
Site Address:	64A Stakes Road, Waterloooville, PO7 5NU		
Proposal:	Single storey rear infill extension, first floor side extension with dormers to front and rear.		
Application No:	APP/19/00856	Expiry Date:	28/10/2019
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Comley		
Agent:	Ms Leadbetter	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Critchley Architecture and Design Ltd		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site relates to a linked detached dwelling located on the south side of Stakes Road and it is noted that the curtilage of the site extends to Fir Copse Road to the rear/south such that the property has dual vehicular access. The dwelling is gable fronted and constructed with red brick with a feature grey clad panel, beneath a dark tiled roof. Windows and doors have been replaced with dark colour. The frontage of the site is entirely block paved providing off road parking for 3 or 4 vehicles. A low close boarded fence provides the side front boundary between No 64B to the east.

To the rear, the garden is enclosed with approximate 1.8m high close boarded fencing, but laid out such that there is an additional car parking space available directly off Fir Copse Road. Levels slope slightly at the rear such that the grassed garden is set slightly lower than the patio and house level. There is a mature tree within the rear garden, close to the highway, but this tree is not TPO'd. However there are 2No trees protected by TPO's within the adjacent site at 64B - one at the front and one at the rear. The canopy spread of both trees encroach over the application site.

Number 64B to the east is a "handed version" of the application site (with original tile hanging panel and white windows). The flat roofed linked garages are sited on the shared boundary (although 64B's has its garage door to the rear with front window) and it is noteworthy that 64B also has a current planning application for a two storey side extension (APP/19/00920 refers). Following negotiations these 2 applications are being progressed as two separate, independent schemes, rather than a combined extension. The determination of each must have regard to the other proposed extension.

2 Planning History

None relevant at 64A

But, as noted above, of relevance is the current application at 64B - see APP/19/00920

3 Proposal

Single storey rear infill extension, first floor side extension with dormers to front and rear.

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

CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

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

Arboriculturalist

No arb objection to this planning application, the proposed development will not impact on the adjacent trees and there is no requirement for tree protection measures or extra conditions should permission be allowed.

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, from same neighbour:**

Comment	Officer Comment
On Original Plans:	
The application clearly needs to be considered under the Party Wall Act of 1996. The drawing 'Survey Plans 19060-201' is wrong. It shows an existing wall lying completely within the boundary of 64A whereas this wall is a shared Party wall dividing the garages and is located on the boundary. Furthermore this wall is of single brick thickness and seems (to my eye) to have been laid on top of a common (for the adjoining garages) concrete slab. It is interlocked with the front wall (onto Stakes Road) to around 2/3 of its height but not for the full height. So it appears to me to be a single thickness wall without dedicated foundations, without any further support pillars along its length and completely unsuitable for bearing the load of a first floor addition. However, if building regulations were to allow a single skinned first floor bedroom extension to be built on such a party wall then of course it would remain a party wall. To this extent I would wish to be able to extend 64B at some date (subject to planning approval) to incorporate a similar increase in floor space albeit that this would result in the current 'link detached' houses becoming semi-detached. I also object to anything that might extend this party wall further onto the adjoining property and therefore I would wish the wall to remain no more than a brick wide on the boundary and without any form of cladding (as now proposed) and without any feature would extend beyond the simple increase in height. On the matter of the further extension (beyond that of increasing the height of the existing party garage wall), Drawing 19060-401 shows a proposed part double-height and part single-height extension towards the rear (Fir Copse Road) but the drawing shows the proposed new wall lying on the boundary (currently a 6 foot wood panel fence). I will not (Party Wall Act 1996) permit this new wall to lie on the boundary, it should be built entirely on	Party Wall Act separate legislation outside planning considerations - but would be relevant Noted & addressed in resubmission Subsequent application APP/19/00920 since submitted

