

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Gwen Robinson

No Comment.

Councillor Mike Sceal

No Comment.

Councillor Peter Wade

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Whilst I still do not object to the application I do not feel the updated application takes into account the look of the rest of the street. The half hip roof, boxed front ground floor window and the gable roof projections above the first floor windows are not in keeping with street scene.	Please see Section 7.
I believe the extension should be a continuation of the existing look of the house as per the extension at the other	This has been amended with the proposed extension now matching the existing terraces to the front.

end of the terrace.	
The principle of the development is acceptable. However, object to the proposed front dormer.	Please see Section 7.

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
- (v) CIL

(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.

7.3 The proposal relates to the recent application reference APP/20/00730 which was refused on the grounds of appearing overbearing and being out of keeping with the character of the area. Furthermore, It was considered that the proposed extension would be an overly prominent and jarring form of development, resulting in an incongruous feature in the street scene at variance with the existing building line and otherwise open spacious character of the immediate area. The proposed plans here have removed the single storey extension and reduced the size of the proposed side extension.

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

7.4 The proposed development would involve a two storey side extension. It would have a width of approximately 4.2 metres, a depth of approximately 7.1 metres not further than the existing rear wall and a pitched roof with a maximum height of approximately 7.4 metres slightly below the existing ridge height. There would also be front and rear dormers of the same size with a length of approximately 1.7 metres, a depth of approximately 1.6 metres and pitched roofs with maximum heights of approximately 2.6 metres.

7.5 The proposed extension would have render and brickwork with interlocking concrete roof tiles to match the existing. This is considered to be inkeeping with the context of the main dwellinghouse.

7.6 It is considered that the proposed two storey side extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling, set back slightly from the front and rear of the property and off the existing ridge height, which would be accordance with the Havant borough Design Guide SPD. This is considered to be materially different from the previous proposal (APP/20/00730) due to its reduced size and design. Therefore, it is considered to be acceptable to the context of the main dwellinghouse and not deemed to have a negative impact on the character of the area.

- 7.7 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

- 7.8 With regards to the impact on No.35 Crystal Way to the side (north) the proposed extension would not project beyond the existing rear elevation of number 33 and would be approximately 4.5 metres from the boundary with this property. Although there is a new first floor window in the rear elevation of the extension, it is judged that this would not result in any unacceptable additional overlooking to the rear amenity area of this property.
- 7.9 In terms of the impact on No.31 Crystal Way to the rear and side (west) due to the location of this property, the rear elevation of the proposal would face the side elevation and garden of number 31 Crystal Way. The extension would be 14 metres from the boundary with this property. Whilst there could be the perception of additional overlooking to the garden of this property it would be to the side area behind the garage and a degree of overlooking already exists from the current first floor windows in the present rear elevation. It is therefore judged any resulting impact would not be unacceptable.
- 7.10 With regards to the impact on No.s 30, 32, 40 and 42 Crystal Way opposite (south and east) these properties are situated opposite the site, with the front elevation of the closest property at number 32 Crystal Way 17 metres away and the furthest at 22 metres away. Whilst the proposal would be visible from the front elevations of these properties, they are considered to be a sufficient distance away for any impact to be limited and acceptable
- 7.11 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking 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

- 7.12 There is an increase in the number of bedrooms from two to four, subsequently there will be a requirement for three on site parking spaces as recommended in the HBC Parking SPD (July 2016). There is currently no parking on site and the block plan only indicates the provision of one parking space to serve the property.
- 7.13 The agent advised the area is not particularly busy, enabling residents to park on the roadside if required, however a parking survey has not been carried out and submitted to verify this. Notwithstanding this, there are no parking restrictions on the road which is not a main thoroughfare, and a high proportion of the surrounding properties have private drives. Furthermore, there are several parking courts within the immediate area. Therefore, whilst it is acknowledged the proposal would result in a deficit of two on site parking spaces it is considered this would not be a defensible reason for refusal. This was deemed acceptable from the previous application APP/20/00730 and the position remains the same.

(v) CIL

7.14 The proposed development is under 100sqm. therefore not CIL liable.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00119

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, Block Plan and Proposed Plans - HOPA-002-P - 23.3.21

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.