
Site Address:	7 Bushy Mead, Waterloooville, PO7 5DY		
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/19/00530	Expiry Date:	16/07/2019
Applicant:	Mr L Gibbons		
Agent:	Mr D P Manns	Case Officer:	Ross Leal
	D M Designs		
Ward:	Purbrook		
Site Visit Date:			

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

No. 7 is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings located on the north side of Bushy Mead. House types in the immediate vicinity are of similar design and materials and are mainly rendered, with brick quoining. The application dwelling has a large box dormer to the rear roof plane. The pair of dwellings have side gables and profiled roof tiles in a red/brown colour. The dwellings have small two-storey front projecting elements with front gables and a small pitched roof. The application dwelling has two car parking spaces to the front which is open to the street. No.9 in this pair has hedging on its' frontage and the joint boundary of approximately 1.8m in height. There is a low 1m+ fence between no.5 and the site.

The application dwelling is separated from the joint boundary with no.5 by 2.15m and from the side wall of no.5 by approximately 3m, with an intervening wooden panel fence of approximately 1.5m in height and this partly screens the lower part of a window in the side of no.5 which faces the side gable of the existing application dwelling. This window is located towards the rear of the side wall of no.5. No.5 also has a single storey rear extension with lean-to sloping roof, this has no windows facing the site and main openings are in the rear elevation.

To the rear of no.9 in this pair there is a single storey extension which is set away from the joint boundary by approximately 2.5m, this has side windows facing the site, although these are not principal ones and serve a conservatory. No.9 also has a habitable room window at rear ground floor which is between its rear extension and the joint boundary. The boundary is a fence and wall.

Site boundaries elsewhere are a mixture of fencing and hedging, with some tree screening at the very rear of the site.

Materials would be render and detailing to match existing.

2 Planning History

No relevant planning history.

3 Proposal

It is proposed to erect a mainly rear extension, although this would be single storey and would also extend out to the side and forwards along part of the side wall of the existing dwelling. The extension would be 4.539m in depth and 5.7m wide and would have a parapet wall behind which would be a flat roof. There would also be a roof lantern. The proposal has been revised, so that the side of the rear extension, which would have been on the joint boundary with no.9, has been moved away from the joint boundary and would now be 0.96m away from the joint boundary. The application is also

accompanied by a further drawing which indicates impact on outlook from the adjoining ground floor rear window of no.9.

The extension would also extend out from the side of the existing dwelling by 1.112m and therefore be 1.038m from the joint boundary and 1.888m from the main side wall (and side facing window) of no.5. The parapet wall would be 3.1m in height. The side element of the extension would extend forward of the rear wall by 4.8m. The parapet has been omitted from the side of the rear extension facing no.9 and the extension would be 1m from the shared boundary with that dwelling.

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)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

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

Developer Services, Southern Water

No objection.

A public foul sewer within the site. The exact position of the public foul sewer must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

Please note:

- No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 meters on each side of the external edge of the public sewer.
- No soakaways should be located within 5 meters of a public sewer.
- All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

Furthermore, due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Please read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which has now been published and is available to read on

our website via the following link
<https://beta.southernwater.co.uk/infrastructure-charges>.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119), www.southernwater.co.uk or by email at developerservices@southernwater.co.uk.

Regarding the line of the public foul sewer, this is unaffected by the proposal. An informative will however be added to ensure that the applicant is aware of the public foul sewer, the need to ensure that this remains unaffected and the other matters raised by Southern Water.

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
An adjoining occupier has made representations objecting to the application: We would like to register our objection to the planning application submitted in its current form for the reasons as listed below. - Quality of plans - my neighbouring property is not represented on the detailed plans despite the side extension coming just over 1m of the boundary. - Rights of Light - We have concerns regarding the light into our main living room window that currently overlooks property. - Character of the design - The design of the flat roof when there are none locally to this property. - Further details of bin storage and usage of the side door which will increase the disturbance to our living room.	See Planning Considerations section of this report. The case officer has visited the application site and so will have secured an appropriate understanding of both the position of No.5 relative to the site and the impact of the proposed development on the side facing window.

