
Site Address:	9 Highfield Avenue, Waterloooville, PO7 7PY		
Proposal:	Proposed front porch and two storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/19/00590	Expiry Date:	09/08/2019
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Gibbs		
Agent:	Mr C Mallen	Case Officer:	Ross Leal
	Thorns - Young Ltd		
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

This application site is a two storey, detached dwellinghouse located on the North side of Highfield Avenue, Waterloooville. It has an attached garage to the front and conservatory to the rear and has a hardstanding driveway with no front boundary wall, giving it an open appearance from the street. There is a sizeable garden to the rear with woodland beyond to the North East of the property.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Proposed front porch and two storey rear extension. This application has undergone various changes in design and scale regarding the proposed two storey rear extension. This decision shall be based upon the amended design and plans.

The initial plans submitted with this application showed a two storey rear extension that had a 6m depth across the full width. This was deemed unacceptable in terms of overshadowing and subsequently amended plans have been received showing alterations to the depth of the second storey rear extension as well as to the roof.

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
AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Mike Seal

As long as it is in keeping with all the other houses in the road and does not not over look neighbours gardens and they stick to planned guide lines

County Ecologist

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information. Whilst I would not expect the building to be of particular ecological interest, it may nevertheless provide opportunities for protected species such as roosting bats and nesting birds. If present, these species could be impacted by the proposed works.

In this instance I would be willing to review recent, good quality photographs of the areas of the building to be impacted (these should show all areas affected, especially roof tiles and ridge tiles, soffits and fascia and the interior (ceiling and floor surfaces) of any roof void). I must stress that it is not the role of the LPA to determine ecological impact although I can provide a more informed opinion with this additional information. Should photos prove inconclusive or demonstrate that surveys are required (e.g. by demonstrating that features suitable for legally-protected species are indeed present) I would recommend that the applicant commissions a Phase 1 ecological survey of the site: this should include an assessment of the potential for the site to support protected species (to be provided by a qualified ecologist (see Natural England guidance on finding a suitably-qualified ecologist). The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (www.cieem.net) holds a database of suitably-qualified ecologists.

NPPF, Circular 06/2005 and Natural England Standing Advice on Protected Species, require that planning decisions are based on full, up-to-date ecological information and it is essential that all necessary survey, assessment and mitigation information is available to the local planning authority prior to determination, particularly in the case of protected species, which are a material planning consideration. This will enable the LPA to determine the application on the basis of full knowledge about the ecological impacts of the proposal and to ensure that any impacts can and will be mitigated, and are acceptable.

Officer Comment: *Whilst the site is close to a SINCE, it is a modern dwelling with limited opportunity for protected species use. An informative is recommended in relation to protected species.*

Environment Agency

No comments

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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
We have concerns regarding the impact of the two-storey extension on our light levels, particularly as our living spaces are towards the rear of our property. The rear of number 9's property is currently two metres further forward than ours. Therefore any additional building will have a considerable impact on our property in its existing state. We have expressed these concerns to Mr and Mrs Gibbs and have had a discussion about this. Whilst we have these concerns, we are also understanding that they wish to extend their property to gain extra living space and bedrooms. In view of this, we have no issue with them building an extension however, we would prefer the current plans to be reduced in order that our light levels would not be so affected.	Please see Planning Consideration section 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 This proposal includes a two storey extension to the rear of the property incorporating the demolition of the existing conservatory and changes to the roof and fenestration. The second storey rear extensions would be staggered, with the closest elevation to no 7 on the Western side of the property having a depth of 2.5 metres and on the Eastern side would have a depth of 3.9 metres. The extension would have pitched roofs, from ground level the Eastern side would reach a height of 7.1 metres and the Western side would reach 6.5 metres. There is also a single storey rear extension

proposed behind the two storey extensions that would have 3.7 metre depth from the Western rear wall and 2.1 metres from the Eastern rear wall as well as a ridge height of 3.8 metres and a width of 9.7 metres to eaves level.

This development would be sited to the rear of the property and would not be visible from the public realm. It would be set within a large plot to the rear, affording some leeway for development to take place without seeming overdeveloped or overtly obtrusive. The proposed development would sit below the ridge height of the main house and, although to the Eastern side the depth would be significant, the effect of this has been reduced by the staggering of the Western extension depth and the stepping down into the single storey at the rear.

The proposed porch would be flat roofed, brick with one window to the West, with a depth of 1.5 metres including the eaves. This would be visible from the street, however as the property is set back from the highway, and the porch works are modest in scale, this would not have any notable impact on the character of the streetscene.

The single storey rear extension would have a pitched roof, as would the two storey extension works and the materials proposed include facing brickwork and concrete tiles to match existing. These are considered complimentary to the main property and in keeping with Havant Borough Council Design Guide SPD (2011).

Although there have not been many two storey extension developments within Highfield Avenue, such a development is not deemed to be damaging to the area as these properties are typically detached, with generous rear gardens. It is also of some significance that no 7 has recently been granted planning permission for two and single storey extensions (Application APP/19/00085), similar to the works proposed in this application. This extension has yet to be implemented.

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

- 7.4 The proposed second storey extension would be sited between no 7 and no 11, to the East of no 7 and to the West of no 11. No 9 is staggered back (North) from no 7, leaving no 7 more vulnerable to overshadowing at the rear elevation from any development at no 9. One of the most notable issues with this application has been this impact on no 7 via loss of sunlight due to the second storey element of this proposal, exacerbated by the staggered positioning of the properties. One of the amendments made to mitigate against this issue has been the reduction in depth of the Eastern side of the second storey.

Plans showing 45 degree lines have also been supplied, which show the impact upon no 11 would not be unduly imposing as the extension at first floor level would be within the 45 degree line guidance in the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD used to assess impacts.

The plans show there would be some limited impact of overshadowing on the kitchen window at no 7. Although permission has been granted at this property for extension works at this level, these have not yet taken place so shall not be considered within this application. Whilst some impact on light would occur, this would not be considered

to be significantly greater than the existing shadow created by mature hedging situated on the boundary between these two properties. Plans show this would be retained. Overall the impact of the revised development on No. 7 is considered limited and acceptable.

There are no additional windows proposed to the Western side, two rooflights and large windows are proposed on the ground floor rear facade and three additional windows proposed on the Eastern side, two on the ground floor level and one on the first floor level. This window would serve a bedroom and would have a cill height of 1.7m. There are no properties to the rear as the property backs onto woodland. Consequently the proposed changes to fenestration would have a limited impact upon neighbour amenity.

- 7.5 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).

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/19/00590 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:
- 3091 19 1 existing floor plans and elevations
3091 19 2 REV C proposed floor plans and elevations received 5 November 2019
Location Plan received 13 June 2019
1:200 Block Plan received 10 September 2019

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.