
Site Address:	6 Neville Gardens, Emsworth, PO10 7XZ		
Proposal:	Part single, part two storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/20/00892	Expiry Date:	04/01/2021
Applicant:	Mr C Piesina-Blaber		
Agent:	Mr S Walker	Case Officer:	Jane Burton
	Parkers Design		
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

6 Neville Gardens is a two-storey 3 bedroomed detached dwelling in a cul-de-sac location. The property has an integral garage and space for one car to park to the front. The surrounding area is residential with properties of a similar age and design. The site is in the urban area as defined by the local plan, and is within flood zone 3.

2 Planning History

No relevant history.

3 Proposal

The proposal is a rear extension, 3.3m in depth which would be part 2 storey (to north side) and part single storey (to south side). The 2 storey element would be pitched roofed measuring approximately 4.3m in width, 4.9m to the eaves and 6.7m to the roof ridge. The single storey element would be approximately 2m in width with a mono-pitch roof.

The application form states that the proposed materials would be sand and cement to match existing and roof tiles to match existing, however this was queried with the applicant as the existing building is constructed in brick, not render. The applicant has confirmed by email (dated 10.02) that the material will be brick to match.

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

CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

E1* (High quality design)
E19 (Managing flood risk in new development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Julie Thain-Smith

No comments were received.

Councillor Lulu Bowerman

No comments were received.

Councillor R Kennett

No comments were 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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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) Flood risk considerations
- (v) Car parking provision

(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 extensions would be to the rear of the property, but visible from the public realm from Cotton Drive and pedestrian paths to the east. The proposed two storey extension would be pitched roofed, as the existing building, and would be set down from the main roof ridge by approximately 0.3m. It is not considered that the proposal would extend excessively from the rear elevation. Further to the email received from the applicant dated 10.02 in respect of the materials it is recommended that a condition is attached to require that external materials match the existing building to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

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). It is not considered that the scheme would result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.4 No.7 Neville Gardens is the adjacent property to the south
No. 7 is set further forward in the plot than No5, but has a single storey rear extension. The proposed extensions would be up to the side boundary between no.5 and no.7, with a gap of approximately 1m between the built forms. Given that the proposal would not extend excessively beyond the single storey extension at no.7 (approximately 2.5m), the setting in of the two storey extension from the south (side) elevation, and the orientation - overall it is not considered that the proposals would have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of no.7. There are no windows proposed on the south elevation except a high roof window, thus no unacceptable overlooking/loss of privacy would result.

No.3, no.2 and no 1 Neville Gardens adjoin the site to the north

No.5 shares a common boundary with no. 3, 2 and 1 Neville Gardens - the rear gardens of which adjoin the side boundary of no.5. Due to the position approximately 1m to the boundary, and two storey height the proposal would impact on no.2 and no.3 Neville Gardens in terms of outlook from the rear of the properties. Measuring from the block plan the position of the extension at its closest point would be approximately 14m distance from the main rear elevation of no.2 Neville Gardens, and approximately 10.5m distance from the conservatory/rear extension at no.2. The extension would be approximately 13m distance from the main rear elevation of no.3 Neville Gardens. Whilst it is acknowledged that there would be an impact, the proposal would retain the minimum separation distance of 10m where a dwelling faces a blank gable provided as guidance within the Councils SPD (p.36). In addition, the extension would have an eaves height of 4.9m and the roof would pitch away from the rear of the properties to the north. Thus having regard to the guidance in the SPD it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable impact in terms of outlook/overbearing to warrant the refusal of the application. Due to the two storey height of the extension and position to the south of no.2 and 3, shadowing would result from the proposal varying at differing times of the day and year. Whilst it is acknowledged that there would be an impact on garden area there is considered to be sufficient distance to the rear of the dwellings to the north that the extension would not result in an unacceptable loss of light to habitable rooms. As such it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable shadowing/loss of light impact that would warrant the refusal of the application. There are no windows proposed on the north elevation of the extension hence no unacceptable overlooking/loss of privacy would result. A door to the north elevation is proposed but there is a boundary fence

that would prevent an unacceptable loss of privacy.

Due to the relationship it is not considered that the proposals would have an unacceptable impact on no.1 Neville Gardens, and there are no properties to the immediate rear of the site..

- 7.5 Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable impacts to neighbouring properties having regard to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Flood risk considerations

- 7.6 The applicant has annotated the proposed ground floor plan to state that finished floor levels are to be no lower than the existing ground floor level, and all sockets are to be a minimum of 450mm from ground floor level. Thus suitable flood resistance / flood proofing would be incorporated in accordance with the standing advice of the EA.

(v) Car parking provision

- 7.7 The proposals would not result in an increase in the number of bedrooms hence there is not requirement for additional car parking having regard to the Councils parking standards.

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/20/00892 for the following reasons/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:

P107 (Location Plan)
P106 (Block Plan)
P100 (Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans)
P101 (Existing and Proposed First Floor Plans)
P102 (Existing and Proposed Site Plans)
P103 (Existing and Proposed N & S Elevations)
P104 (Existing and Proposed W Elevations)

P105 (Proposed 3D Images)

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.