
Site Address:	4 South View, Cowplain, Waterloooville, PO8 8ES		
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/20/00938	Expiry Date:	16/12/2020
Applicant:	Mr N Lodge		
Agent:	Mr D P Manns	Case Officer:	Selina Donophy
	D M Designs		
Ward:	Cowplain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 This application site is a semi-detached, two-storey dwellinghouse located on the western side of South View, Cowplain. The property is a terraced property where South View forms an end, it is formed of red brick with a tiled, pitched roof. Towards the front of the site is a small front garden which is only accessed on foot, surrounded by a low boundary wall and to the rear of the site is the garden and an outbuilding.

2 Planning History

08/70628/000 - Erection of single storey side and rear extension. , PERM,18/03/2008

APP/16/00912 - Single storey side and rear extension and loft conversion with front and rear dormers and front porch., PERM,10/11/2016

3 Proposal

Single storey side and rear 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

CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
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

Councillor A Briggs - Cowplain

No comment

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

No comment

Councillor Narinder Bains - Cowplain

No comment

Developer Services, Southern Water

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul and surface water sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

To make an application visit developerservices.southernwater.co.uk and please read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link:

southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

In situations where surface water is being considered for discharge to our network, we require the below hierarchy for surface water to be followed which is reflected in part 3 of the Building Regulations:

- Reuse
- Infiltration
- Watercourse
- Storm sewer
- Combined Sewer

Guidance on Building Regulations is here:

gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-document-h

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

Website: southernwater.co.uk by email at:

SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk

Engineering/Drainage

I can confirm that on the basis of the evidence presented to date there are no land drainage observations I would wish to make on this application.

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre

Within 50m - Notable and/or protected species - Pipistrell Bat Species Roost

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: 5

Comment	Officer Comment
Officer comment : These representations have been received prior to the removal of the second storey : 6 Representations received- all relate to the proposal prior to amendments. 1 comment has been received which relates to the current proposal following amendmnets (visible in 3rd representation below).	
This house is over a century old and has loft extension already. The proposed extensions do not affect my property but would possibly affect the property overlooking them. a professional look should be taken before approval or not is given,	Please see ' Planning Considerations' section of the report.
It is unclear where my boundary line is in relation to the new extension but would be appear to be shown by a faint line drawn. If I take this as my boundary and compare it to the size of the rainwater downpipe then the gap between the new brickwork and my timber panel fence appears to be no more than 250mm. This space would not enable me to maintain my fence. It cannot be accessed from my side as I have a 1m wide Leyladii hedge backing on to the fence. Furthermore the excavation for the new foundations could undermine the fence posts. The width of the new extension needs to be reduced to give me access for fence	This is noted, however isn't a material planning consideration. Boundary treatment maintenance would be a civil matter between the parties involved.

maintenance and/or a more permanent fence erected which would not require maintenance. Security of my property is important as the Applicant do own dogs.	
There appears to be a discrepancy as to the height of the ridge of the dormer windows. The side elevation and section shows it to be above the level of the main roof whereas the front and rear elevations show it below which is acceptable. I would request the dormer ridge is kept as low as is reasonably practical to reduce the visual impact of the side elevation. The width of the dormer windows is out of keeping with the other first floor windows and I would request that they are reduced to lessen the visual impact.	This comment relates to previous plans and is no longer relevant
I have become aware that there is an underground watercourse that runs between my property and 4 South View. This watercourse continues along the rear boundary of the properties in Ashington Close and flows towards Longwood Avenue. I am concerned that the installation of foundations to facilitate the construction of the side single storey extension could divert the watercourse and cause flooding to my garden. I would ask that a proper investigation is undertaken to establish the watercourse and a scheme is developed to alleviate the risk of flooding.	This is discussed in the 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.
Further to the issue of revised drawings my comments about the first floor dormer windows in the extensions have been alleviated by the substitution of rooflights.	Noted
My comments about the closeness of the extension to my boundary still stand.	Noted.
This comment (below) relates to the current proposal following amendments .	
Further to the issue of drawings dated the December which reduce the 2 storey side extension to a single storey.	Noted

