
Site Address:	4 Hartwood Gardens, Waterloooville, PO8 8RA		
Proposal:	Proposed two storey side extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/22/01169	Expiry Date:	08/02/2023
Applicant:	Mr Jones		
Agent:	Mr Wyatt	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Wyatt Design and Build		
Ward:	Hart Plain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to a modest detached dwelling set on a private drive off the end of the cul-de-sac of Hartwood Gardens. The private drive serves 3 other dwellings and the correct Notice has been served on all other parties that own the private drive. The application dwelling is set at 90 degrees to the private drive and its curtilage extends with 3 linked but essentially separate rectilinear chunks to its north, west and south. The southern section comprises a garage and the parking to serve the dwelling. The garden to the west is enclosed by fencing and has a shed located within its south-western corner. The garden area to the north comprises the sitting out area and has a series of outbuildings along the northern boundary.
- 1.2 The site has an unusual relationship with its surrounding properties - the rear gardens of the dwellings in Silvester Road abut the north, and western boundaries. There is then another private cul-de-sac off Silvester Road that extends such that the front curtilage of bungalow 1B Lawrence Avenue abuts the southern boundary of the western garden area.
- 1.3 The application dwelling is chalet style with steeply pitched roof containing sloping pitched dormers in its front (south) elevation. It is constructed on pale red bricks beneath a dark tiled roof. There are other properties in the immediate area of Hartwood Gardens of identical design - notably numbers 5 and 6 which are joined as a pair of semi's, and number 2.

2 Planning History

APP/15/00886 - Retention of storage shed., PERM,03/11/2015

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Proposed two storey side extension.
- 3.2 The proposed extension would effectively double the size of the property by adding a two storey side extension that follows the ridge and eaves line of the main house. The existing dwelling has a footprint of 6.9m wide and 6.9m is proposed to be added. The side extension would be cedar clad with concrete tiles to match and includes a large first floor window with Juliet opening in the side (western) end.

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)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

n/a

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Southern Water

map provided of approximate position of existing public foul sewer - *close to east elevation*

the 1350mm public sewer requires a 5m clearance

no new development or tree planting within 5m;

no soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or other surface water retaining or conveying features within 5m;

existing infrastructure should be protected during construction.

if any other sewer found then must be investigated;

formal application required for any new connection

surface water discharge should follow part H3 of Building Regs and encourage reuse.

Officer comment: *existing sewer runs on the opposite side of the dwelling & curtilage to the proposed development - and is over 8m away.*

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: 13

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>1. Privacy</u> Our bungalow is in a secluded plot at the very end of a private roadway and is not overlooked by any houses around it as we wanted privacy. It is also set down at a lower level to 4 Hartwood Gardens such that cannot currently even see the application house. The proposed extension will mean that the majority of the proposed extension will be visible to us and it will involve 3 - 4 windows on the Southern elevation looking directly down onto our lower bungalow plot. Their garage will not obscure or screen the view from any of the proposed new windows. Proposal provides for several full height windows (or double doors) on the ground floor and one or two dormer windows on the first floor, all of which will look directly down onto our plot. <u>2. Loss of Outlook</u> Currently, our outlook from our Northern elevation is expansive and as the application dwelling is of to the side it can barely be seen. Remaining houses to the North are those on Silvester Road which are approx. 60 metres or more away. Consequently most of the sky is currently visible and for about 120 degrees laterally. The proposed extension will be imposing as it would be two-storey (the same height as the existing house) and on a plot that is already raised above our lower bungalow site. It would extend across most of our north elevation and so completely block a substantial part of our northerly outlook.	Noted - see section 7 re separation distances The existing line of trees helps to screen & separation distances are adequate The south elevation includes one dormer (serving a bedroom), one roof light (serving a bathroom), and two slimline ground floor windows (serving the extended lounge) which, given the separation distances in a built up area would not result in material harm to amenity The existing outlook is to a line of trees which acts as a buffer, with the skyline above currently clear; due to offset siting the 7m side extension would only partly align with this neighbour and the separation distance is such that it would have minimal impact to outlook above trees

3. Light Pollution / Loss of Light

For the same reasons as point 2 above, we have minimal light pollution from the northerly outlook - it is very dark at night.

The proposed extension will involve light from 2 full height windows (or double doors) on the ground floor level and 2 windows at first floor level approx 20 metres away, thereby having a significant impact on light pollution.

Also our Northern elevation benefits from natural light into the rooms on that elevation. Because of its lower down plot and bungalow construction, all these rooms in our Northern elevation already suffer from low natural light and proposed extension would block out a significant part of that natural light making our Northern rooms even darker.

4. Scale of Proposed Extension

A comparison of the submitted plans against satellite imagery suggests that the plans are not to the correct scale. The plans suggest that the proposed extension will only extend into approx. one quarter of the land to the side of the house, whereas the satellite image clearly shows that is not right and in fact it would extend into approx. half of the land to the side. It is a substantial proposed addition taking up a significant part of the land.

5. No Subservient Nature of Proposed Extension

The proposed extension is a mirror image of the existing house. It is not subservient in any way and essentially doubles the size of the house. It would extend into the side garden.

There is already a significant pitched roof outbuilding at the Western end of the side garden (which is about half the size of the existing house) and for which retrospective permission was sought. As a result of the outbuilding, the majority of that side garden would be filled with buildings. It will therefore have a substantial impact on our outlook.

