
Site Address:	33 Cunningham Road, Waterlooville, PO7 5TY		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/19/00345	Expiry Date:	23/05/2019
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Fry		
Agent:	Mr M Morris	Case Officer:	Bee Crawford
	Mick Morris AADipl Architect		
Ward:	Stakes		
Site Visit Date:	03/05/2019		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a two storey semi-detached property which has a brown tiled pitched roof and elevations of red multibrick and tile hanging at first floor. The site is level although there is a slight east/west incline to the road and it is gated to the front with a concrete drive, paving and shrubs, enclosed to all boundaries with walls ranging in height from 0.5 metres to 1 metres. There is a slight incline to the rear garden which is mainly paved with a shed with a 2 metre high wall and fence to the north western boundary, a 1.6 metre high fence to the south eastern boundary and a 2 metre high trellis fence and mature shrubs to the rear boundary.
- 1.2 The adjoining two storey semi-detached property is to the south east, an area of grassed amenity land is to the north west with the front aspect of a block of two storey flats beyond, two storey semi-detached properties are opposite and the rear garden of a property in Cowan Road is to the rear. The surrounding area is of medium density consisting of semi-detached two storey properties and bungalows and two storey block of purpose built flats of a similar age and different styles and design.

2 Planning History

00/64431/000 - Alteration to front elevation of existing single storey extension, to provide window in place of doors, permitted 08/12/2000.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application is for the construction of a single storey rear extension. At the time of the officer's site visit the building was under construction.

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

None.

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: 3

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
In our opinion, the extension is too high. Mr Fry has removed the original bedroom window and replaced with a smaller (shorter) window to accommodate the extreme height of the extension (Pic 1). Accordingly, the small bedroom window means that the appearance of the back of No. 33 is different from the rest of the houses in the street. In our opinion, this is therefore not a single storey extension. At no point have Mr or Mrs Fry discussed the extension with us, other than a comment by Mr Fry to my husband that he "would not build higher than the fence". The height of the extension casts a shadow across our hitherto sunny patio and also obscures our view of the trees we had before. Combined with the other brick built outbuilding (which Mr Fry also did not seek planning permission to build) the extension takes up a very large percentage of the garden area and both structures together run almost the entire length of our border	See section 7. This alteration would not have required the benefit of planning permission. The scheme being considered is for the construction of a single storey rear extension. See section 7.

(Pic 2). This is extremely oppressive when viewed from our side of the fence (Pic 3). In our opinion, the extension is also too close to our fence as there is virtually no gap between the extension side and our fencing. The plans show cladding but it would not be possible to get cladding on in the gap as it currently stands (Pic 4). The plans refer to a "games **room** extension" and in our opinion it is therefore being used as an additional room to the house and should accordingly be built in the same materials as the original building.

Construction already undertaken

The structure already partially built bears no resemblance to the plans and what has been done is of poor quality. The sides of the extension are made of plywood and we have screws protruding through our side (Pic 5). The roof covering is clad in grey metal and does not match the roof tiles of the existing building (Pic 6). The current extension is of thin construction and has no sound insulation. All noise can be heard – the balls clacking on the pool table and dropping when the table is reloaded, conversation and music, particularly if the roof light windows are open. This sometimes goes on until quite late and is directly under my daughter's bedroom window, leaving her unable to sleep when she has to get up for work in the morning. Mr Fry is undertaking the work himself and we doubt that he would be able to achieve the high standards shown in the architect's drawings.

The height of the extension also has an impact on the security of our garden and property, allowing easy access (by climbing) to our garden and my daughter's bedroom window. We will be unable to leave this open when the house is unattended. This may have implications for our home insurance if we were burgled.

See section 7.

A condition would be part of any planning permission to ensure the construction is built in accordance with the approved plans. Confirmation has been received from the agent that the roof of the extension would be finished in tiles to match the existing dwelling.

This is not a material planning consideration.

A condition would be part of any planning permission to ensure the construction is built in accordance with the approved plans.

This is not a material planning consideration.

The plans submitted do not include the

Mr and Mrs Fry are currently using what looks like a wood burning stove to heat the extension, with a chimney flue attached to the structure. The structure is wooden and in our opinion this makes the stove a fire hazard not only to No. 33 but to our house also. Again, this might affect our home insurance in the event of claim due to fire.	installation of a flue to serve a wood burning stove.
--	---

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 proposal is for a single storey rear extension which at the time of the officer's site visit was under construction. Due to the location of the property, the side elevation would be partially visible from the public realm.

7.4 The scheme would result in a modest increase to the footprint of the property, with the 4 metre depth 1 metre over what could be built under permitted development. This would reduce the depth of part of the garden to less than the 10 metres as recommended in the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide. However this would be the case if the extension was constructed as permitted development. Furthermore, the extension is set in slightly from the side elevation of the property and there is a area of garden which retains the 10 metre depth.

7.5 The extension has a mono-pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.4 metres rising to approximately 3.35 metres incorporating two roof lights. At the time of the officer's site visit, the roof had a grey membrane covering. However confirmation has been received from the agent that the roof will be finished to match the existing roof tiles.

7.6 The proposed cladding is of a muted colour and whilst it would be partially visible from the properties in the immediate vicinity, it is judged it would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7.7 The design and appearance of the extension 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). The existing street scene is mixed and it is considered the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 Concern has been raised regarding the height of the extension and proximity to the boundary, however the extension is set in approximately 0.21 metres from the shared boundary and it is noted that whilst the depth is 1 metre over what could be built under permitted development, the height of the extension falls within the limits for permitted development.
- 7.9 A 45 degree angle test was carried out as recommended in the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD, and although part of the extension falls within the 45 degree overshadowing zone of the patio doors at 35 Cunningham Road, it is considered the resulting impact is not so great as to constitute a defensible reason for refusal.
- 7.10 There is one high level window in the south east elevation of the extension, and the plans indicate this is to be obscure glazed and non-opening. It is therefore judged this would not have an adverse effect on the occupiers of the neighbouring property.
- 7.11 The rear and other side elevation of the extension are predominantly glazed with bi-fold doors to the rear and full height windows and a door to the side. However there are no properties to the north west and the properties to the rear are considered to be a sufficient distance away for any impact to be negligible.
- 7.12 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the property immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties 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/19/00345 subject to the following conditions

- 1 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.

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

Drg no. 33 CR PL 01 Existing and proposed floor and elevations plan:
perspective views

Drg no. 33 CR PL 02 Location and block plan

Email dated 09/05 confirming colour of proposed cladding

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

