

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Arboriculturalist, Havant Borough Council

No objection

Developer Services, Southern Water

Southern Water would have no objections to the above proposal.

Southern Water requires a formal application for new connections to the public foul and surface water sewers to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Please read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which has now been published and is available to read on our website via the following link
<https://beta.southernwater.co.uk/infrastructure-charges>.

It is the responsibility of the developer to make suitable provision for the disposal of surface water. Part H3 of the Building Regulations prioritises the means of surface water disposal in the order:

- a Adequate soakaway or infiltration system
- b Water course
- c Where neither of the above is practicable sewer

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119), www.southernwater.co.uk or by email at developerservices@southernwater.co.uk.

Please find attached a plan of the sewer records showing the approximate position of a public surface water sewer within the site. The exact position of the public surface water sewer must be determined on site by the applicant before the lay out of the proposed development is finalised.

Please note:

- No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 metres either side of the external edge of the public sewer.
- No new soakaways should be located within 5m of a public sewer.
- All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

Furthermore, due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

Officer comment: *An informative is recommended as per Southern Water's request. With regard to the discharge of surface water, given that this is an application for an extension to an existing dwelling, it is considered that this issue is a matter for the Building Regulations.*

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
I live in the property immediately next to the proposed development (indicated above) and am writing to ask that HBC refuse the planning application in its current proposal. Having given the planning application very careful thought and consideration here my comments and objections relating to the application: It is my view that this very large two storey proposed extension (not quite but close to doubling the applicants existing property footprint) is totally out of keeping with other properties within the Close. The proposed development will extend a full 6.5m along my immediate boundary line down the whole side of my house with the end elevation then lining up with the rear elevation of my property. The extension will be visually overbearing from within my curtilage and it is my contention that the proposal is of a disproportionate size and design. The proposal as submitted will completely remove all the planned and as built "natural offsets" and distances between the two properties created by the estates original architect's which currently allows a high degree of natural privacy to be maintained (by distance) and ensure an open space feel between adjacent properties. The existing end elevation of the applicants property currently has 2 small windows (1 obscured) on the end	See section 7. It is noted that this objection was received prior to the submission of amended plans.

elevation but these are not close enough to overlook my property. On the submitted proposal however additional Windows are included in the application and all of these additional Windows on the upper floor would all then directly overlook my property. In particular two much larger windows on the new side/end elevation will now be 6.5m closer than they currently are and would be directly above and directly overlook my private sitting area which will lead to a loss of privacy and impact the peaceful enjoyment of my home and garden. The proposed 2 storey extension will therefore create a dominance to the the extent to that it will impinge on the immediate aspect and outlook we currently enjoy and I feel that my property will be adversely affected by being 'hemmed in" and overlooked by the addition of a large 6.5m two storey wall and roof extension. I have no objection whatever to the proposed modifications to the porch on the front elevation of the property. I invite you to visit our home to verify that these objections are valid. Therefore, I ask that Havant Borough Council refuse this Planning Application and encourage applicants to resubmit a building design that is perhaps somewhat smaller, less intrusive on neighboring properties and more sensitive in maintaining the overall character of the close. Should you require any additional information, clarification of any comments made, or would like to arrange a visit to our home; do not hesitate to contact us.	
It is my opinion that such a large extension will affect me for 3 main reasons. 1. The size of the proposed development will allow my garden to be overlooked by an additional house. The houses are staggered to avoid this.	See section 7. It is noted that this objection was received prior to the submission of amended plans.

2. The light and the feeling of space achieved from the original design of the cul de sac will cease as the gap between no.4 and 5 will no longer exist. 3. Parking - This house already has 3 vehicles. They have opted not to move their garage back to accommodate this but park in a visitors parking space regularly. I am concerned that while I am not directly affected by this proposed extension the potential parking arrangements required for a 5 bedroom house remain impractical, as does the need for a 5 bedroom house in this particular residential close .	
While the latest proposal is much more in keeping with the overall layout of the close the applicants revised proposal still features 2 windows on the end elevation at 2nd floor level. These windows albeit 3.5 m further away than what was originally proposed will still overlook my private sitting area which will result in a loss of privacy and impact the peaceful enjoyment of my home and garden which still remains the principle reason for my objection.	See section 7. It is noted this representation was received after the publicity expiry date.