I have no objection to this change. However my objections dated 11th Nov. and 13th & 15th Dec. still remain relating to the closeness of the new extension to my fence, making it impossible for me to maintain it, and also the construction of new foundations for the side extension may divert the water course which runs through the footprint of the extension causing flooding to my garden.	This is not a material planning consideration. Boundary treatment maintenance would be a civil matter between the parties involved. See 'Planning Considerations'
Whilst we are not in any position to make any significant objection to the proposed extension, despite the fact the additional second floor will overlook our garden, we would strongly request that all construction work is undertaken during the daylight hours of Monday to Friday and to therefore avoid additional invasion of noise over the weekend. Over the past 2 years we have had to endure constant noise from 2 extension projects to the immediate left of our property and from the adjacent properties in Dorrita Avenue. Much of the construction work involved has been taking place almost 24x7 and often well into late evening which has been very disruptive with high volume of noise and almost constant dust.	It is acknowledged that construction activity can cause disruption to adjoining properties, however this is not a material planning consideration. Any undue noise and disturbance would be a matter controlled under separate Environmental Health legislation. Informatives are proposed to highlight key Environmental Health issues.
I object to the application and am writing to ask that Havant Borough Council refuse this planning application from Mr N Lodge the 'Applicant'. My reasons for objecting are as follows: 1. The walkway in front of the Property and other properties in the row of cottages is extremely narrow and heavy plant will struggle to access the the Property. The general area is built on clay and piles may be required for excavation works. In addition deliveries of large quantities of building material is highly likely to cause damage to neighbouring properties and part of my fence. 2. Parking in the area is very limited and large vehicles and heavy plant will cause noise pollution and dust, possibly at all times of the day. South View is off London Road which is	Please refer to the comments above re construction phase. If damage were to be caused to other properties this would be a civil matter between the parties. Please refer to comments above. The proposal is for a domestic scale extension and any construction phase issues are relatively limited in time and extent.

already a very busy and at times congested road and will cause traffic problems and create a safety hazard for other motorists.	
3. There are currently two exits to the Property, one at the front of the house and the other at the back and down the outside passageway to the front. One of the plans shows hatching right up to the fence of 2 Ashington Close and another plan shows a very narrow gap, roughly the width of half a person between the outside wall of the proposed development and number 2's fence, (redacted text). This is clearly an insufficient space to enable escape by that route in the event of an emergency.	There would be access to the rear garden from the property (a similar position to a mid-terrace property). The loss of the side access would not warrant the refusal of planning permission in this case.
4. If the external wall of the new build is on the boundary and actually forms part of it then the roof guttering, if any, may overhang no 2 Ashington and should be sited within the Applicant's own land.	It has been confirmed by the applicant that there is to be no overhang.
5. The proposed front dormer windows will overlook my property, the result of which will be the loss of my privacy. All proposed dormer windows are of a disproportionate size and out of keeping with the existing property elevations.	This does not relate to the amended application .
6. The applicant states he has not commenced works but footings down the side passageway, which forms part of the development, have already been dug or at least started.	This has not been specified as par of this application.
7. There is a 'structure' at the bottom and to the right of the side passageway on the proposed development site and I wonder if that is to be demolished if the development proceeds?	This has been noted, however the works carried out in themselves are unlikely to have required planning permission.
8. An underground stream runs along the back of properties in Ashington Close and possibly properties in Ivydene Gardens and Longwood Avenue . These properties are as previously stated built on clay and I am extremely concerned that damage may	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

