

2 Planning History

APP/18/00001 - Proposed refurbishment (including extensions and alterations) to no 10. Proposed complete re-building of no 8 (including extensions and alterations)., PERM,24/05/2018

APP/18/00858 - Proposed refurbishment (including extensions and alterations) to No 10; proposed complete re-building of No. 8 (including extensions and alterations); revised application to include dormer to No. 10; enlargement of ground floor rear extensions to both properties; and increase in width of No.8. , REF,28/11/2018

3 Proposal

Proposed refurbishment (including extensions and alterations) to no 10. Proposed complete re-building of no 8 (including extensions and alterations); provision of garden room to each dwelling with solar panels. (Revisions to previously approved planning permission APP/18/00001)

The works approved under APP/18/0001 were previously described as: It is proposed to demolish the end dwelling (No 8) and re-build it of near identical proportions and design to the front, but with a large two storey and single storey contemporary rear extension that crosses both Number 8 and 10. The rear two storey element would create a new gable end across the two dwellings with large glazed element and opening doors. The proposed single storey extension beneath would be flat roofed and staggered in depth, extending beyond the first floor element by 1.8m and 4.2m. Nos 8 would also have a single storey wrap around the rear half of the side elevation. It is also proposed to create a gravel parking space on the frontage of No 10, but No 8 would remain as garden area.

The first amendment sought under APP/18/00858 was refused and previously described the revisions as:

- 1/ the addition of a large flat roofed dormer that would extend across the whole width of the rear of No 10 to adjoin to the parapet with No 12 - this dormer would be entirely slate clad with a rooflight on the horizontal flat roof;
- 2/ an enlargement of the ground floor extensions - both are increased in length by 0.5m and No 10's is also extended forward such that the side extension that previously had a length of 9m and is now proposed at 14m, and the width of this element is marginally increased taking the extension closer to the shared boundary with No 6;
- 3/ the rebuilding of No 8 is now proposed at an increased width - previously it was 4.3m wide, now 4.5m wide.

The current amendment seeks permission for

- 1/ an enlargement of the ground floor extensions - both are increased in length by 0.5m and No 8's is also extended in width such that the side extension that previously had a length of 9m is now proposed at 14.7m, resulting in the single storey element running closer to shared boundary with No 6 for a greater distance
- 2/ insertion of additional window at ground floor in west side elevation
- 3/ within this single storey side extension the insertion of a front door and the previous front door on the front elevation becomes a "false" door
- 4/ at first floor level change of inward opening french doors to sliding doors, retention of 1.1m high glass screen to prevent access to flat roof

5/ enlarged rooflights in rear roofslope - conservation style

6/ addition of outbuilding for each dwelling in the form of a semi-detached outbuilding at rear of garden straddling both gardens - would measure 7m wide x 9m deep with eaves of 2.2m and ridge of 4m. Each unit would have timber doors at both front and back and a side window; materials would be timber cladding with slate roof including solar panels on south facing, rear roofslope.

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)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

Small off site tree at the rear of the gardens, however it is not a suitable specimen to be protected by a Tree Preservation Order, therefore I have no objection to the proposal.

Building Control

Building Regulation application to be submitted

Compliance with Approved Document B (Fire) to be indicated as part of Building Regulation application

Timber rear garden structures will need to comply with Approved Document B (Fire) due to overall size and separation between dwelling notional boundary

Existing loft room not shown on new proposed plans consideration of Approved Document B (Fire) due to open plan ground floor should be undertaken

Conservation Officer

verbally discussed - no objection

Crime Prevention

None received

Southern Water

object - appears developer is intending to build over an access point and change of direction on public sewer - SW would not allow such construction over public apparatus. Might be possible to divert the public sewer so long as this would result in no unacceptable loss of hydraulic capacity and the work carried out at the developers expense to the satisfaction of SW under relevant statutory provisions.

