

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Gary Robinson
No Comment.

Councillor Kenneth Smith
No Comment.

Councillor Mark Inkster
No Comment.

Southern Gas Network
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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Unclear issues with plans	Please see Section 7.
Timing of application is inappropriate, especially at this stage of the severe COVID-19 lock down.	This is not a material planning consideration
Traffic disruptions	This is not a material planning consideration
Parking of vehicles and scaffolding will not block access to my property.	This would be a matter for the Police to deal with

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

(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 development would involve the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension over the existing ground floor on both sides of the dwelling. The proposal would involve a first floor side extension on the south side. It would go above the existing utility room and have a width of approximately 2.6 metres, a depth of approximately 3.7 metres and a pitched roof with a maximum height of approximately 8.6 metres, lower than the existing ridge of the property. On the north side there would be a first floor extension above the existing study which would be used as a dressing room. It would have a width of approximately 2.8 metres, a depth of approximately 7.1 metres and a pitched roof with a maximum height of approximately 6.8 metres. The proposed development would also involve the removal of the existing conservatory with a single storey rear extension which would have a width of approximately 9.5 metres, a depth of approximately 4 metres with a pitched roof having a maximum height of approximately 3.6 metres.

7.4 The proposed development would have facing brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing property. This is considered to be inkeeping with the context of the main dwellinghouse.

7.5 The proposed works would be visible from the street scene in the form of the proposed side extensions. Due to the proposed side extensions being set back from the front of the property and below the existing ridge it would appear subservient to the host dwellinghouse and accord with the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD. The proposed rear extension would not be readily visible from the street scene and is considered to be subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of the retained amenity space. To this regard the proposed development is considered to be inkeeping with the character of 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). 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 To the front of the property there would be no additional windows in the proposed first floor extensions therefore it is deemed acceptable.

- 7.8 On the south side there would be no side windows in the proposed side extension. The land slopes down towards No.7 Glebe Park Avenue which have a ground floor window facing the application site. Due to the orientation and No.7 Glebe Park Avenue already being overshadowed it is not considered to result in the harmful additional loss of light. Furthermore, as the proposed extension would extend above the existing ground floor side extension and would not extend any closer to the boundary it is not considered to appear overbearing to the neighbouring property. The proposed rear extension would also have no side windows. The proposed extension would line up with the rear wall of No.7 Glebe Park Avenue and would be screened by the existing fencing. Therefore, it is not considered to result in overlooking or appear overbearing and result in the harmful loss of light to the neighbouring property.
- 7.9 On the north side the proposed side extension would have no side windows and abut a shared access road to the properties to the rear. Therefore, it is not considered to cause overlooking or appear overbearing and result in the harmful loss of light of any of the neighbouring properties. The proposed rear extension would have no side windows and have the same depth as the existing conservatory screened by the existing wall/fence. Thus, it is not considered to cause any harm to residential amenity.
- 7.10 To the rear there would be a first floor window in the en-suite. This is considered to have similar views already experienced on the property and is not considered to directly overlook the private amenity space of No.7 Glebe Park Avenue and No.7 Spinnaker View. There would also be a dormer in the proposed side extension within the dressing room. It is considered the view would be screened partially by the existing garage which currently has views of the rear of No.7 Spinnaker View from the platform. It is considered that the proposed dormer would have similar views to the existing dormer. On balance it is considered not to cause additional sufficient harmful overlooking into the private amenity space of No.7 Spinnaker View. Within the proposed rear extension there would be bi-folding doors and a door facing the rear garden. The views would be screened by the existing boundary treatment and is not considered to cause harmful overlooking.
- 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).

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/20/01176

- 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 - 001

Block Plan - 002

Proposed Block Plan - 008

Proposed Floor Plans - 009

Proposed Elevations 1 of 2 - 010

Proposed Elevations 2 of 2 - 011

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.