
Site Address: 14 Esmond Close, Emsworth, PO10 7HX
Proposal: An extension of an existing dwelling including a 2 storey extension to the side (North) to existing garage, a single story to the rear and loft conversion with front dormer
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/23/00637 Expiry Date: 19/09/2023
Applicant: Miss Mackinlay
Agent: Mrs Alexander Case Officer: Joseph Toole
Helyer Davies Architects Ltd
Ward: Emsworth

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

14 Esmond Close, Emsworth, is a link detached property located to the west side of Esmond Close. The property comprises of brown facing brickwork with clay roof tiles. Vehicular access is from Esmond Close with parking to the front and side.

The property is located within a residential area with some surrounding properties of the same design and others differing.

2 Planning History

No relevant planning history.

3 Proposal

The proposal includes a two storey side extension over the existing garage, which would be converted to living accommodation, to provide a utility room and part of the kitchen on the ground floor and part bedroom and bathroom on the first floor. There would be a single storey rear extension to be used as a living room and part kitchen. Furthermore, the proposal would include a loft conversion with a front dormer to incorporate a loft room and bathroom on the second floor. There would also be a new entrance porch to the front of the property.

The following changes to the proposal include:

Removal of rear dormer - replaced with rooflights
A reduction in the width of the first-floor 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)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

ENP_D1 (General Design Policy)
ENP_D2 (Height, Mass & Materials)
ENP_D3 (Layout, Form & Density)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Grainne Rason

No Comment.

Councillor Lulu Bowerman

No Comment.

Councillor R Kennett

No Comment.

County Archaeologist

When the houses of this area were built evidence was observed indicating the presence of a Saxon domestic site, although little can be said about its date or extent. There is a high archaeological potential that archaeological evidence will be encountered, but in view of the small scale of development and the degree to which the construction of the existing building will have compromised archaeological survival at the site it is my opinion that the burden of an archaeological condition would not be merited.

However I would be grateful if you could draw this consultation response to the attention of the applicant and request that should archaeological discoveries become apparent during works that they contact me so that I can make a note of any material found.

Officer Comment:

These comments were passed onto the agent to inform the applicant.

Emsworth Residents Forum

No Comment.

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: 14

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 8 - 7 objections - 1 neutral

Comment	Officer Comment
Original plans	
Distance to the rear is a minimum of 21 metres	These plans have been updated.
Side extension contrary to Havant Borough Design Guide - closer than 2 metres to the neighbouring property	Please see Section 7.
Dormers dominate the roof - out of character	
Rear dormer would cause harmful overlooking and impact on loss of privacy	
Hedge unlikely to survive	
Rooflights instead a better alternative	
Rear ground floor extension could result in the loss of light	
Proposed works out of scale with the existing property	
Hedge should be retained	
Parking concerns	
Overdevelopment of the site	
Two storey side extension too close to other property	
Impact on loss of light from rear extension	
Stealing of land	
Damage to my property	
Foundations of the proposed extension will undermine my house foundations	Any damage to third party land would be a private matter between the parties involved.
Drain issues	
Loss of light from proposed north side extension	Any drainage issues would be a Building Control matter.

Loss of light from ground floor extension beyond 45 degrees angle Where is the 3 metre measurement taken from? Object to toilet on second floor putting a stench pipe above the existing roof line Builders will knock down my utility area Scaffolding concerns Noise concerns Object to sedum roof - seeds everywhere Clarification on boundary walls	Please see Section 7.
Revised plans (1) Description needs updating Removal of rear dormer welcomed - height of velux windows would need to position to prevent overlooking Previous objections still relevant - front dormer out of keeping, parking concerns Maintain objection to the design of the proposed two storey side extension Two storey overbearing and cause overshadowing. Havant Design Guide SPD says first floor side extension should not be closer than metres from the boundary Reduce gaps between the properties Create a tunnel between the two properties Drawings in design and access statement are different to the proposed site plan and proposed plans Front boundary queries	Noted - this has now been updated. Please see Section 7. The design has now been amended which reduces its size. This is due to amended plans provided. This does not form part of the application.

