

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East

No comment received

Councillor M Wilson - Hayling East

No comment received

Councillor R Raines - Hayling East

No comment 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: 2

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
No comment received	

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

- (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 This proposal seeks to regularise works that have already been completed and therefore is retrospective. The proposal comprises a single storey rear extension as well as an extension to the garage which is linked to the rear extension and other internal and external alterations. The garage has been extended by approximately 60cms additional depth from approved . The rear extension has a hipped roof with a ridge height of approximately 3.4 metres and an eaves height of 2.3 metres . This comes up to the boundary on the west side with a set off from the boundary on the east side. The extension features 4 rooflights and bi-fold doors to the rear and the garage also features doors to the rear. The rear extension allows for an open plan living space .
- 7.4 On the west side of the roof slope a new rooflight has been introduced and the rooflight heights and positions have been changed as well as the rooms which they serve. The previous approval allowed for two rooflights on the west side roof slope serving the stairwell and bathroom to the rear. The rear rooflight would now serve a dressing room, the middle rooflight would serve a stairwell area and the rooflight closest to the front would serve a bedroom. The rooflight windows on the east side roof slope have also been repositioned and pushed back closer towards the edges of both ends of the roof. The approved plans showed these to serve the landing and front bedroom - these would now serve two bathrooms. The rear first floor window has also been increased in size.
- 7.5 Internal changes have also taken place as noted above with the rear bathroom now a dressing room and there would now be two bathrooms on the east side of the first floor . The bedroom is now a different size to that approved with the stairwell repositioned.
- 7.6 Overall the alterations are considered to be acceptable. The changes to the garage are relatively minor in scale and the rear extension is in keeping with the design of the host dwelling and does not overdevelop the plot in scale. The rooflights do not significantly alter the appearance of the main dwelling and overall the changes are not deemed to result in harm to 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 To the east of the application is no 36 North Crescent. The garage is located just set off the shared boundary with no 36 however it would not project substantially beyond the rear elevation of no 36 and is not considered to result in harmful loss of light to this property. It is noted there was previously a garage which projected further out located alongside this side boundary. Whilst the rear rooflight would come closer towards the edge of the roof this would serve a bathroom and is not considered to offer views from a primary habitable room - views would be angled in the roof and no harmful direct overlooking has been identified. No objection has been received in this regard and on balance the impact is considered to be acceptable.

7.9 To the west is no 38 North Crescent. The rear extension has a depth and height which is in keeping with permitted development allowances which would not require planning permission. The reason why it requires planning permission is because it is joined to the garage which makes the width exceed permitted development allowances. The rear extension does not project far beyond the rear of no 38 and has a roof hipped inwards. No 38 is also set off the shared boundary. There is an additional rooflight to this side roof slope, the other rooflights are repositioned and larger than previously approved. The rear roof light would serve a dressing room although could be used as a bedroom in the future- this is set slightly further back from the rear elevation than approved however would have a lowered height. The impact of this window in terms of overlooking towards the rear garden of no 38 has been assessed and it is considered that, due to the angle of the roof and siting of the window within the roof, whilst there would be some increased view towards no 38 than previously approved, this would not be direct and would be angled due to the pitch of the roof. There would also be no direct views back towards the rooflight at no 38, with the closest window being that above the stairwell which would not allow for direct overlooking. On balance the impact of these rooflight windows are not considered to result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of no 38. It is noted no objections have been received.

7.10 There are no properties located immediately to the rear of the application site.

7.11 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). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Parking

7.12 The rear dressing room could be used as a bedroom room however the applicant states there are two bedrooms. There is no increased parking requirement between a two and a three bed property and therefore the existing on site parking would meet the Havant parking allocation requirements.

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 Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00307 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

18.235.AB100 REV C AMENDED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS AS BUILT
BLOCK PLAN
LOCATION PLAN

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.