
Site Address: 54 Lone Valley, Waterlooville, PO7 5EB
Proposal: Construction of single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/23/00527 Expiry Date: 06/09/2023
Applicant: Mr Holder
Agent: Loretta Taylor Case Officer: Ikrame Essalih
 Thorns - Young Ltd
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 54 Lone Valley, Waterlooville is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse with accommodation in the roof space, constructed in old English mixture rustic yellow bricks with element of pebble dash at the ground floor façades level and tiles hanging on dormer windows walls. The roof is of half-hipped style and constructed in brown concrete tiles with two gable dormers and a roof light to the front elevation and three gable dormers to the rear elevation. The property has an integrated garage to the north side and a conservatory on the south side elevation.
- 1.2 The site is located at the east side of Lone Valley and characterised by a gently slopped ground. The front of the property is paved and allows for approximately three parking spaces and a pedestrian access to the rear garden through a wooden gate on the south side of the house.
- 1.3 The surrounding area is residential in character with properties of similar design and heights and some others differing.

2 Planning History

08/72828/000 - Dormer windows to front and rear and build up of gable ends to extended roof., PERM,13/03/2008

3 Proposal

The proposal comprises the demolition of an existing conservatory on the south side elevation and the construction of a wraparound extension formed by single story pitched side extension and flat roof rear 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)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Husky Patel

No comments received.

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No comments received.

Councillor Ryan Brent

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: 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) 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 development would result in the demolition of an existing conservatory and the construction of a single storey side and rear extensions. The side extension would be flush with the existing south side elevation wall with a width of 1.75 metres and a mono pitched roof and an eaves height of 2.9 metres and of a similar pitch to the existing one on the main dwellinghouse. The side extension would wrap around the rear of the property connecting to the proposed flat roof rear extension which would be of 5.5 metres in total width, projecting beyond the rear wall of the dwellinghouse by approximately 2.95 metres with an eaves height of 2.9 metres.
- 7.4 The new space on the side would create a utility room towards the front of the property served by a window on the front elevation, and partly merged with the rear extension there would an expansion of the existing kitchen space with a rooflight above, glass doors to the rear garden and a window on the side elevation facing north. The proposed extensions would have brickwork, tile hanging and pebbledash on the walls and concrete tiles on the pitched roof, all matching existing style and materials. On this basis, the proposed works are considered to be in keeping with the main dwellinghouse.
- 7.5 The side extension, as part of the proposed works, would be visible from the public realm. However, considering the modest width of the side construction, the proposed pitched roof reflecting the design of the main house but remaining subservient to the existing main half-hipped roof and the appropriate proportion, material and position of the front window, the extension is deemed in keeping with the main dwellinghouse and the character of the area.
- 7.6 The rear part of the side extension and the rear extension would not be visible from the street scene. Also, the design and size of the extension would be modest in scale and in keeping with the main dwellinghouse.
- 7.7 Considering all of the above, the design, mass 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

- 7.8 The proposed wraparound extension would be set back from the boundary line with the adjoining property at No.52 by approximately 700 mm. Whilst the side extension would seem to be close to the south boundary line, it would for part of its extent be similarly positioned to the existing conservatory. Furthermore, the design of the side extension would be an improvement to the south side elevation of the property counting that it doesn't have any windows on that side. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any harmful impact of overlooking or loss of privacy on the neighbouring property.
- 7.9 It is noted that the adjacent property at No.52 have existing windows facing the south side elevation of the application site. However, the windows are serving bathrooms and a ground floor kitchen where the side elevation would be set back by approximately 2.5 metres from the side boundary making a total of approximately 3.2 metres between side elevation walls. Also, the windows are mainly screened by the existing 1.8 metres fence. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any harmful impact of overshadowing on this neighbouring property.

- 7.10 On the other side of the application site is the adjoining property at No.56. As the side extension would be mainly screened by the property and as the rear extension would be located at approximately 8.6 metres further from the boundary line where a fence of 1.8 metres is existing and where the neighbouring property at No.56 has no main windows facing the proposal, it is considered that the proposed wraparound extension would be positioned at a sufficient distance to have any adverse impact on this neighbouring property.
- 7.11 The properties located to the rear and on the opposite side of the application site are considered to be located at sufficient distance to receive any adverse impact from the proposed development.
- 7.12 Considering the mass and design of the proposed extensions, the setback distance from the existing boundaries between the proposed built and the neighbouring properties, it is considered that the proposal would not have any adverse impacts on the residential amenity of these neighbouring properties. Therefore, the proposal does not appear overbearing or lead to loss of privacy or overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the immediately adjacent properties and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is noted no letter of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is adequate in principle. The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties, the streetscene and the character of the area and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00527, 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:

7137.23.1 Existing & Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations
Location Plan dated 12th July 2023
Proposed 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.