be caused to surrounding properties as a result of the excavation works. 9. The proposed development generally will cause dirt, disturbance and disruption to all residents in the surrounding area. 10. The bulk and mass of the proposed development is totally out of keeping and disproportionate with adjoining and surrounding dwellings in Ashington Close. Therefore I ask that Havant Borough Council refuse this planning application.	Please see comments above relating to construction work. Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.
We wish to object to the application on the following grounds: 1. It will substantially reduce the amount of daylight at our house. 2. The proposed gable end wall of 4 South View will be much closer to our property, seriously degrading our outlook. 3. Our environment will be adversely affected because the proposed extension will undoubtedly divert a stream, currently running in a ditch along the applicant's side of the boundary fence, onto our property causing flooding. 4. Maintenance of the proposed extension would require access to our property, which we would not be prepared to grant on the grounds of damage to our garden and intrusion of our privacy. In the event that construction of the proposed extension required access to our property, as seems likely given that the proposed new wall seems to be within 280mm of our boundary, we would not be prepared to grant this on the grounds of damage to our garden and intrusion of our privacy.	This comment was made in relation to the proposal which has since been amended. Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report. This is not a material planning consideration. Issues surrounding boundary treatments and construction would be a civil matter and not a material planning consideration.

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) Drainage
- (v) Parking
- (vi) Ecology

(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 This proposal has undergone amendments since its initial submission. The initial proposal included a two storey side extension with dormers to the front and rear . Following a site visit it was judged that the dormers would result in unacceptable overlooking to properties located to the west due to the close proximity to the side boundary. The dormers were since removed to be replaced with rooflights with eil height 1.7 metres above finished floor level. Although this mitigated against the overlooking issue, the side gable wall was still within very close proximity to the rear of no 2 Ashington Close at two storey level with a separation distance of approximately 5.7 metres from the gable wall to the conservatory at no 2 , contrary to the Havant Borough Design Guide which stipulates that 10 metres separation distance should be retained. The two storey element has since been removed from the proposal for this reason as it was judged that a single storey extension would be more appropriate for this siting, limiting impact on the amenity of surrounding properties.

7.4 The amended proposal comprises a single storey side extension which would come up to the western (side) boundary , it would have a height of approximately 3.3 metres with a flat roof. The depth would extend on level with the rear wall of the existing rear extension, wrapping around the rear elevation wall. To the front would be a bay window to match the existing ground floor bay window and to the rear would be bi-fold doors. Materials include brickwork to match existing as well as tiles to the front to match the existing tile detail. Due to the dwellings siting, the single storey extension would not be highly visible from the public realm, set at single storey level it also is not judged to be visually intrusive to properties to the west which back on to the site. The proposal would allow for substantial additional floorspace, however this is judged to be reasonably accommodated within the plot size. A similar proposal was granted permission in 2008 under application reference 08/70628/000.

7.5 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

- 7.6 Directly to the west of the site is no 2 Ashington Close - although the extension would protrude above the fence line by approximately 1.2 metres this is not judged to be substantially overbearing so as to cause notable harm to the amenity of the property. It is not judged to result in significant overshadowing or overlooking and is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact. The above also relates to the impact on no 3 Ivydene Gardens which is sited to the north west of the site. There is not judged to be any harmful impact upon no 3 South View as there is an extension on the boundary as existing.
- 7.7 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) Drainage

- 7.8 Objections have been raised in relation to a potential underground watercourse located along the west (side) boundary of the application site. The Council's civil engineer has been consulted in regard to this and has no land drainage observations to make regarding this proposal.

Research has confirmed that there are no underground watercourses or wells located in this position on the records held, therefore this proposal is not considered to cause any disturbance of any watercourse.

(v) Parking

- 7.9 Bedroom number would decrease from 3 bedrooms to 2 bedrooms as part of this application. For this reason no further parking allocation is required on site as stipulated in the Havant Parking SPD.

(vi) Ecology

- 7.10 The comments of Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre indicate the presence of bat roosts within 50m of the site – Given the single storey nature of the development and no alterations to the existing roof it is not anticipated that there would be an impact to protected species as a result of the proposed development

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/20/00938 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:

LODGE-01A Block plan
LODGE 01A Location Plan
01A REV 01 Rev D Amended existing and proposed plans and elevations

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.