
Site Address:	1 Copse Close, Waterloooville, PO7 5JS		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage; Two storey side extension to include integral garage/workshop		
Application No:	APP/19/00487	Expiry Date:	08/07/2019
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Tingley		
Agent:	Mr Gard	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	ACE Designs		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site relates to a 1970's style detached gable fronted two storey dwelling, constructed of pale brick with red tile hanging at first floor. Windows and doors have been replaced with dark grey. There is a detached flat roofed garage set slightly back within the plot and hard up to the eastern shared boundary with No. 2. The site tapers slightly such that the separation from the eastern side flank increases. The land slopes up to the south, such that the dwelling is set at an elevated position relative to the highway and number 10 The Thicket to the west. The frontage of the site is currently grassed with side drive.

The application dwelling is the first property within this small cul-de-sac of just 6 dwellings, located on the south side of the road. Numbers 1 to 5 are identical dwellings set in a staggered, undulating and curved layout. Each has a slightly tapered site and hence the flat roofed side garages vary - some are attached to the east, some to the west. Consequently the separation distances between the properties also varies but the gaps between properties are significant and this spacious setting is a characteristic of the cul-de-sac. None of the other properties have any first floor side extensions.

The defined urban boundary of the adopted Local Plan runs along the south-eastern boundary of number 3 to 5 Copse Close with the mature tree belt to the south and east part of Crookhorn golf course. There is also protected oak tree within the rear garden of the application site.

2 Planning History

05/62168/000 - Application to crown raise to 4m, crown reduce by 30%, crown thin by 10% and to clear house by 1.5m an Oak tree (T1) of TPO 1334., PERM,10/11/2005
APP/17/01170 - Crown lift 1No. Oak (T1) to 5m from ground removing lowest limb (secondary limb to the primary scaffold) on south west sector, crown reduce by 2m, reduce width by 1m on north east sector and by 2m on south west sector, subject to TPO 1334., PERM,14/12/2017

3 Proposal

Demolition of existing garage; Two storey side extension to include integral garage/workshop

The proposal would replace the existing garage with a two storey side extension up to the side boundary. The side extension therefore varies in width to follow the tapered site - from 3.6m at the front to 6.5m before squaring off to 5m wide. Overall the extension would be 9.6m deep ie the full depth of the dwelling with eaves and ridge aligned with 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

CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

A material consideration is also the Pre-Submission Draft of the Havant Borough Local Plan 2036

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

I have no objection to the proposal however a Tree Protection Plan is required to be submitted to ensure that the TPO'd Oak is adequately protected during the course of 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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
None received	

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) Highways and parking
- (v) Impact on TPO tree

(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. It is noted that Certificate A has been signed yet the ground floor layout plan shows development right up to the shared boundary. There is some doubt as to whether the foundations and eaves overhang would be entirely within the application site - this matter would need confirming should the recommendation be for permission.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 The uniform design of the 5 dwellings within the Close provides a visual cohesion to the immediate setting of the site. Due to the undulating levels and curved staggered arrangement of the siting of the dwellings, the gaps between the dwellings varies but nevertheless provides a valuable spacious setting and pattern of development. The wedges of skyline and space between the dwellings, with the backdrop of mature trees to the south, is considered an important characteristic of the area.

7.4 It is considered that the proposed full width and full height two storey side extension would have an adverse impact on the spacious setting of the site and area. The infilling of the existing gap and wedge of space right up to the shared boundary would result in a loss of the spacious setting to the site and result in an uncharacteristically full width two storey development across the full width of the plot (except the existing 1m side gap to the west.).

7.5 The adopted Borough Design Guide SPD, 2011, requires side extensions to remain subservient to the host dwelling and recommends that two storey side extensions should be both set back behind the building line and with a lower ridge height to reduce and avoid domination of the frontage. Furthermore the SPD states that gaps between dwellings should be retained and suggests a 2m separation from side boundaries, and extensions that have a negative effect on the gap between buildings should be resisted. The proposal is full height, depth and width, and is not considered subservient at all. The proposed design is considered overly bulky and dominant relative to the host dwelling and is therefore considered contrary to both the Design Guide SPD and Policy CS16 and would have an adverse impact on the visual character of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.6 The application dwelling lies to the west of No 2 and hence as the sun moves round then some additional overshadowing will fall across No 2. However this property has an attached porch and garage up to the shared boundary with a separation to the

dwelling of some 5m. Within the first floor side elevation of No 2 is a large window, which is thought to serve the landing. Overall it is considered that any additional overshadowing is unlikely to result in any significant loss of sunlight or adversely harm the amenity of this neighbour from overshadowing. No windows are proposed in the side elevation and hence no additional loss of privacy would result.

- 7.7 However the outlook and sense of enclosure from No 2 would be significantly altered with the proposed extension appearing oppressive and overbearing right up to the shared boundary. The height and bulk of the development, particularly with the sloping site necessitating the front to be built up slightly to achieve internal level, would result in a dominant brick facade having a height to eaves of between 5 and 5.5m forming the shared boundary. No 2 has a secondary ground floor window serving a habitable room in the side facing this proposed facade. Due to the slight forward siting of the application dwelling compared to No 2, the frontage area of No 2 would feel hemmed in by the proposed development, which is considered would be harmful to the neighbours amenity.
- 7.8 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will appear overbearing and overly dominant and have an adverse impact on the amenity of the occupiers of No 2, contrary to policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Highways and parking

- 7.8 The proposal would result in the existing 3 bedroom dwelling becoming a 4/5 bed dwelling. As such the adopted Parking SPD requires 3 on site spaces to be provided. The Parking SPD notes that to be a useable space a garage needs to have internal dimensions of 3m x 6m - the proposed garage does not meet this requirement and cannot contribute to the sites parking needs. Therefore the 3 spaces would need to be provided on the sites frontage - whilst these are not shown on the block plan it is acknowledged that the site has sufficient space to provide these spaces which could be conditioned if permission were recommended.

(v) Impact on TPO tree

- 7.9 The TPO'd oak tree is sited within the rear garden, quite close to the western boundary. As such it is some distance from the proposed development and any foundations would be beyond any root protection area. However to ensure the RPA is not used for storage of builders equipment, materials etc, a Tree Protection Plan would be required which could be conditioned if permission were recommended.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposed full width and full height two storey side extension is not considered a subservient form of development that would be overly bulky and dominant, resulting in a loss of the spacious setting of the site, detrimental to the visual character of the area. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00487

(A) for the following reasons

- 1 The proposal would result in development at a full 2-storey height and depth across virtually the whole width of the plot and up to the shared eastern boundary with No 2 Copse Close, resulting in a loss of space about the building to the detriment of the visual amenities and spatial characteristics of the street scene. The proposed development would not be subservient and would result in a bulky and overbearing form of development, being oppressive to the outlook and amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to the adopted Design Guide SPD 2011, policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.