Revised Plans (2)	
The latest plan submitted seem to address all my concerns with the original plan not being in keeping with the Havant Design Guidelines.	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) Parking matters

(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 works would have brickwork to match the existing property with timber cladding detailing applied to the proposed dormer. There would also be clay roof tiles to match the existing property. These materials are considered to be of modern contemporary design deemed appropriate within the context of the area. It is worth noting there is a number of different finishes within the immediate locality along with timber cladding being applied to 10a Esmond Close.

7.4 The proposed works to the front and side would be visible from the street scene along Esmond Close with parts of the scheme to the rear being visible from Seafields. The proposed works to the porch is not considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the area being the same size as existing, with the exception of a mono pitched roof, which would improve the front appearance of the dwelling.

7.5 With regard to the proposed side extension due to its ridge height being offset from the existing ridge height of the property, being hipped away and set in at first floor level it is considered to appear subservient to the host dwelling complying with the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD. It is noted the proposed side extension would infill part of the gap between the side of No.12a and the development. However, following amended plans to set back the 2 storey element from this boundary, this part of the proposal, would provide space between the buildings, which would be reflective of other developments within the locality, which would not result in an adverse impact on the street scene. In terms of the proposed front dormer the design is considered to be appropriate and of a scale that would be in proportion with the existing roof. Other front dormers are found in the locality, most notably No.s 5 and 6 Seafields. Therefore, the front dormer is not considered to have an adverse impact upon the street scene. The single storey to the rear, due to its distance from Seafields and being partly screened by the surrounding properties is not considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the area. Overall, the proposal is considered to be of an acceptable scale given the plot size, the retained amenity space and size in comparison to other properties of similar scale within the area.

- 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) and Havant's 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

- 7.7 The proposed works to the front of the property is not considered to have an adverse impact on the neighbouring properties opposite.
- 7.8 As to 12a Esmond Close to the north this has a small mono pitched structure on the south side of the dwelling, which is currently attached to an existing garage on the application site. From the Officer's visit this provides a covered walkway from a side door from a kitchen to gain access to the front and rear of this property. This structure does not provide primary accommodation for this property. The proposed side extension would be adjacent this walkway at ground floor, following the demolition of the existing garage.
- 7.9 Concerning the proposed side extension this would not extend beyond the rear wall of the existing dwellinghouse at first floor, which would be set back off the boundary. Due to its reduced scale and that it would face out onto the flank wall of No.12a it is not considered to appear overbearing or result in the harmful loss of light to the neighbouring occupiers. It is worth noting there would not be any side windows facing this elevation, nor are there any side windows in the flank wall of No.12a Esmond Close. The proposed rear extension would only extend out 2 metres further than the existing utility room, therefore it is not considered to have an adverse impact on No.12a. Whilst the side extension would result in some of loss of light to the walkway on the side of No.12a, as this is not primary accommodation space it would not have an adverse impact on amenity such as to warrant a refusal.
- 7.10 On the south side facing No.48 Beacon Square the proposed rear extension would be offset from the shared boundary and screened by the existing boundary treatment thus not considered to have an adverse impact on the neighbouring occupiers.
- 7.11 In terms of the proposed works to the rear the proposed single storey rear extension would be screened by boundary treatment thus not considered to have an adverse impact on No.9 Seafields. With regards to the proposed two storey side extension the windows at first floor serving the bedroom are considered to create views already established on site therefore not considered to cause harmful overlooking. At second floor level there would be two rooflights above 1.7 metres in floor height to reduce overlooking concerns to No.9 Seafields.
- 7.12 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).

(iv) Parking matters

- 7.13 The proposal would involve the loss of one car parking space in the form of the garage, increasing of the number of bedrooms from 3 to 5. According to the Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and the Havant Borough Parking Standards SPD three car parking must be provided on site. There is considered to be appropriate space to provide 3 car parking spaces on site and therefore policy compliant.

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/23/00637 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 and Proposed Block Plan - 22159-02- REV E
Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations - 22159-03- REV F

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.