

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)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

E22 (Amenity and pollution)
E1* (High quality design)
IN3 (Transport and parking in new development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

n/a

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None necessary

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: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
Noise and fumes. I have already suffered noise including loud music on any day of the week, including weekends and fumes and ash from bonfires.	This is a matter for Environmental Health; not a relevant consideration; Informatives can be added
Design. There appears to be no emergency access to the back garden.	Amended plans have re-sited away from side boundary thereby creating side access
Design and appearance. The proposed rear single story extension is across the whole plot	Noted - see section 7

which is larger when compared to neighbours and extends further into the garden than neighbours. Appearance and privacy. My main objection is the proposed Dormer which is very DOMINANT. Starting at the eaves and extending to near the ridge line which is much larger than existing neighbours. The proposed vertical gable is not in keeping with the hip ends of adjoining/adjacent properties. The three proposed windows are very large compared to those of an adjoining property. This would invade my privacy, being able to look into my property. A single story extension to the gable end would also be more in keeping with the neighbours.	Noted - amended plans have reduced slightly and balanced windows See section 7 re separation distance
--	---

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 As the third party comment notes, the majority of dwellings in the road feature hipped roofs and the proposal is for a gable end. However, the existing property could change to gable end under permitted development, as some have in the street, eg number 34. In this instance the proposed side extension incorporating gable end would not lead to a terracing effect due to the combination of slight gap to shared boundary and fact that number 40 adjacent is a spacious detached dwelling with single storey side element adjacent. There would remain a sense of separation, space and skyline about the enlarged silhouette that would be appropriate in street scene terms.

7.4 The proposed design, whilst not subservient with any step back or down, retains the consistent uniform ridge height and scale of the host dwelling and streetscene. A balanced, symmetrical front design is proposed, repeating the bay feature with canopy over. During the course of determining this application revised plans have been received reducing the depth of the rear dormer back from the rear facade and centralising windows to align with those below. These minor changes have resulted in

a less bulky and dominant dormer design, more in keeping with the scale of the character of the host dwelling and in better accordance with the Design Guide SPD.

- 7.5 Overall the context of the immediate setting is such that the proposed development design and appearance is considered appropriate in street scene terms, 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

- 7.6 The proposed replacement rear extension would be 1.5m deeper than existing, having a max depth of 5.5m and would extend up to the shared boundary with the attached dwelling at 36. This dwelling also has a 4m deep rear extension. The additional 1.5m would not have any significant effect on the outlook or light available to neighbouring amenity, particularly having regard to the low flat roofed design. The site also benefits from a long garden and sufficient amenity space would remain for future occupiers.
- 7.7 Third party comment notes potential for overlooking from the rear dormer, but the back to back separation distance is in excess of the minimum 20m required in the Design Guide SPD. Given that rear dormers and a second storey level of windows is a common feature in built up areas it is not considered that any material harm from additional overlooking would be caused from the introduction of this proposed dormer.
- 7.8 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

- 7.9 The proposal would result in an additional, 4th bedroom, and the plans provided show provision of 3 parking spaces on the frontage. This would meet the adopted Parking SPD and be compliant with Policy DM13 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Overall the scale, siting and design of the proposed two storey development is considered appropriate given the site context and 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/21/00229

(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:

Location and Block Plan Drawing Rev B Issue 20/4/21 on Councils website dated 22/4/21

Proposed Floor Plans Drawing Issue 20/4/21 on Councils website dated 22/4/21

Proposed Elevations Drawing Issue 20/4/21 on Councils website dated 22/4/21

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.

- 4 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.