
Site Address: 19 Westbourne Avenue, Emsworth, PO10 7QT
Proposal: Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of new single storey, flat roof extension; glazed link section; installation of flue and extension of the existing coach house to form a new single storey garage with pitched roof.
Application No: APP/18/00816 Expiry Date: 17/10/2018
Applicant: Mrs Hardie
Agent: Mr Oswald Case Officer: Rachael McMurray
 AR Design Studio
Ward: Emsworth
Site Visit Date:

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located in Westbourne Avenue which is a residential area of Emsworth. The street is characterised by large, detached dwellings of varying styles and designs. The application site is a large, double fronted bay, detached, Edwardian style dwelling of traditional design of brick and slate tile construction. It has a gravel driveway to the front and is marked from the highway by a flint brick wall with iron railings. There is a two-storey coach house located to the side / south of the dwelling which is also of a traditional design. There is large protected London Plane tree on the front boundary, close to the boundary with No.17.
- 1.2 The rear garden is very large, level and laid to lawn. The house has previously been extended at the rear, with a single storey rear extension with a circular design and lead roof. There is also a small, rear single storey extension adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 21. The rear boundaries comprise a mixture of brick walls and fencing. The boundary with No. 21 is formed by the side elevation of the rear extension moving into a lower height brick wall. There is also a variety of vegetation along this boundary. The boundary with No. 17 is marked by the side elevation of the existing coach house and a low brick wall.

2 Planning History

98/62815/001 - Erection of railings on existing front boundary wall to a maximum height of 1.85 m, increase/rebuild entrance piers to a height of 2.1m, erect new pier at south east corner to a height of 1.7m and increase height of existing pier at north east corner to 1.7m. New entrance gates to a maximum height of 2.4m.,
PERM,29/10/1998
97/62815/000 - Part single storey, part two storey rear extension incorporating balcony, PERM,13/11/1997

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of new single storey, flat roof extension; glazed link section; installation of flue and extension of the existing coach house to form a new single storey garage with pitched roof.
- 3.2 The originally submitted application included a dormer extension and a detached garage with timber cladding however following Officer concerns, the plans were revised to remove the dormer extension and to join up the garage with the existing coach house and also remove the timber cladding from the garage extension.

3.3 The proposal comprises the following elements:

Rear extension / glazed link section

The rear extension would be separated from the main dwelling by a glazed link section. The total depth of the rear extension would be 8.6m however, this would include the glazed link section, the enclosed rear extension and an external terrace area which the roof of the extension would sail over. The extension would have a flat roof design to a height of 3.2m and a green/sedum roof is proposed for this extension. The extension would be finished with timber cladding. The extension would be positioned 1.89m from the shared boundary with No. 21. It would extend 9m in width across the rear of the dwelling.

Flue

A flue is proposed to serve a new fireplace in the snug area as shown on the floor plans. This would extend 1m above the flat roof of an existing rear extension which is to remain.

New garage

The garage would be attached to the east elevation of the existing coach house. It would have a ridge height of 4m and an eaves height of 2.4m, with a pitched roof and would be constructed of brick and tile materials to match the host dwelling.

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)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Arboriculturalist

At the front of the property is a mature London Plane which has now been made the subject of a TPO. In order to ensure that the tree is properly protected and taken in consideration, an AIA, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan will need to be submitted to demonstrate if and how the development can be achieved without damaging this important tree. This information will need to be submitted during the application process and not by a condition.

Further response following the submission of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment:

There is not enough detailed information available to be able to agree that the work can be conditioned. Detailed engineering solutions as to how the foundations of the garage will be achieved without damaging the trees is required. The report suggests piles, but a specific method statement for this is required, along with a method statement for the type of no dig solution the applicant will be going for and how this will be achieved.

Further response based on information submitted on 14/12/2018:

The revised Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan is comprehensive however I have the following comments to make:-

In relation to the proposed garage, the no dig solution described should enable the development to be achieved without harm to the London Plane. However, no level information has been provided and from the diagrams submitted I can only assume that the garage will need to be raised to deal with the no dig solution and ramped access into the driveway. In planning terms this may have implications.

In relation to the extension to the rear of the property, the Willow within the applicants garden and off site Ash in the neighbouring rear garden are not suitable specimens to be protected by a Tree Preservation Order due to their form and limited public amenity value. I have measured the stems of the Ash tree and calculated that the Root Protection Area should be 7.8 not 7.2 as shown within the report. However, the brick boundary wall will have acted as a barrier for the trees rooting system and it is unlikely there will be many, if any roots affected by the proposal. The incursion into this trees RPA is minimal and for this reason consider that the current Tree Protection shown is sufficient to protect this off site tree.

I therefore have no objection to the proposal providing the work is carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan Dated December 2018.

