B4 the amount of openings on to a boundary which is less than 1m away can only be 1msq. If the boundary is 1m or more away the opening can equal 5.6msq See AD B Diagram 11.7 for further details.

The boundary / side elevation is shown as cladding. This will need to be fire rated in accordance with Approved Document B Section 4 (cement board or impregnated timber).

Foundations in a clay sub soil under Approved Document A should be 1.2m deep. The party wall Act is a civil issue and is not covered by the Building Regulations.

Officer comment:

The agent has provided further information and a fire risk assessment test in light of comments received from building control

"Boundary to neighbouring property is 910mm and window to side elevation is 0.6m². External timber frame wall with cladding will have a 9mm Magply board fixed over the 12mm ply sheathing (then breather membrane, counter battens, battens, composite cladding) for external treatment and lined on internal side of studs with 15mm Gyproc fireline board with a 3mm plaster skim finish".

Further Building Control comment:

Based upon the test data provided by Intertek on Wuhu Haoxuan Wood Plastic Composite Co., Ltd I can confirm the cladding will comply with the requirements of Approved Document B Vol 1 B4 Table 10.1 Reaction to fire performance of external surface of walls for a Purpose Group 1 building type and within 1m of boundary with building height no greater than 11m.

Ecologist

This is fine. Modern dwelling with well-sealed roof of modern materials. No justification for further information

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: 11

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
Planning application is incorrectly listed as a rear extension, when the plans clearly show extension to the side elevation. In addition, the submitted elevation drawings are labelled incorrectly, the front and rear are reversed.	The description of the proposal has been changed and readvertised during the application process. Officers note that the plans have incorrectly labelled the elevations on the plans, however it is clear when looking at the drawings in the context of a site visit where the various elevations are and the impact on neighbouring properties is considered to be able to be readily assessed.
The proposed Development/Side Extension does not show consideration for compliance with HAVANT BOROUGH DESIGN GUIDE SPD specifically:	Response to points raised below.
Section 5.38 - the current gap between the garage/proposed extension and existing neighbouring property is ~1 meter, which is demonstrated on the plans. Section 5.38 encourages a gap of at least 2 meters, between side extensions and neighbouring properties.	The potential for a terracing impact is assessed in section 7.
Section 5.35 - Extensions should look to the main building as a reference point for appearance, materials and details. The black timber cladding does not meet this point.	The black timber element of the proposed first floor extension has been amended to be Antique Composite Cladding which on balance is not considered harmful and would not warrant the refusal of this planning application.
Section 5.06 - Mitigation of overlooking, secondary windows should consider the potential for obscured glass to maintain privacy of neighbouring properties, this was a previous condition on this proposal in 2006.	Views would only be oblique from the additional rear window, and it has not been considered appropriate to condition this window if permission is forthcoming. The previous 2006 proposal appears to have required obscure glazing as the window at that time was intended to serve a shower room, where privacy concerns are heightened; the current proposal places a bedroom in this location instead.
Policy CS16 1c - development does not demonstrate honouring the characteristics of the locality, specifically where the extension is to be clad in black timber.	The antique cladding on balance is not considered harmful and would not warrant the refusal of this planning application and is assessed in section 7.

Policy CS16 1e - The development will not harm neighbouring properties via the loss of privacy, outlook, noise or overlooking. Additionally, ensure that all proposed construction works meet the requirements of: Building regulations approved Document B, with regards to fire spread between buildings, where the proposed distance between building eaves is likely <1m. Building regulations approved Document A, where foundations are on clay, and likely within 1 meter of existing structure. The side access to the rear and gap between development and neighbouring property is ~1 metre, consideration and care will therefore be required to avoid damage to the party wall (External housing structure) of neighbouring property, during this development. This work could potentially be subject to the party wall act 1996, and therefore repair and remedial works may need to be considered. Additional consideration needs to be addressed over potential damages and limitations to the right of way of the private road leading to neighbouring properties, which is already showing signs of damage and will be exacerbated by movement of heavy vehicles delivering building materials and collecting surplus.	Neighbour impacts are assessed in section 7. Whilst compliance with the Building Regulations is a separate legislative requirement, Building Control have been consulted and following confirmation from the agent, this proposal is considered to meet these regulations as discussed in section 7. See point above. This (party wall considerations) is not a material planning consideration, and if damage is done this would be a separate legal matter to be resolved between the parties. This (damage to private property) is not a material planning consideration, and if damage is done this would be a separate legal matter to be resolved between the parties.
--	---

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) Building Control
- (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 works would be readily visible in the streetscene.

7.4 The proposed garage conversion is considered acceptable regarding the character of the dwelling and visual amenities.

7.5 The proposed ground floor infill would be of a limited footprint and would not be visible within the streetscene - regarding this, it is considered acceptable in respect of the character of the dwelling and visual amenities.

7.6 Regarding the first floor addition it is noted that this would create a reasonable increase of mass and bulk upon the dwelling, with the first floor addition being proposed to feature an approximate 2.5 metre width, an approximate 6.7 metre depth (7.7 including roof overhang) and an approximate 2.1 metre eaves height and an approximate 4.8 metres ridge height.

7.7 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD with regards to subserviency of side extensions, states "*It is important that the extension remains subservient to the main building, so it can be read which part of the building is the original and which is a later addition. 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*". It is noted that the side extension would both feature a pitched roof and would feature a reduced ridge line compared to the existing dwelling and would also be set back. In consideration of this, it is seen to accord with the guidance from the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and is considered to be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and is considered acceptable in this regard.

