
Site Address:	57 Linkenholt Way, Havant, PO9 4AS		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension (retrospective).		
Application No:	APP/19/00390	Expiry Date:	27/06/2019
Applicant:	Mrs Blakey		
Agent:	Mr C Mallen	Case Officer:	Karen Wooden
	Thorns - Young Ltd		
Ward:	Barncroft		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a two storey mid terrace house, with multibrick elevations and a hung tiled roof. The property has been extended to the front by means of a single storey extension.
- 1.2 Linkenholt Way is a residential road which predominantly consists of two storey semi detached and terraced houses in a style typically found within Leigh Park.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant planning history.

3 Proposal

Single storey rear extension (retrospective application) . The extension exceeds the tolerances of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and therefore planning permission is required.

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)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

- 5.1 No consultees required for this application.

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
The height of the extension is 3.35m prior to the roof being built, and the length of the extension is 3.35m	The submitted plans show the overall height of the extension to be 3.7m, with the projection being 3.25m
There is very little gap between the outer extension wall and the boundary fence which we believe to be in breach of the building regulations and could potentially cause damage/damp to the boundary fence	This is not a planning consideration. Our records show that the works have been completed to the satisfaction of the Building Control department of Havant Borough Council.
The extension blocks light and overshadows the rear of No. 59 causing the rear of the house to be cold and dark	Addressed in Section 7
The rear extension wall makes the view from the rear windows of No. 59 bleak and depressing and impedes on the garden sitting area which is now shaded and cold	Addressed in Section 7
Point 4 of the application form incorrectly shows the work has not been started without consent	This has been selected in error and has no bearing on the determination of the application.
There is also an extension to the front of No. 57 which, along with a rear extension makes the occupants of No. 59 feel 'hemmed in'	Addressed in Section 7

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

(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 extension is located to the rear of the property and therefore is not readily visible from the public domain. Notwithstanding this, the materials used match those used on the host dwelling, reducing the impact on visual amenity. It is noted that many properties within close proximity to the application site have been altered and extended and include single storey rear extensions of varying sizes and designs.

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 Due to the location of the extension there is no adverse impact on the occupiers of the properties to the east or west.

7.6 No. 55 Linkenholt Way is attached to the southern elevation of the application site. Typical of terraced properties within Leigh Park, a shared pathway runs between the properties and provides pedestrian access to the rear gardens and brick built sheds. As such a separation gap of approximately 3m is retained between the southern wall of the extension and the northern boundary line of No. 55. It is therefore not considered that the extension has a significant impact on the occupiers of No. 55 in terms of loss of light or overbearing.

7.7 No. 59 Linkenholt Way is attached to the northern elevation. Concerns have been raised that the extension has a detrimental impact on the occupiers of this neighbouring property in terms of loss of light and overshadowing, impact on view and outside seating area, and a feeling of being hemmed in. An historical check shows that permitted development rights are in tact for the property and therefore an extension with a maximum height of 4m and projection of 3m could have been constructed utilising permitted development rights. This application exceeds the projection tolerances by 250mm.

- 7.8 With regard to the loss of light to the internal accommodation at No. 59, it is noted that the kitchen runs along the width of the rear of the house. The rear elevation has both an access door and a triple window. A 45 degree light test has been carried out, the results of which show the extension does impact the light to the access door however it does not impact more than 50% of the window and therefore the loss of light to the rear room is not considered to be significant enough to justify the refusal of the application. Furthermore the garden is west facing and as such the impact in light will be restricted to early afternoon.
- 7.9 When carrying out the officer site visit the impact on the garden including the area to the rear of the access door, shown to lose light in the above mentioned 45 degree test, was assessed, however, an extension of 3m deep could have been constructed under permitted development rights, and it is not considered that the impact caused by the additional 250mm of brickwork could justify the refusal of the application. Therefore it is not considered that the extension has a significant impact on the external amenity space of the neighbouring property.
- 7.10 The concerns raised that the extension has resulted in a loss of view from the rear window of the kitchen cannot justify the refusal of the application as the impact on a view is not a planning consideration.
- 7.11 It is accepted that the northern wall of the extension is sited close to the boundary line, which is defined by low level fencing, and this has altered the visual amenity for the occupiers of the neighbouring property, however as previously stated, an extension of 3m could have been constructed under permitted development rights, and therefore it is not considered that the overbearing caused by the additional 250mm of brickwork could justify the refusal of the application. It is noted that no windows have been inserted into the northern elevation and therefore the extension does not impact the neighbours in terms of overlooking.
- 7.12 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear significantly 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).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of 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/19/00390 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan - received 02.05.19

Block plan - received 02.05.19

Photographs - received 10.04.19

Existing and proposed plans - 3100.19.1

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.