Officer Note: *With regards to the concern raised with the potential increase in levels for the garage, the proposed ground floor plan clearly identifies this information and confirms that the proposed levels for the garage will be 9.1m AOD (compared to 9.03m AOD for the existing coach house). With the existing ground level in the vicinity of the tree being c.8.86m AOD, there is therefore c.240mm of 'play' available for the rootbridge system. The agent has confirmed that if a greater step up is required for the slab, this can be accommodated without having to alter any of the external elevations.*

Environmental Health

I refer to the above application under the Town & Country Planning Acts passed to this Service for comment.

I have perused the enclosed plans / documentation provided by the applicant. It would appear that the proposed new flue is to serve a new fireplace / wood or log burner installation, in the existing Snug room section of the property.

Based on the current proposed positioning and height of the flue, there is a possibility for smoke nuisance to applicants own property and to neighbouring properties, linked to wind direction and operator efficiency.

If consent is to be granted on this application, I would ask that the following informative's be added to any positive Decision notice.

Hours of Work

Bonfires
Dust Control
Wood burning or multi - fuel stoves / appliances.

Officer Note: *the requested informatives will be added. It should also be noted that a flue of less than 1m in height could be installed on the dwelling without the need for planning permission, as it would constitute 'permitted development'.*

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: 11

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2 x objection received. The points made are summarised below:

Summary of objections to amended scheme:

- 6.1 Errors have been made with the submitted details regarding materials on the existing property.
Officer comment: Noted; a site visit has been undertaken in connection with the application to confirm the materials used on the existing dwelling at first hand..
- 6.2 Trees / vegetation in neighbouring gardens will be affected by the development.
Officer comment: The Arboriculturalist has commented that the adjacent trees are not suitable for statutory protection by way of TPO and therefore the vegetation does not represent a significant constraint on development. Notwithstanding this, the Arboriculturalist considers the AIA to be appropriate for the reasons set out in the consultation response.
- 6.3 The visual impact of the rear extension is not sympathetic to its surroundings, or the original character of the dwelling.
Officer comment: Please see section 7 - Planning Considerations
- 6.4 The rear extension will cause overshadowing of the adjacent property to the north, including its vegetation.
Officer comment: Please see section 7 - Planning Considerations
- 6.5 The regular maintenance of the green sedum roof would result in a loss of privacy to the neighbouring property.
Officer comment: Please see section 7 - Planning Considerations
- 6.6 Noise disturbance would arise from the maintenance of the sedum roof and cleaning of the glazed link and roof lights
Officer comment: Please see section 7 - Planning Considerations
- 6.7 The proposed chimney flue would result in pollution to No. 21.
Officer comment: Please see section 7 - Planning Considerations

- 6.8 The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties
Officer comment: Please see section 7 - Planning Considerations
- 6.9 The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood
Officer comment: Please see section 7 - Planning Considerations
- 6.10 The removal of the chimney on the north elevation will have a negative impact on the streetscene and the north elevation by unbalancing the original Edwardian roof design.
Officer comment: The removal of the chimney in itself does not require planning permission and so cannot be considered as a material consideration.
- 6.11 The proposed garage is out of character with the streetscene in that it fails to leave a suitable gap from a shared boundary.
Officer comment: The position of the garage, as amended, accords with the alignment of the existing coach house to which it will be attached. Its position is not considered to have a significant impact on the streetscene as a result.
- 6.12 The pitched roof of the garage would have an adverse impact on No. 17 Westbourne Avenue and block light into the room which looks towards No. 19.
Officer comment: Please see section 7 - Planning Considerations

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 From the perspective of the streetscene, the only visible element of the proposal would be the proposed pitched roof garage. In the originally submitted scheme, this was proposed to be detached from the existing coach house and include a flat roof design with a timber cladding finish. It was considered that this would have been out of character with the traditional style of the main dwelling and would have formed an incongruous feature in the streetscene. The design was therefore amended and the revised garage is of a more traditional design with a pitched roof, using traditional brick and tile materials. This is considered to be a more suitable match to both the coach house and main dwelling in terms of character and design, with the garage being subservient to the scale of the coach house itself. The position of the garage on the boundary with No.17 echoes that of the existing coach house and is not considered to appear out of place in context.
- 7.4 As such, the overall design and appearance of the garage is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and the street scene and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is considered that the proposed garage would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

- 7.5 With regards to the proposed rear extension (which would replace an existing extension), a contemporary approach is being proposed including a flat roof with a sedum covering, a glazed link section and timber cladding. It is acknowledged that this approach will provide a clear contrast with the character of the host dwelling, and therefore to some extent contradicts the advice in the Borough Design Guide SPD, which looks for rear extensions to be subservient and sympathetic to the original design of the host dwelling. That said, regard must also be had to the advice on design in the NPPF, which (at paragraph 127) looks to development to be "*sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change*". Whilst the proposed extension is not of a traditional style, it is considered that there is more scope to incorporate a more contemporary design in this location as it would be situated to the rear of the dwelling and therefore not affect the visual amenity of the streetscene. The overall bulk of the addition is moderated through the design incorporating a covered terrace which introduces openings in the elevations on the north, west and south elevations. Taken together, the use of high quality materials, the glazed link section and the covered terrace assist to form an interesting addition to the dwelling. On balance, the design and appearance of the rear extension 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).