If you could please consider these points when making your decision.	
Thank you for your letter regarding the further details for the extension on the above mentioned property. Our only comment is that, although the green line denotes the boundary, the location of our property 5 Bushy Mead is still not represented, therefore not showing clearly how close the extension is. We would like the impact on our living room to be considered and feel that without clear representation or a visit of the property this will not be possible.	See Planning Considerations 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
- (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 The proposed extension would not be widely visible, except to neighbours and impact on views from the public realm would be limited to a glimpse between dwellings. There is therefore not considered to be an appreciable visual impact on the street scene and the proposal would not give rise to harm to visual amenity in this sense. The application dwelling is a mix of render and brick for walls, with some matching painted brick to the rear. The use of render for the extension with brick detailing would therefore match the existing dwelling and is considered to be sympathetic to the appearance of the existing dwelling. The design of the extension would utilise a parapet wall and this would screen a flat roof with roof lantern. This type of design is not generally uncommon and would not appear incongruous. The parapet wall design is not therefore considered to be harmful to visual amenity.

The design and appearance of the proposals are therefore deemed appropriate in context to the existing dwelling, the site, the locality and not to be harmful to visual amenity. The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy) and also consistent with the Council Design Guide 2011.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.4 The proposed extension to the rear and side would have an impact on the adjoining occupiers. The issue is whether the impact is harmful to a degree where refusal of planning permission would be justified.

In respect of no.9 in this pair of dwellings, the proposed rear extension would encroach into the 45 degree outlook from the adjoining ground floor rear window by 1.431m and would therefore not be entirely consistent with the Councils Design Guide SPD which requires that the 45 degree outlook is protected. However, the impact has been reduced by moving the side of the extension 0.96m away from the joint boundary. In addition, it should be noted that a 3m deep rear extension could be erected on the boundary without the need to obtain planning permission and this would encroach into the 45 degree outlook by 1.431m, which is the same amount as by the proposed extension in its revised form. Given that the same impact on outlook could occur from an extension which would not require planning permission, it is difficult to sustain an argument that refusal of the revised proposal on grounds of encroachment into outlook would be justified, particularly as the applicant has sought to mitigate impact by moving the side of the extension away from the joint boundary. Impact has been further mitigated by removal of the parapet wall on the side of the extension facing no.9. Following these amendments it is not considered that the limited encroachment into outlook is so harmful as to justify refusal of planning permission.

In respect of the potential impact on no.5 to the west, the proposed extension would extend out from the side of the application dwelling by 1.112m and be 1.038m from the joint boundary and 1.888m from the main side wall (and side facing window) of no.5. However, this window is located in a position where it already directly faces the side gable of the main application dwelling and is within the shadow created by it. There is also a boundary fence which already partially screens the lower part of this facing window. The introduction of what would be a limited sideways extension would not add appreciably to impact on light given the location of this existing window and also the orientation of these dwellings. It is acknowledged that there will be a limited impact on outlook, but this is not considered to be so harmful in terms of light loss or dominance in outlook so as to amount to significant harm that would justify refusal of planning permission.

The potential for future impacts on adjoining occupiers from the possible introduction of new doors or windows in side elevations can be controlled by condition.

(iv) Parking

- 7.5 The proposal would not result in increased parking demand at the dwelling given that no additional bedrooms are proposed. The proposal is therefore in accord with Policies CS16 and DM13 of the HBLP (Core Strategy)
- 7.6 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not result in unacceptably harmful loss of outlook or light, nor be overbearing in outlook - such that no significant harm to amenity would result which would justify refusal of planning permission and it also meets the requirements of Policy CS16 and DM13 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposals are not considered to be harmful to visual amenity or to the amenity of the adjoining occupiers and the proposal is not considered to give rise to harm such that refusal of planning permission would be justified. 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/19/00530 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:
Drawing Number GIBBONS_01A/Revision C - Plans elevations and Sections - Dated 04.07.2019
Drawing Number GIBBONS_03A/Revision A - Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension Showing GPD and Proposed - Dated 17.05.2019
Block Plan, Scale 1:500 - Received 21.05.2019
Location Plan, Scale 1:1250 - Received 21.05.2019
Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 The external materials used shall match as closely as possible, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing dwelling so far as is 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 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order (as amended), no additional windows, doors or other openings other than the door shown in the west side elevation shall be constructed within the east and west facing side elevations of the extension hereby permitted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.