Officer Comment: see below, applicants intend to divert sewer

Waste Services Manager

No concerns

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: 9

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
HOUSES We note that drawings 003 and 007 of this new planning application conflict; drawing 003 now shows sliding doors from the first-floor rear bedrooms on to the flat roof whereas drawing 007 shows the inward opening French doors with 1.1m fixed glass screen guard over as per the previously approved application APP/18/00001.	Noted - this has been corrected with further amended plans
We would wish to ensure that Condition 6 of application APP/18/00001 is retained whereby "the flat roofed area to the rear of both No 8 and 10 shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area".	Noted and condition can be repeated
TIMBER SHEDS The location & block plan submitted with application APP/19/00483 does not show the correct location or size of our own timber garden building. As such we believe that the height and position of the proposed window on the west elevation of the timber sheds will provide an outlook directly in to our	Noted - site visit made, window of outbuilding overlaps with neighbours outbuilding but 1.8m high fence on boundary - see section 7 below

garden towards the rear of our house thus affecting our privacy. This issue would be resolved entirely if the window was shifted southwards, towards the rear of the proposed sheds, so that it falls entirely behind our own timber building at the bottom of our garden; or the window is removed from the West elevation. We would request that one of these modifications is made to the plans before any consent is given for the timber sheds. However we are also uncomfortable about the size of the proposed sheds. We have absolutely no objection to the principle of a garden building being erected that is ancillary to the main house, after all we have our own. But the combined size of the proposed 'semi-detached' timber sheds would appear to be the equivalent of a small bungalow being built at the bottom of all of our gardens, almost occupying the same footings as the original cottages. We are concerned that this could be overbearing in this location and we would certainly object to any future application to convert and combine the buildings to create a separate dwelling. We are not sure why these combined timber sheds are being proposed when No. 10 Kings Road is currently on the market.	Noted - can be conditioned as remaining ancillary only - see section 7 below
We welcome the development generally and the much needed improvements it brings to the present appearance of the properties. But we must insert a strong caveat that it be made a condition that an effective site management plan be agreed with the council before work commences. The site is situated in one of narrowest parts of Kings Road where there are already constraints on parking space. Given the scale of the proposed works it is likely to involve plant as well as offloads and deliveries. It should also be a strong condition that the hours of work be strictly observed to exclude Sundays and other statutory days.	Kings Road has unrestricted parking and is not a classified road - no on site area for a CEMP and as householder scaled development not considered necessary - any disruption an unfortunate temporary inconvenience; noise and hours controlled by Environmental Health - Informative can be added

A further informal query received concerning accuracy of plans to boundaries and maintenance and drainage on the boundary

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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways and parking
- (v) Southern Water
- (vi) CIL and SRMS

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

The pattern and character of the existing terrace is a strong feature in the street scene with an unbroken rhythm. Each property is of identical width (4m) with a single ground and first floor window. The approved scheme allowed a marginal increase in width of the rebuilding of No 8 to 4.3m allow for modern construction methods/insulation etc. It was considered the additional 0.3m would be indiscernible to the eye and would not unbalance the terrace as a whole. The first amended scheme that was refused (APP/18/00858) sought a further increase in the width of No 8 to 4.5m which was considered to be relatively significant and unacceptable and formed part of the reason for refusal. This revised application reverts the front facade back to the already approved 4.3m to maintain visual uniformity to the terrace but has achieved extra width by enlarging the side extension.

This is set back by some 2.5m and as such would be subservient to the main facade which in street scene terms would still read as matching the host terrace. Overall this revised scheme is considered appropriate to the character of the area and compliant with policy CS16.

To the rear, it was acknowledged that the approved scheme did compromise the pattern of gable end projections with a re-arrangement of the shared gable ends resulting in the two storey projection of No 12 becoming truncated with a parapet wall. When determining APP/18/0001 it was a balanced decision as to whether the less integrated rear roof design was an acceptable change to the terrace as a whole and on balance it was determined that the harm caused was not so significant on the character of the area to be materially harmful and to justify a refusal of planning permission. This application does not significantly alter the rear facade compared to APP/18/0001 - it is considered that the further slight variations in length and rooflights would not be detrimental to the overall design or character of the area.

Other properties in the area have sheds and outbuildings at the rear of their plots and No 30 Beach Road has a large barn style outbuilding. The proposed outbuilding is relatively large (although the garden is long and can readily accommodate it) and it is stated has doors both ends to enable dinghy's/kayaks to be walked up the rear pedestrian path and stored. It is intended to use the outbuilding for ancillary storage and on this basis the proposed outbuilding is considered acceptable in principle. The proposed materials would be timber and slate which are considered appropriate. On this basis, and conditioned as ancillary use only and not to be converted to habitable accommodation for independent occupation, then the outbuilding is considered acceptable.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The approved single storey rear projections do not meet the 45 degree guidance within the Borough Design Guide SPD. When determining APP/18/0001 it was noted that the single storey rear projections were only flat roofed with parapet height of 3m. Since under permitted development and with prior notification, a rear extension could be up to 6m deep, then the impact of the proposed single storey elements would be similar with no identified harm to neighbours in terms of outlook, overbearing or overshadowing. The now proposed additional 0.5m would still be considered the same way and it is not anticipated that the additional length would have any material harm to neighbouring amenity.

