
Site Address:	15 Barney Evans Crescent, Waterlooville, PO8 8SR		
Proposal:	Retrospective application for a single storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/19/00299	Expiry Date:	09/05/2019
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Neilson		
Agent:	Mr Bennett	Case Officer:	John Shaw
	Kalotec Limited		
Ward:	Hart Plain		
Site Visit Date:			

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application dwelling is a two storey detached property to the western side of Barney Evans Crescent, Waterlooville.

The property and those to the north of Barney Evans Crescent were permitted and erected in the early 1990s and as such share similarities in regard to style though the immediate streetscene does display a mix in relation to scale, mass, external facing materials and with dwellings set along an irregular building line. The dwellings to the south of Barney Evans Crescent are older two storey semi-detached properties which are highly uniform.

The application is part retrospective with the bulk of the proposed rear extension now in-situ following the demolition of the earlier conservatory which was set to the rear. The proposal is not classed as permitted development due to the removal of permitted development rights for Class A at the time of the original permission for the dwelling

2 Planning History

90/52395/000 - Barney Evans Crescent Waterlooville, PO8 8SR - 21 houses with garages parking spaces & associated roads - PERM 21 February 1991

91/52395/001 - Building Plot Barney Evans Crescent Waterlooville, PO8 8SR - Construction of 25 No 1,2,3,4 bedroom houses together with garages, parking spaces and associated roads. (Revised layout) – Perm 23 January 1992

APP/19/00159 - Application for certificate of lawfulness relating to erection of a single storey rear extension., REF,03/04/2019

3 Proposal

Retrospective application for a single storey rear extension.

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)

CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

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

Non-applicable

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: 4

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
The reasons for my concerns and objections include the following: - Overshadowing and loss of light - Dominance and overbearing impact - Harm to neighbouring plants and trees - Inaccurate plans - Lack of information regarding maintenance of boundary fence if permission were granted.	Matters relating to overshadowing and overbearing are addressed in section 7. No trees are to be removed as part of the application. The trees at the application site and at adjacent neighbouring properties are not protected and have minimal wider visibility. Any potential impact to these non-protected trees through reduction in light as a result of a development would not warrant the refusal of the application. The inaccurate labelling of the existing plans has been rectified during the course of this application. The existing boundary fences at the application site are to be retained and direct access to the rear of the application dwelling will also be retained. Matters relating to future maintenance and repair of boundary fences/wall would be a matter of discussion between neighbours and would not be a material planning consideration and as such cannot be assessed in this report

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 The proposed rear extension would be single storey, use materials to match those existing at the property and would have no visibility from the streetscene. It is considered that the extension would be subservient to the rear of the dwelling and have no impact on the character of the wider area.

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 The proposed extension would have a height of 3.524m with a height to eaves of 2.320m, a depth of 2.7m and would extend across the width of the entire rear elevation of the dwelling. The flat roof conservatory which has now been demolished was 2.9m high, 2.5m deep with a width of 3m. No. 17 Barney Evans Crescent is set to the north and due to the staggered building line, the rear of the application dwelling projects past the rear of no. 17. However, the 45-degree angle of the nearest habitable ground room window to the rear of no. 17 is already intersected by this dwelling's own garage which projects past its rear and would in effect substantially screen this window from the proposed rear extension. The bulk of the light to the amenity area immediately to the rear of no. 17 is also impacted by the presence of the garage and any further loss of direct light to this area which may result from the extension would not be sufficient to constitute a material change to the enjoyment of this space to warrant the refusal of the application. This assessment is further supported by the site visit undertaken by the case officer where it was noted that the rear extension has been erected up to eaves level and the consequential impact to the immediate rear of no. 17 at this moment is not significant; though the roof is still to be added, it is regarded that a mono-pitch roof where the bulk of the roof would be below the highest point of 3.5m would not lead to an overall undue impact in regard to overshadowing.

7.6 The side of the extension would be set apart from the rear elevation of no. 17 by approximately 8m and as stated would be substantially screened from this elevation by the garage of no. 17. These factors ensure the extension would have no undue overbearing on the neighbouring property. Any sense of enclosure to the rear of no. 17 is limited to its southern boundary and comes from the staggered building line, the presence of young trees along the boundary, the height of which are not within the remit of the Local Planning Authority to enforce and this dwelling's garage which projects to the rear. The erection of a single storey and 2.7m in depth extension it is concluded would not constitute an undue increase in overbearing over and above the limited degree to which it currently exists.

- 7.7 There would be no windows to the either side elevation and at single storey it is not considered that the extension would result in undue overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- 7.8 The rear extension would be set in from the boundary with no. 11 Barney Evans Crescent and the nearest wall of this property which is adjacent to the extension is north facing so it is deemed that no overbearing or overshadowing impacts would accrue in relation to no. 11.
- 7.9 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear unduly overbearing or result in undue overlooking or overshadowing on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site therefore 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 no undue impact on the character of the wider area or on neighbouring amenity 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/19/00299 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 Floor Plans, Block plan & Location Plan Kalo-0209-02;
Proposed Elevations & Section Kalo-0209-03 Rev A
Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 The external materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture those on the existing building.
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 2018.