

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Developer Services, Southern Water

Southern Water would have no objections to the above proposal. Informative recommended.

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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

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
- (v) 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 would see the infilling of a small recessed element to the front of the dwelling to create a small front extension of approximately 1m in depth. This extension would represent a minor alteration to the character of the dwelling but would be combined with an increase in the total roof height of the dwelling by approximately 1.03m. The front extension and the increase in height would be deemed to be not of a scale which would fundamentally alter the character of the bungalow so that it would appear as a distinct two storey property. The final height of 6.5m would not be unduly out of keeping with the dwellings within the wider streetscene. The materials would also match existing further ensuring the property would not appear unduly prominent.

- 7.4 The proposed rear extension would be single storey, use materials to match those existing at the property and although would have a degree of visibility from the adjacent footpath would be no higher or closer to it than the existing conservatory which would be demolished. It is considered that the extension would be subservient to the rear of the dwelling and have no impact on the character of the wider area.
- 7.4 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

- 7.5 The single storey front extension would be of sufficiently small scale in terms of depth that it would not impact on the residential amenity of no. 66 Charlesworth Drive to the west. The raising of the roof by approximately 1.03m would see it become higher than the roof of no. 66 and the three dormer windows to its eastern side elevation. However, the raised roof would have a pitch which slopes away as it drops to the west, with a proposed pitch of 44 degrees and a approximate 5m separation distance between the respective side elevations of the two properties, and in light of this it is regarded that the higher roof would not unduly impact on the light to the windows to the side of no. 66 or create an overbearing impact upon it. The creation of the 2 bedrooms in the roof space would also necessitate the insertion of high level rooflights to the sides of the raised roof. As the windows would be high level with cill height of 1.65m from floor level, the centre of the window 2m above floor level and set into a sloping roof, it is not considered that they would result in direct overlooking of adjacent properties. The insertion of a window to the rear elevation to serve one of the newly formed bedrooms would not be high level, however the application dwelling would be separated from the property directly to the rear and at the same land level, no. 52 Andrew Crescent, by 20m which is regarded sufficient to ensure no undue overlooking of this property.
- 7.6 The proposed rear extension would have a height of 3.2 and a depth of 3m. The small scale of the extension as well as its position set off the boundary with no. 66 Charlesworth Drive by 2.5m would ensure that no undue harm to the residential amenity of this neighbouring property would occur.
- 7.7 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would 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) Parking

- 7.11 The dwelling has 3 bedrooms and it is proposed for this number to be retained. The proposal would not result in the reduction of hardstanding area to the front or access to the garage to the rear. It is therefore considered that this parking provision for a dwelling of this size would comply with Policy DM13 of the Core Strategy which outlines residential parking standards.

(v) Flood Risk

- 7.12 The application would be classed as a 'minor development' and according to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) unlikely to cause flood risk unless they would have an adverse effect on a watercourse, floodplain or its flood defences; they would impede access to flood defence and management facilities, or; where the cumulative impact of such developments would have a significant effect on local flood storage capacity or flood flows.
- 7.23 The dwelling is within Flood Zone 2 and a Flood Risk Assessment has been provided. Finished floor levels (FFLs) of the development would be no lower than the existing floor levels and it is therefore duly considered that the proposal would comply with CS 15 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/19/00342 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 Ground Floor Plan, Drg No. SD18529-P1.1 REV B;
Proposed Attic Floor Plan, Drg No. SD18529-P1.2 REV B;
Proposed Elevations and Sections, Drg No. SD18529-P1.3 REV B;
Site and Location Plan, Drg No. SD18529-P1.4;
Flood Risk Assessment received by the Local Planning Authority on 05/04/2019

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture those stated on the received 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 2018.