
Site Address:	53 Springwood Avenue, Waterloooville, PO7 8JA		
Proposal:	Single storey front extension.		
Application No:	APP/21/00125	Expiry Date:	27/04/2021
Applicant:	Mrs A Phillpot	Case Officer:	Denise Sheath
Agent:			
Ward:	Stakes		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

53 Springwood Avenue, Waterloooville, is a semi detached two storey property, the property is constructed with brick with a hung tiled roof. The front of the property has no boundary treatments to the front or east side elevation. The west elevation boundary consist of trees and shrubbery.

Note - Due to Coronavirus a site visit was not possible but the applicant supplied photos of the application site which have been used to inform this decision.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Single storey front extension.

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

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Not required

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: 6

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

(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 front elevation of the dwellinghouse is noted to be 6.5m in width, the proposed flat roof extension would have a 4m depth protruding from the front elevation with a 3.5m width. The proposal therefore represents a significant increase in footprint size to the front of the property and would create a loss of symmetry to the pair of semi detached dwellings appearing out of keeping with the character of the area. The design of the proposed front extension is a box like design with a flat roof and no windows to the front elevation, the design of the extension appears out of keeping with the design of the main dwellinghouse and does not respect the front building line between the semi-detached properties.

The Havant Borough Design Guide states:

Paragraph 5.35 In general, an extension should not be bigger than the main building and therefore should appear smaller in mass and height. Extensions should look to the existing building as

the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such ridge, verge and eave finishes, head and cills, brick coursing, dressings and quoin work.

The positions and proportions of solid wall to opening of windows and doors is also important. The roof form and slope should also reflect that of the main building.

Paragraph 5.36 - Front extensions should not protrude too far forward from the main building, or be prominent in the street and should respect the common building line. Front extensions are therefore most appropriate where the building is

set well back from the street, where there is a staggered building line, or in isolated countryside locations.

It is therefore judged that the overall size, design and forward projection results is an addition that is not considered to respect the host dwelling, its situation and surroundings and is contrary of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy and the paragraphs 5.35 and 5.36 of the Havant Borough Design Guide.

The proposed front extension would also create a precedent for front elevation development of a larger scale in this area.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.4 The proposal would have no impact to the front and west side elevation, the area to the front is open green space, the area to the side is a public footpath screened by high trees and shrubbery.
- 7.5 The proposed extension would be to the west of the adjoining neighbouring property (No.51), with a distance of 3m from the shared boundary, although the proposed extension would have a window inserted in to this facing elevation, this frontage area is already visible from the public domain and highway.
- 7.6 It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The design, by virtue of the scale and siting is likely to appear contrived, leading to a detrimental impact to the character of the existing dwelling and the streetscene, contrary to the advice provided within the Havant Borough Local Plan and the objectives of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy). The proposal also sets a precedent for development of this kind in this area of Springwood Avenue.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00125 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed development by reason of its bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous feature within the streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. Furthermore the proposal would create an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult to refuse further similar applications. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.