

4 **Policy Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

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)

DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Arboriculturalist

No objection

Environmental Health

No objection to the development pending informatives being added to the decision in relation to hours of work, bonfires, light and dust control.

Planning Officer Comment: These shall be included as part of the decision.

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: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Concern raised by No 41 Seafront Estate regarding: * Any building which is too close to the boundary which would restrict occasional access for maintaining the roof and gutters which run the length of the house. * I feel the site plan is mis-leading	See section 7 A site visit was performed in order to understand the layout of No 40 and No 41.

Concern raised by No 39 Sea Front Estate regarding: Future access concerns Reduction of light into property in particular the kitchen and over-shadowing from extension. The visual impact caused by any development increased height and dormer shall reduce light. Dormer shall remove privacy and increase the visual impact of the development.	See section 7
---	---------------

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 works propose the raising of the ridge height on No 40 in order to accommodate a first floor living space. This would increase the height to the front of the dwelling by approximately 1m. Alongside this a first floor extension is proposed to the east side which would increase the overall width of No 40. However, whilst this would create a visual change of No 40 from Sea Front Estate the works are considered to be of a modest proportion and from being set away from the shared boundary from No 41 the works are considered to not create a cramped or crowded appearance in the streetscene. The proposed dormer, although an extension to the roof, would be screened from the streetscene due to its position. Although large on the rear roof elevation it is acknowledged that the development is set in from the side elevations, down from the main ridge and up from the eaves height creating a dormer that appears in proportion to the space available and projects modestly from the rear. The works would therefore not warrant a refusal of planning permission.

7.4 The proposed single storey flat roof addition is located to the rear of the site and would therefore primarily be viewed from adjacent properties and gardens. Following concern raised over the proposed extensions size and the over-bearing dominance that the works would have on No 40 which is a modestly sized dwellinghouse, and the surrounding neighbouring dwellings; the proposal was amended which produced a flat roof extension with a reduced depth and height. The impact caused as a result to No 40 is considered, on balance, to not be significant enough to warrant a refusal of planning permission and would accord with the Boroughs Design Guide. It is also noted that rear extensions are present along Sea Front Estate and therefore the development proposed would not look wholly out of keeping to the locality therefore

protecting the existing character and appearance of the area.

- 7.5 Materials are proposed to match No 40 in the majority however a grey cladding is proposed to be used on the rear dormer. Due to the dormer being to the rear of the dwellinghouse the visual impact of this material is considered to be reduced. As No 40 is also not in a restricted area the use of cladding is considered to result in a limited and acceptable impact and the colour grey is considered to not result in an obtrusive appearance.
- 7.6 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

- 7.7 The works are considered to have the potential to impact the adjacent neighbours No 41 Sea Front Estate and No 39 Sea Front Estate.
- 7.8 Following a reduction in the scale of the proposed rear extension the works would now sit in approximate line with the rear elevation of No 41. From being set off the shared boundary and single storey in height the works are considered to not adversely impact light levels reaching the dwellinghouse. No 41 does not have windows along the west side elevation of the dwellinghouse which would ensure that the works do not impact any current outlook from the neighbouring dwelling. Therefore on balance, the works are considered to not result in an un-neighbourly impact. Although concern has been raised regarding maintainance of the dwellinghouse the proposed works to No 40 shall retain a gap between the development and neighbouring dwellinghouse which is considered to satisfy this concern raised.
- 7.9 The neighbouring dwelling No 39 has raised concern in regards to the raising of the roof, the proposed dormer and rear extension. The rear extension measures approximately 4.8m deep by 4m wide and 2.8m high and shall be up to the shared boundary. Although the works have the potential to impact No 39 it is acknowledged that the development is modest in height at 2.8m high and that under permitted development rights no planning permission would be required to carry out a similar sized development. The works shall be in line with the rear elevation of No 39 and due to their height is considered to not adversely impact light levels reaching the neighbouring dwelling. Although the same concern has been raised in regards to the ridge height increase and dormer No 40 is to the east of No 39 and therefore although morning light has the potential to be impacted this is a modest increase to the existing impact caused by No 40 itself and would not be significant enough to warrant a refusal of planning permission. Further access to No 39 would not be impacted as a result of the development proposed at No 40 and due to the gap between the works and the design of the proposed extension the development is not considered to impact the outlook of No 39 significantly. One new window is proposed along the side elevation but due to the screening in place between the dwellings the impact caused is considered to be limited and acceptable.
- 7.10 It is noted that an objection has been made by neighbouring dwellings in relation to the development's potential to cause overlooking from the proposed dormer windows. However it is considered that the dormer windows would not result in significant over-looking to No 39, 41 or the dwelling to the rear as they would be primarily face down the rear garden of No 40 and be set well off the properties further to the north. Plans have since been amended which propose the window serving the

bathroom, wardrobe and stairway to be fitted with obscure glass with the wardrobe and stairway windows to be fixed. This is considered to satisfactorily address the concern raised.

- 7.11 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal is 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). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Parking

- 7.12 The application site proposes the removal of one bedroom at ground floor level with the installation of one master bedroom at first floor level. As the development would retain and not exceed the amount of bedrooms at No 40 there would not usually be a requirement for parking spaces to be increased on-site. The proposed integral garage however is not able to accommodate a car due to the size proposed and therefore two spaces would be required to be accommodated onsite which is shown and indicated on plan PL.165.18 02 Rev B. Therefore the works are considered to accord with the Borough Parking SPD and this shall be conditioned as part of the decision.

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/18/00125 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, Parking and Sections Plan: PL.165.18.02 Rev B
Proposed Elevations Plan: Drawing No PL.165.18.04 Rev A

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 The external materials shall be as outlined in the application form 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.

- 4 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans PL.165.18 02 Rev B to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

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.