
Site Address:	50 London Road, Cowplain, Waterloooville, PO8 8EN		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension, with associated landscaping, erection of single storey home office.		
Application No:	APP/20/00965	Expiry Date:	09/12/2020
Applicant:	Mr Becker		
Agent:	Mr Eitel	Case Officer:	Selina Donophy
	50.8 Architecture + Interiors		
Ward:	Cowplain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 This application site is a two storey, detached dwellinghouse located on the east side of London Road, Cowplain, Waterloooville. This property has a hipped roof and is constructed from brickwork and render, to the front is a pitched roof porch, supported by posts and the entrance is raised up, accessed via a stairway. To the north is a private access road, allowing vehicle access to the property off London Road, with parking in the front garden space as well as access to the properties located to the rear of the site.

2 Planning History

93/58014/000 - Single storey front extension, PERM,01/03/1993
04/58014/001 - Outline application for detached bungalow and garage., PERM,22/11/2004
05/58014/002 - Removal of existing detached single garage and resiting of garage to front (north west) garden of the property., REF,22/02/2005
07/58014/003 - Outline application for 1No. detached bungalow and garage., PERM,03/12/2007
08/58014/004 - Outline application for erection of 2No. 4bed chalet bungalows and 1No. 3bed bungalow., REF,24/06/2008
APP/10/00688 - Outline application for the erection of 1No. detached bungalow and garage. (Renewal of Planning Permission 07/58014/003.), WD,10/03/2011
APP/10/00962 - Reserved Matters Application for 1No. detached bungalow relating to appearance and landscaping following Outline Planning Permission 07/58014/003., PERM,22/02/2011
APP/11/00979 - Discharge of Condition No/s 3(ii)g and 3(ii)w of Outline Planning Permission 07/58014/003 and Discharge of Condition No/s 2 & 7 of Planning Permission Reserved Matters Application APP/10/00962., PERM,23/06/2011
APP/11/01216 - Erection of 1No. detached 3 bed bungalow and detached single storey garage. (Revised Application.), PERM,07/10/2011
APP/11/01857 - Erection of 1No. pair of semi detached 3 bed bungalows and replacement detached garage for existing dwelling., PERM,28/06/2012
APP/12/00876 - Erection of 2No. 2 bed detached bungalows and replacement detached garage for existing dwelling., PERM,23/10/2012
APP/14/00667 - Discharge of Condition No. 2 of Planning Permission APP/12/00876., PERM,24/07/2014
APP/14/01034 - Application for Non-Material Amendments to APP/12/00876 in

relation to removal of chimneys; fenestration amendments and internal alterations;
minor adjustment to rear projection (plot 1); boundary fence between existing house
and new garage moved; minor amendments to parking and turning, landscaping
update and replacement planting following removal of existing hedge.,

PERM,30/10/2014

APP/14/01198 - Proposed double garage and workshop for approved Plot 2.

(Amendment to previously approved scheme reference APP/12/00876).,

PERM,05/02/2015

3 Proposal

Single storey rear extension, with associated landscaping, erection of single storey
home office & shed.

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)

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

Comment from case officer : Upon consideration there are no trees sited within close
proximity of the application site.

Councillor A Briggs - Cowplain

No comment

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

No comment

Councillor Narinder Bains - Cowplain

No comment

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

Thank you for consulting Environmental Health on this application.

We would require additional supporting information regarding the application due to concerns of the impact on available amenity of the area.

It appears that the application seeks to put in place a log burner in the dining room of the proposed extension. We would require detailed information of the proposed flu including discharge height and location, to ensure it is located in an appropriate manor as to not detrimentally impact the amenity of the area.

I would have concerns regarding noise from use of the gym and hot tub depending on the type of sound insulation provided by the build. I would like further demonstration that the materials and build has been considered, of both the shed/gym and the hot tub & Hydro pool/home office, to ensure that the amenity of the area is not detrimentally affected by the use of the site.

This can be conditioned if necessary by the carrying out of a satisfactory noise report by a competent person, and submitted to the Local Authority for approval.