In this existing urban area additional light pollution is not considered to constitute a sustainable reason for refusal

The separation distances in question are considered too great to result in any overshadowing or impact on light to rooms

Satellite imagery is not considered to be as accurate as plans drawn to scale

Noted - see section 7

The application asserts that the impact of no subservient nature will be minimal for houses on Silvester Road, which are much further away, but pays no regard at all to other houses on Lawrence Ave which are much closer and so more impacted. The proposed extension does not front a public highway, it is close to Lawrence Ave and so will be very visible from that road and the proposed Juliet balcony will look directly onto that road.	
<u>6. Potential to Create two Separate Dwellings</u> Whilst the application states that two staircases as proposed is not intended to provide for 'splitting' into two separate dwellings in future, it clearly creates an easy opportunity to do so, whether by the current owners, or future owners in due course. <u>7. Parking</u> The application states that an additional parking space will be added to allow for parking of 3 vehicles. The location of the proposed additional space is not shown on the plans. However appears to already have space for 3 vehicles - 2 in front of the garage and 1 on the Eastern side driveway - it is not clear where the additional space is intended or whether it is needed, or whether it is intended to provide for a 4th parking space nor is the need for it explained. To the extent any additional space or driveway is intended to be constructed along the Southern elevation (between the house and garage or beyond) then it is objected to on the grounds of noise and privacy as it would be immediately adjacent to the boundary adjacent our property.	Noted - see section 7 - conditions could control future use Noted - currently a 2 bed dwelling, would become 4 beds requiring 3rd space - see section 7 Not proposed in this area

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. It is noted that the proposed householder application extension would result in a dwelling having two staircases. This is due to the difficulty in gaining first floor access to rooms without compromising an already small bedroom. The application is for extensions and the site would remain a single family dwelling and is to be determined on this basis. However, the layout and presence of a similar pair of semis at number 5 & 6, demonstrates that it could be possible to subdivide the dwelling in the future to create 2 dwellings, and in this instance it is considered necessary to condition the occupation of the dwelling as a single unit only.

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

7.3 The proposed extension would replicate the design of the existing dwelling with matching ridge, eaves and dormer features and would double the size of this modest dwelling. As a result it is not subservient and as such does not technically comply with the Borough Design Guide SPD. However the property is in a unique set back location and is not viewed in any traditional street scene context. It is noted that a pair of semis at number 5 and 6 are of the same design and therefore their scale and mass equates to the proposed development. Since the proposed footprint and scale of development is not out of context with the character of the area, then the principle of the doubling of the size is considered acceptable in principle. The design detailing matches the host dwelling and would be visually appropriate.

7.4 Furthermore, the site has ample garden areas and as such can readily accommodate an extension of this size. Notably the western side garden area has a length of at least 20m and would retain a length of 13 to 14m.

7.5 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal is not subservient, it would however result in a cohesive design that both respects the design of the host dwelling and scale of development in the area. Since the side extension would not be visible from any public viewpoint (just oblique views from private properties - see section below), then it is not considered to be visually harmful to the character or appearance of the area. Overall, 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).

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.6 The siting of the application dwelling is such that it has a back to back separation of some 22m to the nearest property in Silvester Road, and a front to front separation of some 18m to the nearest property in Lawrence Avenue. These dimensions would be maintained as a result of the development and meet with the recommended minimums in the Borough Design Guide SPD.
- 7.7 There is a large shed located within the south western corner of the site, and outside the application site, along the southern boundary, is a line of old evergreen fir trees. In combination these provide screening to No 1B Lawrence Avenue. This bungalow is set at a slightly lower level and whilst the proposed two storey side addition will likely be partly visible above the trees, nevertheless this would remain offset and due to the distances, have no material harm to the outlook of number 1B. For the same reasons the proposed windows in the development would be unlikely to result in any direct loss of privacy or loss of light or overshadowing.
- 7.8 The proposal does include a large first floor Juliet opening which would enable views out and over the rear gardens of numbers 93 and 97 Silvester Road, as well as the front garden of 1B Lawrence Avenue. Number 97's garden is dog legged and any views would not be over any private sitting out area. Views towards 93 and 1B would be more oblique and in the case of 1B partly screened. Regard must be had to existing views from front and rear first floor windows and the fact that in such residential areas some degree of cross overlooking is possible. It is considered that the first floor side opening would not result in any significant additional, or direct loss of, privacy to neighbours private amenity areas.
- 7.9 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

- 7.10 The existing dwelling has 2 bedrooms and the proposed development would result in 4 bedrooms. To comply with the adopted Parking SPD three on site spaces are required to serve a 4 bedroom dwelling. The site already has sufficient space for the parking of 3 cars (in front of the garage and alongside the house) so it is not necessary to condition the provision of any additional space.

(v) CIL

- 7.11 The floor space of the proposed additions amounts to less than 100sqm and is therefore not CIL liable.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on character of the area and 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/22/01169 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 resultant extended dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied as a single family dwelling only, and the site shall not be subdivided to form a separate unit of accommodation.

Reason: The application has been determined as a householder extension and not as a new dwelling, which raises other issues, having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 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.

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

Location and Block Plan - Drawing number P/HG/4.0

Proposed Elevations - Drawing number P/HG/7.0

Proposed Floor plans - Drawing number P/HG/2.1

Design & Access Statement by Wyatt Design & Build dated 29/11/2022

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.