

HBC will need to determine in their capacity as local parking authority that the level of parking provision proposed falls in line with adopted standards.
If the garage is to be classed as a parking space it must have an internal dimension of 6m x 3m.

Officer comment : Amended plans have been received since this comment. As Hampshire Highways raised no objection to the initial proposal they have not been reconsulted on the amended plans.

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: 13

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Comment	Officer Comment
- I am pleased to see that further details and revised plans now retain the existing garage for us as a garage. - I am glad that the attractive green frontage and side gardens along with pathway will be retained and maintained. - Please note that the revised rear extension will have an impact on No 4's open aspect in the direction of No 6. Along with the already imposing balcony at No 2, it could create a narrowing tunnel effect to No 4, the slim mid-terrace of three. - Any such extension should have a party-wall agreement, with no guttering on No 4's side. Brickwork should match existing walls. All adjacent surfaces and fencing to be made good.	Please see Planning Considerations section of the report . This is not a planning consideration. Brickwork proposed to match existing.
I have no objections to the application. However, I request serious consideration be given to the installation of yellow lines on both bends of the road outside number 11a, 11, 9 and 7 Markway Close. If both sides have cars/vans parked on them this prevents the Fire Service getting close to the properties, having turning facilities or being able to use aerial	The dropped kerb , garage door and parking space are no longer proposed to the front of the property following amendments made to the proposal.

appliance in the event of a fire for those properties. Building Regulations 2000, Fire Safety, B5 say the minimum width of road between kerbs: 3.7m, minimum width of gateways: 3.1m. If both sides had vehicles parked on them, it would be under these measurements. Good visibility to allow drivers emerging from driveways from 11a through to 7 to see traffic coming up or down the road would be reduced under the Highway 242 (You must not leave your vehicle in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road) and 243 code (Do not stop or park on a bend, in front of an entrance to a property, prevent the emergency services accessing a property. These would be contravened as a result of having cars/vans parked on both bends of the road.	
I would like to point out that parking is a big issue in Markway Close and having another dropped kerb will only exacerbate this problem. The residents on the East side of Markway Close park outside their properties and this may make access to the new garage difficult for the residents of No.6.	The dropped kerb , garage door and parking space are no longer proposed to the front of the property following amendments made to the proposal.

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.

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

7.3 This proposal comprises a side and rear extension . The single storey side extension would come flush with the front elevation wall and with the existing garage to the rear.It would have a width of approximately 3.2 metres and a pitched roof with a ridge height of 3.8 metres. The rear extension would be sited in the space between the boundary shared with no 4 Markway Close and the existing garage. The rear

extension wall would come level with that of the existing garage in depth so would project beyond the rear elevation wall of the existing property by 2 metres and would have a lean to style roof with a height of 3.2 metres.

This current proposal has been amended from the previous proposal which initially proposed the demolition of the existing garage and a smaller extension to the rear. This was since altered due to the lack of parking provided on site with the removal of the garage.

The side extension would be visible from the public realm due to the location of this property on a corner plot. Despite this, the pitched roof design is in keeping with the roof slope of the main property and those in the surrounding area. It is deemed the scale and design of the side extension is acceptable within the context of the main property and the streetscene. The rear extension would be mostly screened by the boundary treatment to the north and west of the site. Materials proposed include tile and brickwork to match existing.

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 This application site forms the end property of a terrace of 3 properties. To the south of the site is the adjoining property, no 4 Markway Close. The existing rear elevation wall is currently on level with that at no 4, however the rear extension would protrude forward by 2 metres. There is a window at single storey level at no 4, however there is not deemed to be significant impact upon light received by this window from the extension due to the relationship of the properties, with the application site to the north. The lean to style roof also helps to mitigate against this. Additionally a rear extension with a larger depth could be constructed under permitted development which would not require a planning application. For these reasons this proposal is not deemed to have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 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).

(iv) Parking

- 7.6 There are no additional bedrooms proposed to the property and no existing parking spaces would be removed.

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/20/00144

(A) 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:

20013-02 REVD Amended proposed general arrangement

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.
- 4 The garaging, car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.