
Site Address: 5 Westways, Havant, PO9 3LN
Proposal: Two storey side extension with integral garage, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension with extended canopy roof.
Application No: APP/20/00112 Expiry Date: 15/04/2020
Applicant: Mr & Mrs R Warrington
Agent: Mr B Dunnaway Case Officer: Tina Pickup
 Mr B Dunnaway
Ward: Bedhampton

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is located on the east side of Westways and is the northern most dwelling before Nos 1A, 1 and 3 which are set at right angles on the cul-de-sac head, having their rear gardens abutting the side boundary of the application site. As such, in street scene terms, the application site is perceived as the end property in an otherwise fairly uniform and linear area characterised by hipped roofed semi-detached two storey properties. The land in the area slopes slightly, such that the curtilages of Nos 1 & 3 rise slightly from the shared boundary.

The single storey garage belonging to No 3 is located adjacent to the northern boundary and sits alongside the drive of the application site, which in turn leads to an existing single storey garage set back behind the rear elevation. The eastern boundary of the site abuts the Forty Acres housing site, recently granted planning permission. The frontage of the site has been recently completely block paved, providing on site parking for about 3 cars.

There is a low brick wall on the northern boundary - which retains the slight step in levels and appears logically to belong to, and enclose the curtilage of the application site. There is a hedge planted on the side of number 3 where in front of their garage; and to the rear of the applicants garage, a close boarded fence.

2 Planning History

APP/17/00465 - Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing rear conservatory)., PERM,21/06/2017
APP/18/00112 - Demolition of rear conservatory and garage. Construction of single storey side and rear extensions., PERM,15/03/2018

3 Proposal

Two storey side extension with integral garage, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension with extended canopy roof.

Neither of the 2 previous schemes permitted have been implemented on site and this current proposal seeks a modest variation to APP/17/00465 which was also for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The current proposal is of similar footprint and roof height and profile - the differences being the inclusion of an integral garage and forward single story link to front porch with canopy roof across the front of the dwelling; single storey rear extension increased from 3m deep to 4m deep with change from lean to roof to flat roof with lantern light; and resultant internal layout changes.

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)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

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

None necessary

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: 2 letters have been received, from the same address.

[illegible]

the drive of No.5. Other concerns:- 1. Protection of the garage roof of No.3 during construction, which is corrugated asbestos and could be easily damaged by heavy items dropped on it and mortar dropped on it blocking the channels. 2. The foundations of the extension would no doubt be deeper than the foundations of No.3 garage leading to exposure of the foundations causing possible undermining, weakening and damage. 3. It is believed that the rainwater drainage from No3. & No.1 flow under the existing conservatory and is thought to have an inspection cover within the conservatory, which if it is the case may need to be moved.	A private matter, applicants aware of need for care Building Regs matter Building Regs matter
On the previous objection comment it stated that the fence at the bottom of No.1 garden sits on top of the low wall. It was omitted to say that this fence was erected and maintained by the previous owner of No.1 (owner for approx 50 years). No objection was raised by previous owners of No.5 that the fence was on top of the wall so it should be presumed that the low wall is in ownership of No.1 & No.3. At the end of the garage of No.5 there is a fence between the gardens of No.5 with the gardens of No.1 & No.1A (Long Acre). This fence was erected by the previous owner of No.5. It should be noted that the fence follows the line of the outer wall of the garage and not the continuation of the line of the low wall. If the previous owner of No.5 thought the boundary was on top of the low wall then surely that's where the line of the fence would have been erected. Instead it was erected inside the line of the low wall. Unless proof is shown describing that the low retaining wall is part of No.5 plot then it should be assumed that the boundary is up to the low wall and not on top of it.	Boundary dispute matter a private issue to be resolved via Party Wall Act - see section 7

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) Parking

(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. Third party representations indicate a neighbour dispute over the precise location of the northern shared boundary and who the low brick wall belongs to. The development has been designed with a parapet wall and hidden guttering, extending up to and including the disputed single brick boundary wall - and thus protecting the existing narrow gap between the outer edge of this wall and the neighbours garage. This low brick wall is treated as being within the application site and on this basis there would be no overhang to No 1 and 3. Certificate A has been submitted and is considered appropriate - the dimensions are accurate on site and represent logical demarcation of the boundary. Previous applications also used Certificate A and no evidence to the contrary has been forthcoming from either neighbour. This ongoing boundary dispute will need to be subject to the Party Wall Act, which is not a planning matter. It is understood that a surveyor has been appointed to review this boundary; should the outcome vary from the assumptions made within this application then the development would not be implementable and a revised application would need to be submitted. The applicants have been made aware of this situation and an Informative added.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 The proposed two storey side element uses a hipped roof and would be set below the ridge line of the host dwelling and set back marginally from the upper front facade. This profile is considered suitably subservient to meet the Design Guide SPD and repeats the scale of development previously permitted and still extant. Westways has a strong visual uniformity and pattern to the streetscene and the two storey hipped roof addition would respect that. Being the most northern dwelling the site benefits from space around it to the north and the proposed two storey extension right up to the boundary would not result in any 'terracing effect' .

7.4 In street scene terms, the difference to the previously approved extension includes an integral garage, enlarged linked porch with canopy across the frontage. There are other examples of similar front canopies within Westways and hence this variation is considered acceptable. Accordingly the revised 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

- 7.5 There is an existing first floor landing window in the side elevation facing north and the garden and rear of No 3. The amended proposed plans omit any side windows and thus results in an improvement to the perception of being overlooked by properties to the north.
- 7.6 In terms of outlook, the proposed side extension would be constructed right up to the boundary with No 3 and separated by number 3's own drive and garage. By virtue of the generous rear garden depth of No 3 the rear to side separation would be at least 13m which is in excess of the recommended minimum in the Borough Design Guide.
- 7.7 In terms of effect on the other half of the semi, No 7, the two storey extension is limited to the depth of the existing dwelling and would therefore have no effect on No 7. The proposed 4m deep single storey addition across the whole of the rear would replace an existing conservatory. Number 7 also has a rear addition, although smaller, but the flat roof profile with height of 2.9m would have limited impact on number 7. The orientation is such that any additional overshadowing would be limited to early morning only and consequently this aspect of the proposal is considered to have limited impact on outlook or light.
- 7.8 Notwithstanding the boundary dispute, in all other respects the proposal is considered unlikely to 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) Parking

- 7.9 The proposal results in an additional 4th bedroom which triggers the need for a third on site parking space. The proposed integral garage does not meet the internal dimensions recommended for a garage by the Parking SPD and cannot therefore be relied upon to provide one of the 3 spaces required. However the frontage has recently been block paved and provides adequate space for 3 vehicles to comply with the Parking SPD. There is therefore no highway objection to the proposal.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of this revised proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval. The ongoing boundary dispute is a private matter and does not prevent the determination of this application.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00112 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:

1:1250 Site Location Plan
1:250 Parking Plan Drg no 06 A
Plans and Elevations Drg no 05 B

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.