Case officer comment : These comments from Environmental Health are no longer applicable as the applicant has since removed these elements from the scheme.

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: 10

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
I have no major objections to the plans for the development of 50 London Rd, but there are a few issues that need to be taken into consideration.	Amendmnets have been made to the proposals and therefore some of the comments received no longer relate to the current proposal.
The property boundary as shown in drawing 1430296 (and others in the set) is in error - there should be a distinct gap between the north wall of 48 London Rd and the land of 50 London Rd. As shown in the drawing, therefore, part of the proposed shed/gym would be built on the property of 48 London Rd, which is unacceptable. Further to this I would hope that the shed/gym would be a sufficient distance from the wall of 48 London Rd such that reasonable access will be retained for essential maintenance purposes and in order to clear the build	The gym has since been removed from the plans. Please see above

up of any material that could bridge the damp-proof course of 48 London Rd. For the last 34 years or more, where the gap between the North wall of 48 London Rd and the main property of 50 London Rd has simply been used as hard standing, it has afforded reasonable access, by agreement, for the maintenance of the north aspect of 48 London Rd. This access should be retained, albeit in a modified form, to the benefit of both properties. I am also concerned that what is essentially a wooden building placed near 48 London Rd could be a fire hazard and it is directly beneath the escape route, from the main bedroom of number 48, provided by the roof windows. It is not obvious that the foundations/drainage of the proposed shed/gym will not interfere with the foundations and drainage of 48 London Rd and I would be grateful if this could be borne in mind in any essential modifications to the positioning of the shed/gym. I hope these matters can be taken into consideration and will result in modifications to the proposed development.	Please see above This would be addressed under building regs application.
Whilst we have no objection in principle to the above planning application, we do wish to express our concern in two areas which may impact our property. The first area is that the extension is right on the boundary of both properties and we are concerned as to the effect it may have on the stability of our garage and drive. The distance between the edge of our garage wall and the boundary fence is 410 mm. The height of the garage wall from the floor to the soffits is 2340 mm, bearing in mind that the proposed rear wall of the building is shown as 2980mm. Our drive along the boundary fence has a slope away from the garage of 220mm thus making the other end of the proposed building that much higher.	No longer relevant due to revised plans

Our second concern is that under the planning approval for the properties 50A and 50B APP/12/00876 para 5 it states that a turning space must be provided within the site to enable vehicles to enter and leave in forward gear. The turning space currently forms part of the drive shared by nos 50, 50A and 50B. The proposed new boundary wall for no 50 would appear to compromise this provision.	The alterations to the turning circle will be discussed in the 'planning considerations' section.
Further comments relating to comments above : Thank you for your letter dated 16th December informing that a revised planning application had been submitted for the above reference. It would appear that our original concern regarding the proximity of the office building to the boundary of our garage and driveway no longer exists. The other concern we had was that under the planning approval granted for the building of properties 50A and 50B (ref APP/12/00876 para 5) it stated that a turning space must be provided within the site to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. The turning space presently forms part of the drive shared by numbers 50, 50A and 50B. It is difficult to see from the revised drawings how this has been addressed.	The alterations to the turning circle will be discussed in the 'planning considerations' section.

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) Access and 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.

7.3 The initial proposal for this application included a gym proposed to the south of the

property , as well as larger outbuildings proposed to the rear garden. Upon consideration it was judged that the scale of the extensions and outbuildings combined would result in an overdeveloped and cluttered appearance , reducing the rear garden to a depth deemed unacceptable for the current occupiers and any future occupiers. Subsequently the gym has been removed from the plans , the office has been reduced in size and altered in position and the rear extension has been reduced in scale.

