

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Non-applicable

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: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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 two storey front extension would consist of a gable projecting from the front of the dwelling by 1.5m and a setback entrance projecting 0.8m. The two storey extension would have a ridge that would extend from the existing steep front roofslope by approximately 4.5m and would be set down from the existing ridge by 0.1m. The first floor front extension would extend from above the existing single bay garage and would also have a gabled roof though would be narrower than the two storey extension projecting gable and would be set down from the existing ridge by 0.7m. Though the introduction of projecting gables to the frontage and replacement of the front dormer windows would ensure it has a clear two storey appearance when viewed from St Thomas Avenue unlike now, the extensions would be subservient to the existing bulk and height of the dwelling.

The overall consequence of the extensions would be a coherent design aesthetic while the use of render to match existing would further ensure the front extension would not appear unduly prominent within the wider mixed streetscene.

- 7.4 The first floor side extension would be set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling by approximately 0.5m and would be set back 1.4m from the roof of the dwelling. The extension would also be set off the boundary by 0.9m. The extension would appear subservient to the dwelling and would not be unduly prominent within the wider streetscene. The front dormer window would be set centrally to the extension and its pitched roof would match the design of the front extensions enabling it to integrate effectively with the overall visual appearance of the altered and extended frontage.
- 7.5 The single storey side extension would be set back from the front of the extended dwelling by 1.5m and at single storey with the use of matching materials would not cause harm to the character of the dwelling or the wider area.
- 7.6 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

- 7.7 The front extensions would be set to the centre of the residential curtilage of the application dwelling with distances from the adjacent neighbouring boundaries sufficient to ensure there would be no harm to residential amenity. The front facing windows of these extensions would be no higher than the existing front dormer windows and it is deemed therefore that there would be no undue overlooking impact on the dwelling immediately facing and which is separated by the highway.
- 7.8 The first floor side extension would be set off from the boundary with no. 7 St Thomas Avenue by 0.9m. No. 7 is a dormer bungalow and the 2 windows to the side elevation which would be adjacent to the first floor extension serve the living room of this property. It was noted by the case officer after undertaking a site visit that due to the proximity of the side of no. 7 to the boundary with the application dwelling, the light derived from the window opening nearest the boundary is already severely limited while the other window opening is also impacted. The bulk of the light to this room come from the primary windows to the front and rear. In considering these factors, it is concluded that the first floor extension, which would be set down from the existing ridge of the application dwelling, would have a only marginal additional overshadowing impact on no.7 which would not warrant a refusal of the application. There would be no windows to the side of the extension while the windows to the front and rear would result in overlooking no worse than currently exists from the front and rear elevations.
- 7.9 The single storey extension would face the blank side elevation of no. 11 St Thomas Avenue. At single storey and with no windows to the side or rear, this element of the proposal would not result in harm to the neighbouring residential amenity.
- 7.10 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.

(iii) Parking

- 7.11 Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy states that residential development must accord with the standards set out in the Residential Car Parking and Cycle Provision Supplementary Planning Document. The dwelling currently has 3 bedrooms and this number will increase to 4. The existing garage would be retained and the submitted plans show there would sufficient space for a further 2 parking spaces. Therefore, it is deemed that the parking spaces for a dwelling of this size would comply with Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have no undue impact on the character of the wider area, neighbouring amenity or parking provision 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/19/00263 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:

Proposed Extension 19/6019/P01 A; Site Plan 19/6019/P04A; Block Plan 19/6019/B01

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external facing materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture those on the existing building; the roofing materials to be used shall be in accordance with the details set out on the application form.

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.