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

(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 is for a two storey and single storey side extension and front porch and would be visible from the public realm, although the property is situated at the end of a cul-de-sac and set back 15 metres from the highway. The original proposal was for a substantial two storey side extension extending a depth of 6.5 metres close to the southern boundary of the site. Following the officer's site visit, concerns were raised regarding the potential impact of the proposal on the neighbouring property at 4 Fontwell Mews. Amended plans were subsequently submitted for a two storey and single storey side extension and front porch, with a 3 metre reduction in the depth of the

proposal at first floor.

- 7.4 Consequently the two storey element has a depth of 3.5 metres with a pitched roof 0.2 metres below the existing and is set in approximately 0.3 metres from the north and south elevations of the property with a width of 5.8 metres. It is judged to be subservient to the main dwelling by virtue of the revised depth.
- 7.5 The single storey extension is a continuation of the two storey addition with a depth of 3 metres and a shallow pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.34 metres and a ridge height of 3.72 metres.
- 7.6 The proposed porch is to replace the canopy over the front door and would extend 1.65 metres beyond the front elevation of the property with a width of 2.2 metres and a pitched roof to a height of 3.621 metres. This would match the height of the existing front projection. Given the situation of the property within Fontwell Mews, together with the surrounding dwellings which are of varying styles and designs, it is considered the proposal would not appear incongruous within the existing street scene.
- 7.7 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

- 7.8 The side extension is to the western elevation of the property and would be built close to the southern boundary of the site, approximately 0.3 metres away with the northern elevation of the neighbouring property at number 4 Fontwell Mews a further 4.4 metres away. There are no windows in the northern elevation of the neighbouring property and the extension does not project beyond the rear elevation of this property. Furthermore the rear elevation of the two storey element is set back a minimum of 3 metres from this rear elevation. Whilst the extension is close to the southern boundary, given the relationship with the neighbouring property to the south, it is considered that the reduction in the depth of the two storey extension would mitigate any perception of it being overbearing.
- 7.9 There are two small bedroom windows in the western elevation of the two storey addition, although a degree of overlooking already exists from the current first floor windows in this elevation serving the en-suite and bedroom. However, due to the depth of the 2 storey element of the extension there is potential for these windows to result in an unacceptable level of overlooking of the rear amenity area of the neighbouring property. A condition is therefore recommended for these windows to be obscurely glazed with only the top fan lights openable.
- 7.10 There are no windows in the side elevation of the extension, although there is one high level window situated in the southern roof slope of the single storey extension which pitches away from the property boundary. It is deemed any impact from this window would be negligible.
- 7.11 Whilst there are windows in the western elevation at ground and first floor level, the property benefits from a large rear garden and the closest elevations of the dwellings to the west of the site are in excess of 25 metres away. This meets the 24 metre distance recommended in the Havant Borough Council Design Guide SPD and it is judged the proposed windows would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy to these properties. The impact is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.
- 7.12 The northern elevation of the extension is 12.5 metres from the northern boundary of the

property and there is a first floor window, sliding doors and a window in the northern roof slope. A degree of overlooking is present from the existing first floor windows, although no properties to the north directly face the rear elevation of the dwelling. The properties to the rear of the application site are deemed to be a sufficient distance away for any impact to be minimal.

- 7.13 The proposed porch is of a modest size and situated such that any impact on the neighbouring properties would not be harmful.

(iv) Parking

- 7.14 There is an increase in the number of bedrooms from three to five, subsequently there will be a requirement for three on site parking spaces as recommended in the HBC Parking SPD (July 2016). A parking plan has been submitted as part of the application to reflect this and a condition is recommended to retain the spaces for parking at all times.

- 7.15 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).

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/19/00535 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 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.
- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the windows in the first floor on the western elevation (i.e. the elevation annotated 'Left Side Elevation' on Drawing PG No: 06) shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) with only the top fanlights to be openable, and they shall be 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.

- 4 The three parking spaces shown on drawing number PG 02 shall be kept available at all times for such purposes.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

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

Drg no. PG 01 Existing ground floor plan - Design 4A - 26.07.19

Drg no. PG 02 Proposed ground floor plan - Design 4A - 26.07.19

Drg no. PG 03 Existing first floor plan - Design 4A - 26.07.19

Drg no. PG 04 Proposed first floor plan - Design 4A - 26.07.19

Drg no. PG 05 Existing elevations plan - Design 4A - 26.07.19

Drg no. PG 06 Proposed elevations plan - Design 4A - 26.07.19

Drg no. PG 07 Site location and block plan - Design 2A - 15.05.19

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.