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

- 7.4 This proposal comprises a single storey rear extension and linked home office building as well as alterations to the front of the property, which include enlarging the raised platform and flattening the existing pitched porch roof. As the office is attached to the proposed rear extension, this will be considered as one extension , forming a Lshape which juts out towards the south although it will be discussed in two separate parts known as 'the rear extension' and 'the home office' for ease of visualising . The rear extension would have a flat roof with an approximate height of 3.2 metres, although it is noted there are some slight land level changes, it would follow the width of the existing property and would have a depth of approximately 3.7 metres . This would form a living and dining area to the rear which would be served by a set of 5 rooflights and bi-fold doors to the rear. The home office would attach to the rear extension towards the south of the site and would have a depth of approximately 4.9 metres , creating a maximum depth of approximately 8.6 metres accounting for the rear extension and home office combined. The home office would step out towards the south (side) boundary by 2 metres, leaving a 1 metre gap to the side boundary and it would have a width of approximately 5.1 metres, would have a flat roof and doors to the north and west elevations. Materials proposed include white render to the rear extension and vertical timber cladding to the home office.
- 7.5 The plans also include alterations to the front elevation, increasing the raised area forming the entrance in depth , creating a centralised stairway entrance and flattening the pitch of the porch roof. The front of the property would be rendered in white . Alterations to the boundary treatment are also proposed which include 1.8 metre high fencing to the front and side elevations . It would include a side gate set at the same height as the fence which would open inwards. There is currently foliage to the front elevation which would be retained , with the fence sited behind this, however the side elevation is currently open. The fence would be visible when approaching the property from the north , however the streetscene along London Road is varied with properties generally set back from the road in the immediate area, although with no standard pattern of boundary treatments. In general, the fence is not deemed overly harmful to the character of the area .
- 7.6 The proposed extensions would be sited towards the rear of the site and would generally be hidden from the public realm, although the access drive to the rear runs adjacent to the property and rear garden. In design terms the extensions are judged to be acceptable in appearance. The setting of this site includes a rear garden that is fairly constrained in size - the proposals would reduce the outdoor amenity space to the rear further . The Havant Borough Design Guide states that rear gardens should have a minimum of 10 metres and this is to allow for quality of enjoyment for both present and future occupiers. From the office to the northern boundary there would be approximately 9 metres retained and from the rear elevation of the rear extension to the rear (east) boundary there would be approximately 9.3 metres retained. Whilst this is just below the 10 metres as stipulated in the Design Guide , on balance it is judged that this loss of space would not be harmful enough to substantiate a refusal.

- 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 north of the site is no 52 London Road. This is a detached property, separated from the application property by approximately 10 metres, with the access road sited between them. The proposals aren't judged to have any harmful impact on the amenity of this property.
- 7.9 To the rear (east) of the application site are nos 50A and 50B London Road. There would be approximately 5.5 metres separation distance between the home office extension and the garage to the rear belonging to no 50B - the extensions would be set away from the properties to the rear so as not to have any harmful impact upon them.
- 7.10 To the south of the application site is no 48 London Road which is located alongside the shared boundary . The home office extension would be set forward of the rear of no 48 by approximately 3.5 metres , meaning it would slightly clip the 45 degree line of the mid point of the rear french doors at no 48, however the impact of this is not considered harmful enough to substantiate a refusal . The impact is therefore considered 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) Access and parking

- 7.12 This proposal includes the removal of the existing turning area located to the side of the front garden at no 50. This turning circle was conditioned under APP/12/00876 when the two bungalows were granted permission to the rear as the third parking space serving no 50 was also sited to the rear under these plans. Under application APP/14/01198 this space was removed from the rear as it was noted that the front garden space was being used for parking . It has been shown that 3 parking spaces can be provided for towards the front of no 50 , which has an area of approximately 13 metres by 10 metres , allowing adequate space for turning so that vehicles can leave the site in forward gear onto London Road which is a classified road. For this reason it is judged to be acceptable for the turning circle to be removed.

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/20/00965

(A) 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:

P214B Amended proposed south elevation 1
P220 Proposed south elevation 2
P003B Amended proposed site plan
P112A Proposed first floor
P113A Proposed roof
P211A Proposed ground floor
P211A Proposed west elevation
P212A Proposed north elevation
P213A Proposed east elevation

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.