
Site Address:	58 Highland Road, Emsworth, PO10 7JN		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension linked to single storey side extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/23/01018	Expiry Date:	16/01/2024
Applicant:	Mrs Nichol		
Agent:	M Farrer	Case Officer:	Josephine Lacey
	MF Designs Ltd		
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

58 Highland Road, Emsworth is a semi-detached property on the north side of Highland Road. The neighbouring properties are of similar design in terms of size and style. The front elevation comprises a pale brick with red tile hanging to the second storey. The windows are uPVC, with two windows located just below the eaves of the roof, and one on the ground floor. The front door is also uPVC with a glass window and a small flat roofed porch above. The frontage comprises a section of grass and a section of hardstand to be utilised as a driveway. There is a side gate and fence leading down the east side of the property, with hardstanding leading up to a garage and store adjacent to the garden area. Immediately to the rear of the property is a covered decking area. There are concrete tiles to the main roof with corrugated sheeting to the rear canopy covering the decking area and a corrugated roof to the garage structure. The rear elevation is pale facebrick and the boundary treatments are 1.8m close boarded timber fences and brickwork to the side of the garage.

2 Planning History

None recent or relevant.

3 Proposal

Single storey rear extension linked to single storey side extension.

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)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Grainne Rason

No comments received.

Councillor Lulu Bowerman

No comments received.

Councillor R Kennett

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
Dear Ms Lacey Re: Proposed extension to 58 Highland Road, Emsworth, PO10 7JN Further to your letter of 18 December 2023, we have now reviewed the proposed online planning application and wish to make the following comments regarding the implications of the extension and change of room use to our adjoining property. We purchased our property on the basis that we were joined to our neighbouring property by a lounge/diner and this arrangement has been in existence since our occupation [redacted text] without any issues or problems.	The relocation of the kitchen within the existing dwelling is not a material planning consideration that can be taken into account - changes to room arrangements internally do not require planning permission and fall outside the scope of this application.

We are therefore opposed to the change of the dining/living area to a working kitchen for the following reasons:-

- The positioning of the sink unit and dishwasher on the internal wall adjoining our dining/living area wall. Our objection to this is that water from a leak or flood can penetrate through to our wall causing water damage and subsequent problems arising from damp.
- The substantial increase in the level of nuisance noise volume between the adjoining party wall as a result of:-
 - Water pressure noise arising from the use of the kitchen tap and adjoining water pipes.
 - Vibration and humming noise arising from the installation of a dishwasher (the positioning of which we strongly object to due to the constant disturbance noise level this appliance will cause to us)
 - Vibration and humming noise arising from the installation of an extractor fan.
 - Constant switching on and off of electric sockets.
 - Vibration and humming of domestic appliances i.e. electric kettle, ping of microwave etc.
 - The banging of cupboard doors.
 - General noise created by a working kitchen such as clattering of pots and pans and use of cooking utensils etc.
- We also have concerns regarding the installation of any higher voltage electrical wiring or gas pipes leading to the oven or hob/domestic appliances being adjacent to our adjoining party wall with the potential risk to our property of fire damage and/or gas explosion.
- The potential damage that the planned construction work can have to the structure of our property i.e. the possibility of cracks forming on our party wall/damage to existing brickwork.

We would also like to point out that this type of Sadler built semi-detached house has always been built with the kitchen located on an outer wall to maintain minimal disturbance to the neighbouring property. We therefore think the kitchen should remain in keeping with the original layout to avoid disruption and interference to our adjoining property.

Any noise issues arising should be addressed through separate environmental health legislation; any structural issues associated with the extension are matters dealt with under separate building control legislation.

Property value is not a material planning consideration.

We are also not aware of any other semi-detached property in this road which has a sink unit and dishwasher situated on an internal wall adjoining their neighbour's party wall and believe, in any circumstance, that this will have a detrimental effect to our property in relation to a resale value when having to declare the above-mentioned concerns to a potential buyer.

We do not object to the rear extension although could not see any mention of the 4 meters of boundary fence between our properties alongside the proposed extension which we were

informed by previous owners is the responsibility of No.58 and has been maintained by them for the last 30 years. We would therefore expect the boundary fence in totality to continue to be maintained by the owner and to remain in situ.

