
Site Address:	22 Belmont Grove, Havant, PO9 3PU		
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear, side and front extension		
Application No:	APP/20/00185	Expiry Date:	23/04/2020
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Barton		
Agent:	Mr Potter	Case Officer:	Selina Donophy
	James Potter Associates		
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

This application site is a semi-detached, two storey dwellinghouse located on the north side of Belmont Grove, close to the junction with Norman Way. This property has a hipped roof and is of red brick construction with clay hanging tiles to the first floor level of the front elevation. Set back towards the rear is a detached garage served by a driveway running down the western side. Towards the front is a lawn, bordered by a low boundary wall separating the property from the highway.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Erection of single storey rear, side and front extension.

NB A raised platform to the rear was in the original submission, however this was removed from the application following officer concerns.

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)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

No comments received

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
We have looked at the plans that my neighbour has submitted for an extension and are quite dismayed at the length that it extends out into the garden. Our gardens face NNW so the sun only gets round the house pm. A 6m extension will cast even more shade and will affect our patio. As it is we don't get the sun right at the back of the house and the extension will create a really gloomy area. The neighbour will have all the afternoon sun in his extension. Does the planning officer take into account the aspect of the building and is 6m plus 2.7m high a reasonable extent for additional building? (Bearing in mind that it is a solid structure not a conservatory)	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of report. The application was amended following the receipt of these concerns resulting in a modest reduction in the depth of the extension, coupled with its relocation 1m off the boundary with the adjoining neighbour. A raised platform in the original application was also removed.
The revised plan shows the extension to be not as close to the boundary as the original plan and we are agreeable to that but the length of the extension has only been reduced by half a metre so we still feel that it will block out too much sun/light. We have no extension at the back and will not be adding one of our own so this building will make the area by our french doors dingy.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of report. The degree to which the revised extension will intrude upon the light and outlook of the neighbouring property is considered to be consistent with that which would arise from the construction of a rear extension under permitted development rights directly on the boundary, and this 'fallback position' is a material consideration.

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) CIL

(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.

It was not possible for a site visit to be undertaken for this application and therefore this report is based on photos of the application site supplied by the applicant and neighbour, together with aerial photographs and street views. These are considered sufficient for a robust assessment of the application to have taken place.

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

7.3 This proposal comprises a side, front and rear extension. The single storey side extension would be constructed to the west side of the property and would have a width of approximately 1.8 metres and a total depth of 15.6 metres . It would have a lean to style roof and would wrap around the front south western corner of the property, jutting forward of the existing building line to create a boot room/porch with a pitched roof. At the rear of the property a flat roof extension is proposed - this would be set back slightly behind the extension running down the side with a depth of 5.4 metres taken from the rear elevation wall of the existing property and a height of approximately 3.2 metres. It would be set in from the boundary by 1 metre.

This proposal follows amendments made to the initial proposal following concerns raised in regards to impact upon no 20 Belmont Grove. These changes include the set off from the boundary; the removal of the parapet roof originally proposed, creating a reduction in depth of approximately 0.6 metres; and the removal of a raised terrace area.

Other elements of the proposal include the relocation of the front door to the side, velux roof lights and windows to the side and front extension roof as well as an additional door to the side extension. Two roof lights are proposed to the rear extension serving the kitchen and bi-folding doors with steps leading down to the garden. Materials proposed include a timber frame to the front extension which would have white render. The side element would be constructed of hanging natural slate and the rear extension would be in white render.

This proposal is judged to be a sizeable addition to the property in terms of scale. Despite this it is not judged to be excessive within the context of the plot size. The properties in the immediate vicinity are generally in attached pairs with gaps retained to the boundary at the front . Although the side extension does infringe upon this space a gap is retained to the side and it does not exceed single storey height. The materials proposed are not considered particularly in keeping with the surrounding area, which mainly comprises facing brickwork, however this would not be highly

visible when viewed from the front and is not judged to cause harm to the streetscene. The rear element of this proposal would not be visible from the public realm.

The design and appearance of the proposal is therefore deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is 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 To the west of the application site is no 24 Belmont Grove. No 24 forms part of a separate semi-detached pair and is set off from the boundary shared with no 22 by approximately 2.8 metres. The proposed side extension is set off this shared boundary by 1 metre. Due to the gap retained and as this extension would be single storey, with the roof pitched away from the neighbouring property, it is not judged to have any significant impact on the amenity of no 24. There would be a reduction in windows facing west on the side elevation. Although there would be an additional door to this side this is not considered to bring any notable increased activity.

To the east of the application site is the adjoining property, no 20 Belmont Grove. This has a window and set of french doors on the rear elevation, sited close to the boundary between the properties. The initial rear extension proposal was judged to have a harmful impact on no 20 in terms of impact of overshadowing, exacerbated by its siting directly on the shared boundary and total length of 6 metres. In accordance with the criteria set out in the Council's adopted Design Guide SPD, a 45 degree line was taken from the mid point of the doors at no 20 which showed that anything beyond 1.5 metres depth, sited on the boundary would exceed the 45 degree rule and therefore impact light and outlook to the rear of no 20.

In this regard it is of note that a rear extension could be built with a depth of 3 metres on the boundary, with a height of 4 metres under permitted development rights which would not require planning permission. If this were to be constructed under permitted development rights the 3 metre depth would cut across the rear door at no 20 on a 70 degree angle, and thus any consideration of the scheme must consider this potential outcome as a viable 'fallback position' for the applicants. In this context, amendments have been negotiated to the proposal to include a set off of the extension from the boundary by 1 metre. This set off would mean that, at 5.4 metres depth as proposed, the extension would not have any significantly worse impact than a 3 metre extension set on the boundary under permitted development rights as it would sit along the same 70 degree line. The raised terrace area previously proposed to the rear has also been removed from the application as this was judged to have a harmful impact on privacy at no 20.

Taking the amendments secured into consideration, whilst this proposal is considered to have some harmful impact upon light and outlook received at the rear of the neighbouring property, no 20, for the reasons sited above the impact of this extension is not significantly worse than what could be built under permitted development rights and therefore this extension is judged on balance to be acceptable.

- 7.5 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear unacceptably overbearing or lead to overlooking and, when taking the permitted development fallback into consideration, 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) CIL -

This proposal would not result in additional floor space of 100 square metres or more , therefore this is not CIL liable.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours compared to the permitted development fallback position and would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality. It 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/20/00185 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:

20014-PL-001 REV A Amended location and block plan
20014-PL-002 REV A Amended existing and proposed ground floor plan
20014-PL-003 REV A Amended existing and proposed first floor plan
20014-PL-005 REV A Amended proposed elevations
Email from agent received 20.05.2020 'Materials'

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable. The materials to the side extension shall comprise natural slate unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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.