
Site Address:	77 The Brow, Waterlooville, PO7 5BY		
Proposal:	Single storey garage extension.		
Application No:	APP/19/00311	Expiry Date:	22/05/2019
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Ayling		
Agent:	Mr Mallen	Case Officer:	John Shaw
	Thorns-Young Ltd.		
Ward:	Purbrook		
Site Visit Date:			

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application dwelling is a two-storey detached property to the northern side of the The Brow, Waterlooville. The streetscene consists of predominantly detached two storey dwellings with the northern side of the street set at a lower level than the dwellings to the south. The streetscene is characterised by properties of a similar age, however variations in regard to scale, heights, roof design and materials ensure the character is not one of distinct uniformity.

The application dwelling has white render to elevations, a tile roof and brown fenestration and is set along a gently staggered building line which follows the line of The Brow as it moves from east to west. The property has an attached single garage and parking for 3 further cars on hardstanding that has been laid to the front of the dwelling house. The front side boundary treatment between the site and the immediate residential site to the west is an approximately 1m high brick wall which transitions to a boundary fence of a similar height as one moves north; hedging grows above this fencing on both sides of the boundary.

2 Planning History

APP/10/00289 - Single storey side extension to garage., PERM,17/08/2010

This previous proposal was largely similar to the application which is the subject of this report. It should be noted, however, that since the decision for application APP/10/00289, a new Local Plan has been issued by Havant Borough Council as well as detailed design guidance, the Havant Borough Council Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. In light of the policies of the currently adopted Local Plan which superseded the Local Plan under which the previous decision was made, and the guidance within the Design Guide, it is assessed that though the previous decision does form a material consideration, it would be afforded limited weight in the consideration of the current proposal given the altered policy and Supplementary Planning Document position.

3 Proposal

Single storey garage 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)

CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Non-applicable

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
Nature of Objection - Concern around building works taking place on the boundary and the negative impact the extension will have to their property in regards to overshadowing, overbearing and potential loss of property value.	Concerns relating to overshadowing and overbearing are addressed in section 7. The concern relating to the effect of building works on the boundary is noted, however, it is considered that if there were undue impacts on neighbouring properties during construction works then these issues could be addressed under relevant environmental health legislation and that it would not be reasonable to impose planning conditions in this instance. Any need to access the opposite side of the boundary during the construction process would be a civil matter to be addressed by the relevant parties. The concern relating to potential loss of property value is not a material planning consideration and so will not be assessed as part of this report.

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 existing catslide roof to the western elevation of the dwelling merges with the roof of the existing attached garage and then drops away to an eaves height of 2.4m, approximately 2.4m from the shared boundary with no. 75 The Brow to the west. The garage projects ahead of the main bulk of the dwelling by approximately 3.2m. The proposed extension would result in the western side elevation wall of the enlarged garage being set off from the boundary by just approximately 0.25m and the eaves still closer almost abutting the boundary line. The ridge of the garage would be moved to the west while the roofline where the main bulk of the dwelling meets the garage would be raised to a small degree to create a 30 degree pitch from the eaves of the garage up to the eaves of the dwelling.

- 7.4 The extension of the garage and the loss of the separation distance between the garage and boundary would create a bulkier and broader impression when viewed from the streetscene. This extension would to a degree disrupt the rhythm of the immediate streetscene where the properties immediately to the west of the application dwelling are like the application dwelling, detached dwellings with a gap up to either side of their respective boundaries. Moreover, the Borough Design Guide states that side extensions should retain a 1m gap between boundaries to protect the pattern of development in an area, which in turn influences local character. However, in the wider streetscene there are examples of other dwellings that are built up to adjacent boundaries and so it is considered that the wider streetscene is sufficiently mixed in regard to the rhythm of the built form to ensure that the extension in this instance would not be unduly disruptive to warrant refusal on this basis. Overall, the garage despite its enlarged form would remain subservient to the main dwelling and the use of matching materials would ensure the proposal would integrate effectively with the character of the dwelling.

- 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 The extension would see the garage built effectively up to the shared boundary with the dwellinghouse to the west, No. 75 The Brow. It is considered that the resulting height and depth hard up to the shared boundary with No. 75 would be particularly dominant and oppressive when viewed from the neighbouring habitable room, a kitchen to the eastern side elevation that would directly face the extended garage. It is acknowledged that the extension would be unlikely to unacceptably affect light levels to this window as the kitchen window is set back from the boundary by 6m and so would comply with the 45 degree line guidance as outlined within the Design Guidance document. The application dwelling is however set at a higher level to no. 75 by approximately 0.5m and by bringing the broad wall of the garage, having a considerable depth of 8.5m, up to the boundary, the result would be to create a sense of enclosure which due to the resulting depth, mass and height (3.1m to eaves and 5.6m high as the pitch of the

garage meets the eaves of the dwelling) would be overbearing to occupiers of the habitable room and to the use of the external amenity space adjoining the extension. Furthermore, no. 75 has an integrated garage to the south east thereby enclosing the outlook from the kitchen in this direction; the garage extension of the application dwelling would therefore further this sense of enclosure to an unacceptable degree.

- 7.7 although the height and depth of the garage would effectively remain unchanged from existing, the loss of the separation between the garage and the boundary combined with a total height of 5.6m and depth of 8.5m would give the impression from the lower level no. 75 of an element far more than 'standard' single storey dimensions and overall it is considered that the overbearing impact which would result warrants the refusal of the application.
- 7.8 There are currently two windows to the western side elevation of the garage; as part of the proposed extension, there would be no windows to the side wall of the extended garage but there would be 3 high level rooflights. It is not considered that this arrangement would cause no undue overlooking of the neighbouring property to the west, no. 75 The Brow.
- 7.9 Overall, it is deemed that the proposal would have an unduly overbearing relationship with no. 75 The Brow due to the oppressive sense of enclosure which would result when viewed from the ground floor habitable room to the eastern elevation of no. 75 and the adjacent amenity area. The agent has been made aware of these concerns and was offered the opportunity to submit amended plans, however, none have been forthcoming and therefore it is concluded that the proposal would not comply with Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is concluded that the garage extension by reason of its depth, mass and height along the shared boundary with No. 75 The Brow would result in an overbearing effect to the living space of this dwelling. The unacceptable harm caused to the neighbour's amenity would be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and consequently the application is recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00311 for the following reason

- 1 The proposed garage extension would by reason of its height, mass, bulk, depth and siting up to the shared boundary result in an un-neighbourly development to the harm of the residential amenities of the occupiers of No. 75 The Brow. In particular the development would have an overbearing effect on the adjacent property to the west. The unacceptable harm caused to neighbour amenity as a result of the development proposed would conflict with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.