With respect to the increase in the length of the side extension to No 8, this would be within 150mm of the shared boundary with No 6 which is a chalet style bungalow and has a detached garage and lean-to style greenhouse against the shared boundary with high shrubs providing some screening. The additional length is primarily the forward section which would largely align with the adjacent garage. The separation is minimal but it has been confirmed that foundations, eaves and guttering would be within the application site. It is unlikely that this additional length would result in any material harm to the amenity of the neighbours, although it is noted by the neighbour that maintenance of both structures would be difficult. Close to the shared boundary the Party Wall Act would apply to resolve any differences.

Overall this element of the current proposal is considered unlikely to 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).

With respect to the outbuilding concern has been raised about overlooking from the proposed side window. But as a ground floor window with separating boundary fence of 1.8m high, and some 40m separation to the house of 30 Beach Road, then no material harm is considered to result. Only the top slither of the windows would be viewed above the fence and serving a non-habitable room it is not considered to result in any loss of privacy.

(iv) Highways and parking

The properties are currently 2 bedroom units with no on site parking - reliance is on street parking. Number 8 would remain as a 2 bedroom unit with no change to parking arrangements; nos 10 is currently shown as a 2 bedroom dwelling but it is noted that under APP/18/0001 a room in the loft space was shown creating a 3 bed dwelling. The Parking SPD would normally require 2 on site parking spaces per 3 bed dwelling, but it is noted the shortfall already exists and the demand for on street parking would not be

increased as a result of the development. On this basis there is no objection to the proposal on Highway grounds.

(v) Southern Water

Southern Water have noted that the development would be over a public sewer and this layout cannot be permitted. They have however indicated that instead it may be possible to divert the sewer, and the applicant is aware of this issue and agreed in principle to the need to divert the sewer in advance of any construction. A condition needs to be imposed to cover this issue.

(vi) CIL, SRMS and water quality

CIL forms have been completed which indicate that the additional floorspace would be 36sqm for No 8 and 33.5 sqm for No 10. Since No 8 is a replacement dwelling then it is CIL liable for any net additional floorspace, in this instance the forms state 36sqm - although it is noted that the applicants are claiming a self-build exemption. The additional floorspace for extensions to No 10 falls below the 100sq m threshold and as such there is no CIL liability for No 10. The Draft Liability Notice will be sent by the CIL team.

In terms of the Solent Recreational Mitigation Strategy, which would apply to No 8 being a replacement dwelling, it is noted that No 8 would remain a 2 bed dwelling. Since there would be no additional bedrooms then it does not trigger the need for a SRMS contribution.

In terms of water quality and the effects of new development on the Solent SPAs, as there will be no net increase in dwellings arising from the development it can be concluded that no likely significant effect will occur. An Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations is not therefore required.

8 Conclusion

Overall the proposed development and amendments to APP/18/0001 are considered acceptable and would not have any detrimental effect on either the street scene or neighbouring amenity. With appropriate conditions the application is recommended for permission.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00483 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:

Location plan at 1:1250 and Site Plan at 1:500 Drawing 009
Proposed Ground floor Plan Drawing 002 Rev A dated 01 07 19
Proposed First Floor Plan Drawing 003 Rev B dated 15 07 19
Proposed Roof Plans Drawing 004 Rev A dated 01 07 19
Proposed Elevations Drawing 006 Rev A dated 01 07 19
Proposed Rear Elevation Glazing Detail Drawing 007 Rev B dated 15 07 19
Proposed Timber Sheds Drawing 008 Rev A dated 01 07 19

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 dwellings and outbuildings hereby permitted, including windows, which in the case of those on the front elevation shall be of an appropriate sash style, and privacy screen, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour, finish and texture of the materials, plus section details for the sash windows. 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.

- 4 No development hereby permitted shall commence until the diversion of the public sewer has first been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with Southern Water. The agreed diversion must take place in accordance with a scheme and timing to be agreed with Southern Water.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and ensure that all such drainage provision is constructed to an appropriate standard and quality and having due regard to policies and proposals CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 The hereby approved flat roofed area to the rear of both No 8 and 10 shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings, having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 Both outbuildings hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes ancillary to the occupation and enjoyment of each host dwelling and shall not be used as a separate unit of accommodation.

Reason: The outbuildings are not in a satisfactory position relative to the character of the area and have no vehicular access to be occupied separately from the main dwellings and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.