
Site Address:	231 Milton Road, Cowplain, Waterloooville, PO8 8LS		
Proposal:	Retention of single storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/18/01309	Expiry Date:	12/02/2019
Applicant:	Mr Duncan		
Agent:	Bramble-Stewart	Case Officer:	Karen Wooden
	GBS Designs		
Ward:	Hart Plain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a semi detached bungalow with brick elevations and a pitched tiled roof. The bungalow, by means of the original design, is set approximately 7m closer to the highway than the adjoining property to the west (229 Milton Road).
- 1.2 The surrounding area is characterised by similar age properties which vary in design. It is evident that many properties within Milton Road have been altered and extended.

2 Planning History

APP/17/01055 - Prior notification for single storey development extending 5 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 3 metres and a maximum height of 3 metres., GPDC,08/11/2017

3 Proposal

- 3.1 A Prior Notification application was submitted in 2017 to establish whether the proposed extension could be constructed utilising Larger Extension Permitted Development rights in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The submitted information complied with the criteria for permitted development and at this stage it was confirmed that the extension could be constructed without the benefit of planning permission. Due to Building Regulations restrictions, the extension could not be constructed in accordance with the original plans submitted and consequently the height of the eaves of the extension exceed the height of the eaves of the original dwelling, resulting in the proposal no longer complying with permitted development and therefore requiring the benefit of planning permission.

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 were 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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

We wish to object to the height and design of the structure for the following reasons: The designs as submitted, and explained to us by the applicant, do not seem to be achievable given that we have been told the constraints of the design are floor height, ceiling height and roof depth regulations and so do not seem to represent the final appearance of the development as built. As illustrated below and considering the above constraints, the submitted plan shows the existing bungalow roof being bigger and the new flat roof smaller than reality therefore misrepresenting its final appearance. The overall height of the extension is greater than is shown on the application and what was previously permitted. We were led to believe from all involved parties that this extension roof would match the existing bungalow eaves height and scale. This affects us particularly because the extension roof now dominates our living room and garden, blocking a considerable amount of sky and daylight in a south-facing garden. Its scale overbears our living room and small garden more than it would a larger garden and this effect is greater as our bungalow is only approximately 7 metres from the new extension and it squarely faces the only window we have in our only living space. The rear and side elevations show differing wall heights and a shallower roof pitch with fewer fascia boards than would actually be needed to bring the eaves in line with the existing roof while maintaining the current height of the extension. The aerial roof plan shows the extension joining the eaves under the lowest tiles whereas the side elevation plan shows a fully flat roof abutting the existing bungalow roof.	Addressed in Section 7
--	-----------------------------------

Visually the new roof is not subservient or sympathetic to the location and surroundings in appearance and scale, it being wider and taller where it joins the existing shallow pitched roof. The plastic fascia boards are much deeper than anything used on the existing bungalow or any other buildings in eyesight that they appear much closer to us and so are out of context. The small size of our garden and height of the roof would make screening very difficult.

This original shallow roof angle does not lend itself to being joined to a tall overhanging square-box roof putting it out of context with the neighbourhood of shallow pitched roofs of gentle appearance.

The height of the brickwork of the new extension was greater than the original bungalow wall, raising the height of the soffits by two courses of bricks. Today we notice the applicant has removed some bricks and fascia so currently work is still in progress and we cannot tell what the finished roof's appearance will be.

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 Due to the siting of the extension to the rear of the property, it will not be readily visible from the public domain. Notwithstanding this, the information provided shows that the proposal has been constructed using brick to match the original dwelling. The extension projects 5m from the rear wall of the bungalow which results in a retained garden length over 20m.

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 It is not considered that the extension will have a significant impact on the occupiers of the properties to the south or north.

7.6 No. 229 Milton Road is attached to the western elevation of the application site, however is set approximately 7m further back from the highway. This neighbouring property has been extended to the rear and as a result the rear elevation extends approximately 5.4m further than the rear wall of the rear extension of No. 231. It is

noted that the extension the subject of this application will reduce morning light to a bedroom and the bathroom window on the eastern elevation of No. 229, however a 45 degree light test has been carried out which shows that an extension of 3m (which could be constructed under Permitted Development rights) would have the same impact on the light to the bedroom. It does result in a greater loss to the bathroom, however this currently benefits from obscured glazing and is not a main habitable room.

- 7.7 Concerns have been raised by the occupiers of the property to the east (1 Spencer Gardens) that the proposal dominates their living room and garden, and reduces their light. No.1 Spencer Gardens occupies a plot which measures approximately 34m x 9m, however as the dwelling is set 13.3m back from the front boundary line, the rear of the property is located approximately 7m from the shared boundary line with the application site. The original dwelling at 231 Milton Road is sited close to this boundary line, and extended 5.6m along the rear boundary line of No, 1 Spencer Gardens. This left a gap of approximately 3.4m to the north western boundary line. The extension the subject of this application projects 5m from the original rear wall and as such extends the whole width of the rear garden of No. 1. It is accepted that this does appear somewhat overbearing, however it must be considered that Permitted Development rights would allow the construction of an extension of 3m, (with a maximum eaves height of 3m and/or no higher than the original eaves height), which would leave a gap of just 0.4m to the north western corner of the garden of No. 1.

Therefore the main consideration of this application is whether the additional eaves height of 0.3m will result in a significant adverse impact on the neighbours in terms of loss of light or overbearing. The rear wall of No. 1 is set approximately 8m back from the extension and as such the proposal will not result in loss of light to the internal living accommodation. Furthermore it is noted that there are no designated external seating areas (decking/patio) within the rear garden of this neighbouring property that would be impacted by the additional height. Therefore any loss of light could not be considered to be significant enough to justify the refusal of this application.

The boundary treatment to the eastern boundary of the application site is shown to be 2m high fencing. When construction is completed this will result in approximately 0.65m of facing brickwork and 0.7m of felt roofing and fascia boards being visible. When assessing the application in terms of the separation gap and the relationship with the neighbouring property, it is not considered that the refusal of this application could be justified in terms of having a significant overbearing impact on the occupiers of No. 1 Spencer Gardens

- 7.8 The plans show the en-suite window to the eastern elevation is to be obscurely glazed and it is recommended that this is conditioned should the application gain approval. This will protect the privacy of the occupiers of the property to the east.
- 7.9 Concerns have also been raised that the extension does not accord with the measurements on the plans the subject of this application. The application is retrospective and as such most of the construction had been carried out prior to the submission of the application. As such, measures have been taken to ensure the extension is weatherproof and does not reflect the final build. However as with all planning applications, any planning permission granted will be subject to the build complying with the approved plans. If the final structure does not accord with the plans the extension may be liable for enforcement action.
- 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.

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/18/01309 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:

Design and access statement - received 19.12.18
Environment Agency flood zone form
Amended site plan - 08 (rev a)
Amended location plan - 07 (rev a)
Amended block plan - 06 (rev a)
Amended block plan showing parking spaces - 05 (rev a)
Amended proposed elevations - 03 (rev a)
Amended existing elevations - 03 (rev a)
Amended proposed roof plan - 02 (rev a)
Amended proposed floor plan - 01 (rev a)

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.

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.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the window in the ground floor on the eastern elevation facing 1 Spencer Gardens shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which

obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.