

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

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)

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Not required

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: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
In principal we have no objection, to the works submitted in this application. However, we do have serious concerns that the drawings and proposals as submitted are inaccurate. The block plan shows the areas hatched red as the new or revised extension and appears to indicate that the existing conservatory south wall is to be moved to the north east, rebuilt and extended as part of the new kitchen and utility room. We are concerned that the new south east corner appears to be right up against our boundary fence and as a result,	Objection retracted please see below.

much too close to our property and should not be allowed. However, on discussion with David & Shirley Metherell, the applicants, they inform us that it is not their intention to move the existing conservatory wall and the proposed new extension will follow the existing building line. This would mean that the south eastern corner of the new extension would come through our fence and be on our property and not as shown on the block plan. Obviously, this is not possible. We feel that if the existing conservatory wall is to remain then the extension wall should run parallel to our exiting fence line which would then form a semi triangular extension. David & Shirley Metherell have said that they will be consulting with their architects to revise the drawings and that we will be included in those discussions. We therefore object to the current plans submitted.	
Further to our objection to the original plans submitted. We can confirm that we have no objection to the revised plans 01A Revision B dated 26/08/2020	Noted

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) Flood Risk

(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 proposal is for a single storey side and rear extension, raised patio area to the rear, alterations to the existing conservatory roof consisting of the roof shape being

altered to a pitched roof replacing the glazing with interlocking roof tiles, the repositioning of the flue from the west side elevation to the east side elevation on the existing conservatory and installation of roof lights to the replacement roof of the existing conservatory, and 1No. roof light along the west side elevation of the main dwellinghouse.

- 7.4 The single storey side extension which is proposed along the west side elevation would be attached to the existing conservatory and protrude 6.150m toward to the front elevation of the property, have a width of 3.284m, an eaves height of 3m and a maximum height of 4m, the materials which will be used will match the materials used in the construction of the main dwellinghouse. The scheme would result in a reasonable addition to the footprint of the property, although it can be comfortably accommodated within the extent of the site. The front and side elevation of the extension would be visible from the public domain, the proposal is 10m from the highway and would not have a harmful effect on the visual amenity of the character of the area.
- 7.5 The single storey rear extension will have a depth of 1.453m spanning the width of the rear elevation of the dwellinghouse adjoining to the existing rear conservatory with an eaves height of 3.5m and a maximum height of 4.3m, the proposal will have bi-fold doors inserted into the rear elevation, the materials used will match the material used in the construction of the existing dwelling. The raised platform will have a depth of 3.621m spanning the width of the rear elevation in line with the rear of the existing conservatory, a height of 0.8m with steps leading to the rear garden.
- 7.6 The replacement of the existing glazed roof to a pitched roof with concrete interlocking tiles will have an additional height of 0.35m, 2No. roof lights are to be installed on the front and rear of the pitched roof, the flue will be removed from the west facing elevation and repositioned to the east facing side elevation, the existing glazing to the east and rear elevations will be replaced with face brickwork to match that on the existing dwelling with a window inserted along the eastern elevation and bi-folding doors to the rear facing elevation. The proposal includes a roof light to the western roof slope of the main dwellinghouse. The materials to be used in the construction will match those on the existing dwelling and would therefore be considered acceptable.
- 7.7 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

- 7.8 Although the side extension is to be along the western boundary, there will be a minimum distance of 2.216m from the main dwellinghouse with No. 17B, there are no windows in the side facing elevation of the extension. Amended plans were submitted reducing the width of the proposed extension by 0.778m to reduce the impact upon the neighbouring property along this shared elevation. It is therefore considered any impact upon this neighbouring property would be acceptable.
- 7.9 The proposal would not be readily visible to the neighbouring property along the shared eastern boundary (No.21), the proposal and raised platform area would face the rear of the garden area and would not create a harmful effect of overlooking into the rear amenity area of this property, therefore any impact is considered minimal and acceptable.

- 7.10 The neighbouring properties to the front are considered a significant distance that any impact upon these properties would be minimal and acceptable.
- 7.11 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). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Flood Risk

- 7.12 The proposed alterations fall within the definition of 'minor development in relation to flood risk and does not require a consultation or further action.

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/20/00479 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:

Food Risk Assessment - Received 18 June 2020
Location Plan 01(A)- Received 26 June 2020
Block Plan 01A (B)- Received 25 August 2020
Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations - Drawing no. METHERELL 01B - Received 25 August 2020

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.