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.6 The position of the proposed garage, adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 17 would mean that it is visible from the side facing windows within No. 17, particularly given that, following amendments, it features a pitched roof design. Concerns have been raised that this would block light to these windows. However, the height of the garage roof would be 4m to the ridge, so lower than the existing coach house, and it would not impede the north facing view from the existing first floor window to a significant degree. It would also appear that this window serves either a bathroom or landing area. With regards to the existing ground floor window at No.17, the height to eaves of the proposed garage is less than that which could be constructed under permitted development rights - such rights would allow for a 2.5m high addition to be built without the need for permission; whereas the eaves height of the garage is approximately 2.4m. With regard to the additional height generated by the pitched roof, this will pitch away from the affected window and will not significantly intrude upon the 25 degree angle which is referred to in the Borough Design SPD. Coupled with the fact that the affected window faces in a predominantly northerly direction, where direct sunlight is unlikely to be affected, overall the impact of the garage on this particular window is not considered to warrant a refusal of the application.
- 7.7 A range of concerns have been raised that the proposal would have an adverse impact on No. 21 as a result of the rear extension by means of its size, design and potential damage to boundary vegetation. The general considerations relating to design are set out at (ii) above. Whilst the proposed extension would be large in terms of its depth at 8.6m, it would be set off the shared boundary by 1.89m and feature a break in the north facing elevation with the inclusion of the external terrace area, thus allowing views and light through both to and from the north. By virtue of its flat roof design, the height of the extension would be 3.2m. Being located due south of the neighbour at No.21, light levels to the adjacent dwelling are not considered to be adversely affected and will not breach the 25 degree angle referred to in the Borough Design Guide SPD. In terms of the impact on garden vegetation, this is not normally a planning consideration, and in any event it is not considered that the impact of an extension set 1.89m off the boundary will be any greater than that which could be caused through the operation of normal permitted development rights (which allow for a 4m deep and 4m high rear extension to be built on a site boundary without the need for planning permission).

Whilst the rear extension would be visible from No. 21, it is considered that, with the added set-off from the boundary secured through the amended plans, the proposal will not appear significantly overbearing or lead to overlooking and it would therefore have a limited and acceptable impact on this property, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

- 7.8 Concern has also been raised with regards to the use of a sedum roof on the rear extension and that this would result in a loss of privacy and noise disturbance due to regular maintenance being required. Reference to published information online indicates that the nature of a sedum roof means that it is generally low, as opposed to no, maintenance - although the level of maintenance to be undertaken in respect of it will depend on the precise planting conditions and preferences of the householder. This is considered to be no different to the normal circumstances that apply within suburban areas, where individual householders will undertake a greater or lesser level of maintenance of their properties according to their preferences. As such, the use of this type of roof in itself would not warrant defensible grounds for a reason for refusal.
- 7.9 Concern has also been raised with the proposal for a chimney flue on part of the existing rear extension which will be retained, both in terms of its visual and amenity impacts. The Council's Environmental Health Officer was consulted and has advised that based on the current proposed positioning and height of the flue, there is a possibility for smoke nuisance to the applicant's own property and to neighbouring properties, linked to wind direction and operator efficiency. This position is noted; however it must also be recognised that the flue only requires planning permission in this instance as it projects 1m above the roof - a marginally shorter flue would not require planning permission (as it could be installed under 'permitted development' rights). It is also the case that any smoke nuisance arising would be covered under separate Environmental Health legislation if a nuisance occurs. It is therefore concluded that the visual impact of the flue, and the risk of smoke nuisance cannot form a sustainable basis to refuse the application. However, an informative drawing attention to the implications of causing nuisance will be included on any decision.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the revised proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and the streetscene 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/18/00816 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 north and east elevations - DN: P110 A

Proposed South and West elevations - DN: P111 A

Coach House and proposed garage North Elevation - DN: P112 A

Coach House and proposed garage south Elevation - DN: P114

Proposed GF plan - DN: P105 A

Proposed FF Plan - DN: P106

Proposed roof plan - DN: P108 A

Proposed site plan - DN: P102 A

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the buildings (including the garage) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.