We have received no communication directly from the owner of No 58 regarding this proposed planning application and feel that the consequences to ourselves of the change of room use to a kitchen have been completely overlooked and ignored in relation to the proposed design layout plan and our well-being (Party Wall Act 1996, Paragraphs 40/41).

Please can you ensure that our comments are addressed in full at your consultation meeting and before making your decision regarding the proposed planning application. We would not expect any further progress to be made with this application until our concerns have been dealt with and/or for us to have the opportunity to seek advice should the need arise in relation to the Party Wall Act 1996 or otherwise. We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely
[Redacted text]

It is understood that the proposed extension is likely to take the place of the boundary fence up to the 4m length which will then act as the new boundary wall. The remaining fence will then abut to the new extension, closing off any gaps to maintain privacy. It is not proposed to reinstate the fence along the 4m length of the extension as it will be replaced with a solid masonry wall of the extension being facing brickwork to match the existing as shown on the proposed west elevation drawing.

Any requirements under the Party Wall Act are a separate legislative requirement outside of the planning application process.

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

(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 rear extension extends 4m from the rear elevation at a width of 7.4m, facilitating a seating and dining area attached to the relocated kitchen. The proposed side extension joins the rear extension at the rear elevation of the dwellinghouse, and extends along the east side elevation by 5.8m at a width of 1.5m to facilitate a new utility room and shower room. The proposed height is 2.9m, with the highest point being the proposed roof light at 3.1m. Within the rear elevation, patio doors are proposed adjacent to a uPVC window. Within the east side elevation, a high level window above 1.7m above FFL is proposed to serve the seating and dining area. A uPVC door is proposed to provide access between the hardstanding at the side of the property and the utility room. There is also a window proposed to serve the shower room within this elevation which would be obscure glazed and opening 1.7m above FFL. There are no windows or doors proposed in the south or west elevations. The proposed extension is likely to take the place of the boundary fence up to the 4m length which will then act as the new boundary wall. The remaining fence will then abut to the new extension, closing off any gaps to maintain privacy. It is not proposed to reinstate the fence along the 4m length of the extension as it will be replaced with a solid masonry wall of the extension being facing brickwork to match the existing as shown on the proposed west elevation drawing.

7.4 The roof of the proposed extension is to be constructed with single ply membrane as a flat roof. The brickwork is proposed to be to match, and windows are also proposed to be white uPVC to match. The doors are proposed to be white uPVC/ aluminium and the boundary treatments will remain as close boarded timber fences to match to maintain the boundary where brickwork is removed from part demolition of the garage.

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 is No.56 Highland Road. The proposal would be approximately 2m from the west elevation of this neighbouring property. The height and depth of the proposed extension is acceptable and is not considered to propose detrimental loss of light or outlook to this property. In addition, the windows on this side of the proposed extension are either high level or obscure glazed, meaning that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on privacy between the neighbouring properties.
- 7.7 To the west is No.60 Highland Road. The proposal would be up to the boundary of this property, with the external wall of the west elevation proposed to act as a new boundary wall in replacement of the existing fence, extending 4m along the boundary. The height and depth of the proposed extension is acceptable and is not considered to propose detrimental loss of light or outlook to this property. There are no windows within this elevation, meaning that there will not be any impact on privacy to this neighbouring property.
- 7.8 Whilst a number of concerns have been raised through the public consultation exercise regarding the implications of the internal room uses and relocation of the kitchen to the party wall with No.60, such changes to room arrangements do not in themselves require planning permission and are therefore outside the scope of the planning considerations associated with this case. Party Wall Act matters are similarly outside the purview of the planning process and are dealt with under separate legislation.
- 7.9 To the rear is 57 Bosmere Gardens. This property is around 31m from the rear of the proposal. This distance indicates that there is likely have a limited and acceptable impact on privacy, outlook or light to this property.
- 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).

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/23/01018 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:

18 Dec 2023	3323P01	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
18 Dec 2023	3323P02	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
18 Dec 2023	3323P03	LOCATION AND BLOCK PLAN

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.