land within the boundary of 64A and any foundations should not interfere with or prevent any similar extension (to any allowed for 64A) that might be built on 64B at a later date.	Amended plans submitted
On amended plans:	
The revised plans still incorrectly identify the boundary line. The boundary runs down the centre of the single skinned garage wall between the two properties 64A and 64B. The plans show an extension built on and above this single skinned wall in the garage and extending the build line along the boundary to the rear of the garage. This boundary is a wooden panel fence and any new wall should be built entirely on the land owned by 64A. Furthermore rain guttering associated with the new build will inevitably extend over the boundary. Furthermore the size of the extension has increased from the previously submitted plans to the rear and now proposes the repositioning of a bathroom window from the side wall to the rear wall. There are two windows on the facing side wall of the neighbouring property 64B and the size of the extension now proposed will be overbearing and create a tunnelling effect on 64B which is separated by just the width of a single garage (~2.7m). Although an application has been submitted (APP/19/00920) for an extension to 64B this proposal has the new building set back from the boundary line and with a much reduced length at the rear to the first floor not requiring the repositioning of the equivalent bathroom window. Unfortunately I have to ask that each application be considered in isolation. I have discussed possible cooperation with 64A but I consider that the smaller of the two proposals (APP/19/00920) is more in keeping with the rest of the property and would retain the link detached nature of the two properties. I cannot commit to a joint development that would result in the creation of a	Certificate A has been submitted and agents confirmed development would be constructed wholly within application site - it is intended to achieve this by strengthening the front of the garage and build a new side wall resting on a beam, inset from the side boundary by the thickness of the party wall. Agents have also confirmed that offset eaves and foundations would be used in the construction to avoid any overhang. Amended design concept proposes dormers in full depth cat slide roof with half hip set down from full ridge - instead of previously proposed full height but 3/4 depth two storey side extension - see section 7 for considerations of impacts Noted

single large semi-detached property.

In reality I believe that the space available for either proposed build is extremely marginal with the internal dimension of any additional room created above either garage being limited to just 2.5m.

I object to APP/19/00856 in its current form and consider that the build be reduced in size to no larger than that now proposed under APP/19/00920 thereby retaining the link detached nature of both properties.

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
- (v) Impact on trees

(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. In this case the issue of the Party Wall Act has arisen with both the owners of 64A and 64B submitting planning applications that extend up to the shared boundary. The Party Wall Act is separate from planning legislation and provides a mechanism for resolving boundary disputes. In terms of planning, following negotiations and revised plans and forms, both schemes have submitted Certificate A's and are proposing development entirely within their own application sites that could be implemented independently. In this case the agents have confirmed that it is intended to strengthen the front of the garage and build a new side wall resting on a beam, inset from the side boundary by the thickness of the party wall, as well as use offset eaves and foundations.

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

7.3 The amended plans propose an alternative design solution through the use of a cat slide with dormers. This has the benefit of a much lower ridge and the angle of roof slope creates a greater sense of space about the side addition. The variance to the more traditional approach at 64B in APP/19/00920 is such that should both schemes be implemented then 64A's scheme would appear less bulky and the variance would reduce the potential terracing effect. The cat slide dormer design solution proposed meets the Design Guide SPD in that the side extension would appear visually subservient to the host dwelling.

- 7.4 Materials proposed include cladding and dark windows, but this would match the existing dwelling and is considered visually acceptable. In street scene terms it is therefore considered that the proposed side extension is appropriate in context to the main building and adjacent site, 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 The proposed extension includes infilling the rear ground floor corner, enabling the first floor element to be full depth above. The cat slide solution enables the eaves line at the front to remain at single storey height and to the rear set at about 3.6m. The neighbouring property 64B currently has a first floor landing and bathroom window in its side elevation facing the proposed rear dormer. If their scheme APP/00920 is implemented then only the bathroom window would remain. The outlook from these windows would be altered, effectively onto a tunnelled well, but the plans demonstrate that a clear 45 degree line of sight in one direction would still be achieved from the bathroom window. The sloping roof angle and inset dormer have been kept as low as possible and accordingly some light to and outlook from would be partially protected. Since these windows serve non-habitable rooms, then the actual harm to, and loss of amenity to neighbouring residents is considered minimal and not refusable.
- 7.6 Overall, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to unacceptable loss of light to habitable rooms, and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.7 The proposal would result in a 4th bedroom and to comply with the adopted Parking SPD 3 parking spaces are required. There are already at least 4 spaces available on site at the front and rear of the site, and hence there is no highway objection to the proposal. It is noted that an additional supporting pier will be required within the internal garage which would further restrict its available width for the parking of a car - however the site has adequate parking elsewhere and does not rely on this space. Accordingly the garage does not need to be conditioned to remain available for parking.

(v) Impact on trees

- 7.8 The root protection areas of the adjacent TPO'd trees fall outside the proposed side extensions. The tree officer has confirmed no objection.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal is considered appropriate to the street scene and 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/19/00856 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:

Location and Block Plans Drawing Number 19060 - 101 Rev B
Proposed Elevations Drawing Number 19060 - 502 Rev B
Proposed Floor Plans Drawing Number 19060 - 402 Rev 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.