- 7.5 The potential for a terracing impact is considered to be important to assess due to the reduced separation that would result between Nos 15 and 17 Salet Way's side elevations. The agent has confirmed there would be an approximate 0.91 metre separation distance to No.17's side wall. With the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD ordinarily preferring at least a 2 metre separation distance between dwellings, to signify different developments, this proposal is not seen to accord with this.
- 7.6 In the wider context however, it is noted that although dwellings are generally of similar appearances, there is some non-uniformity in the streetscene with regards to later side extension additions, as seen with Nos 12 and 22 Salet Way in particular, which lie within close proximity of the application site. No 15 also features a two storey addition to its western side. Furthermore, limited separation distances are noted throughout the street.
- 7.7 With regards to this, although this proposal would add further bulk to the dwelling, given that it would not breach existing building lines and that the streetscene features dwellings which have been similarly extended to their sides, the proposal is not seen to be an unduly prominent addition to the streetscene, and on balance is not seen to be so harmful with regards to design to warrant a refusal of this planning application.

Materials

- 7.8 The proposal at ground floor level would feature matching materials to the existing dwellinghouse which is considered acceptable. The proposal would also use matching roof materials, which is considered acceptable. At first floor level, the extension would feature Antique Composite Cladding. Although it is noted that the street features general uniformity in materials, when considering the proposed location of the antique composite cladding, whereby most of it would be to the side and rear where it would not be particularly prominent in the streetscene, officers consider this antique composite cladding on balance to be acceptable.
- 7.9 The design and appearance of the proposal is therefore on balance deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is 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

- 7.10 To the western side of the application site is No.17 Salet Way. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to this property. Due to shielding received from the existing dwelling and the scale and location of the works, Nos 7, 9 and 11 Salet Way to the west of the application site are considered to be acceptably impacted by this proposal. Furthermore, the proposal would feature a sufficient distance from properties to the front and rear of the application site, to prevent unacceptable neighbourly impacts. The proposed garage conversion aspect of the works is considered acceptable.

No.17 Salet Way

- 7.11 To the western side of the application site is No.17 Salet Way. The extensions would not extend beyond No.17's rear wall, and would face a blank gable wall, and in light of this, this proposal is considered acceptable regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns. There would be side windows at ground and first floor level of the extensions, but as these would face a blank gable, this is considered acceptable. There would also be a rear window serving a bedroom which has led to representations regarding potential overlooking. Given that any views provided of No.17 would be oblique, and of a manner very similar to many other properties in the locality (including the relationship between No 17 and No 15 currently) officers consider this acceptable. In light of this, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on No.17 Salet Way.
- 7.12 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; however the concerns expressed - as responded to in Section 6 and in this Section of the report - are not considered to warrant a refusal of the application.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(v) Ecology

- 7.14 The Council's Ecologist was consulted during the application process, due to substantial first floor works. The Council's Ecologist stated "*This is fine. Modern dwelling with well-sealed roof of modern materials. No justification for further information*". In light of these comments, this proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(vi) Building Control

- 7.15 Whilst compliance with the Building Regulations is a separate legislative requirement, Building Control have been consulted due to third party concerns about the proposal not meeting building regulations. Regarding this, Building Control stated "*The proposed plans appear to indicate that the notional boundary may be within 1m of the proposed extension. Therefore under Approved Document B Section B4 the amount of openings on to a boundary which is less than 1m away can only be 1msq. If the boundary is 1m or more away the opening can equal 5.6msq See AD B Diagram 11.7 for further details*". They also stated "*The boundary / side elevation is shown as cladding. This will need to be fire rated in accordance with Approved Document B Section 4 (cement board or impregnated timber). Foundations in a clay sub soil under Approved Document A should be 1.2m deep. The party wall Act is a civil issue and is not covered by the Building Regulations*".

- 7.16 Regarding these comments, the agent has confirmed that the side first floor window would comply with the 1sqm regulation (0.6sqm). Regarding the cladding after further correspondence between the officer, the agent and the Building Control officer was undertaken, it was established that the black timber cladding originally proposed would not meet the relevant fire regulations. In regards to this, the agent amended the proposal to feature antique composite cladding in lieu of the proposed black timber cladding.
- 7.17 In light of this, a fire risk assessment test was sent over by the agent, and Building Control were reconsulted. Building Control subsequently stated "*Based upon the test data provided by Intertek on Wuhu Haoxuan Wood Plastic Composite Co. Ltd I can confirm the cladding will comply with the requirements of Approved Document B Vol 1 B4 Table 10.1 Reaction to fire performance of external surface of walls for a Purpose Group 1 building type and within 1m of boundary with building height no greater than 11m*". In light of these comments, the proposal is considered acceptable regarding Building Control matters.

(vii) Parking

- 7.18 The proposal would reduce 1No parking space which would be provided by the existing garage. In light of this, the dwelling would remain as a 3 bedroom dwelling, which would require 2 parking spaces to be provided within the curtilage of the application site. 2 parking spaces have been shown on the plans, and on this basis 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. Furthermore it would also be acceptable in terms of ecology, Building Control and parking considerations. On this basis it is recommended for approval.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00818 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: Uploaded 18/10/24

Drawing Number: 200: EXISTING ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 18/10/24

Drawing Number: 102.HOU: AMENDED PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN WITH PARKING: Uploaded 21/11/2024

Drawing Number: 201.HOU Rev B: AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 23/12/24

Drawing Number: 101A: PROPOSED FLOOR: Uploaded 18/10/24

Drawing Number: 100.HOU: EXISTING FLOOR PLANS: Uploaded 18/10/24

Confirmation of proposed Antique Composite Cladding in email named AMENDED PROPOSED CLADDING TYPE IMAGE AND CONFIRMATION: Uploaded 23/12/24

AGENT _ PLANNING OFFICER _ BUILDING CONTROL

CORRESPONDENCE: Uploaded 23/12/24

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms, agent's email dated 5th December 2024, 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.