

by 7.6m in depth, achieving an eaves height of 4.9m to the north and a ridge height of 5.7m to the south, as measured from the ground level immediately adjacent to the rear elevation of the existing main property. The extension would be cut into the sloping site and surrounded by a retaining wall so as to maintain a continuous floor level with the existing main house. The extension would provide an en suite bedroom and storage cupboard on the ground floor with a living area and balcony at first floor level.

- 3.3 The proposed single storey link would measure 2m in width and span a distance of 3m between the rear elevation of the existing main house and the north elevation of the proposed extension. The link would have a flat roof achieving a maximum height of 2.7m as measured from the ground level immediately adjacent to the rear elevation of the existing main property.

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

CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16 (High Quality Design)

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

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

The Highway Authority have no adverse comment to this application

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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 5

Comment	Officer Comment
Loss of sea views	See section 7 of officer report
Loss of sea views from bedroom window	See section 7 of officer report
Out of keeping with existing property	See section 7 of officer report
Negative impact upon visual amenity of locality	
Concern that building would be tantamount to new dwelling	
Loss of light	
Loss of sea views	
Out of scale and proportion with existing property	
Loss of privacy	
Increase local flood risk	
Extension not in keeping with the surrounding properties	See section 7 of officer report
Out of scale with existing house	See section 7 of officer report
Out of character with existing house; modern cube against classic semi-detached house will appear incongruous	
Overbearing impact upon neighbours	
Loss of light, privacy and views for neighbours	
Substantial increase in density of development within site	
Proposal does not correspond with PUSH guidelines with regards to: loss of sunlight for existing properties; subservience to main property; pattern of development within local area; design of extension relative to existing house; and distance between extension and existing house, boundaries and neighbouring dwellings	See section 7 of officer report
The revised plans do not go far enough with regard to the size of the proposed extension, which is far too large for the property dwelling and does not alleviate previous concerns with regard to flooding.	See section 7 of officer report
Our objection to this extension to the side of the property still stands. There appears to be no great difference in the new updated version of the plans and will still have a detrimental impact on us and the surrounding area.	See section 7 of officer 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
- (iv) Flood risk
- (v) Other matters

(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 As originally proposed the rear extension was considered to represent an over large form of development, particularly with regards to its height, and as a result of its scale would have appeared imposing and dominant relative to existing main property. The scale of the extension was exacerbated by its position, being set higher than the existing main house in respect of its floor level with the link extension sloping upward toward the two storey element. Following negotiations with the agent, however, the scheme was amended such that the two storey extension and single storey link would be reduced in height with respect to ridge and eaves, to be achieved by cutting into the sloping site to bring the floor levels in line with those of the existing house. The eaves of the extension as per the amended scheme would be roughly level with, and the ridge lower than, those of the main house. Owing to its simple form and design and in considering its reduced height the extension (as amended) would appear subservient to the main property. With regards to footprint and overall scale the extension would not appear over large within the context of the generous rear garden.

7.4 The extension would be largely obscured from view from the front of the property (Southwood Road facing elevation) by the bulk of the existing house but would be readily visible from the rear where no screening is currently in place. Concern has been expressed within third party objection comments that the extension would appear incongruous in its design relative to the existing semi-detached dwelling and surrounding development. The existing property is a traditional chalet bungalow constructed from red brick, whilst the proposed extension would be a have a modern form finished with grey cladding boards. As such the two buildings would represent two rather different styles of development and may resemble a form of backland development owing to the position of the extension as separated and set back from the main house. However, the development would be read within the wider context of the varied street scenes to the front and rear of the property (as visible from the road and the beach, respectively), which include a range of styles and scales of property and several examples of backland development within the immediate locality. The design and materials of the proposed extension would be reflective of other properties within the locality and appropriate to the property's seafront location. The link between original building and extension would aid understanding and legibility of building as a new element whilst providing a clear visual link between the two.

7.5 On balance the design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to locality 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 character or visual amenity of the application site, the street scene or the wider context of the area as visible from the front and rear of the site.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.6 Concern has been expressed within third party comments that the development would result in a loss of privacy for neighbouring residents. However, no significant negative impact upon privacy is expected to occur as a result of the proposed two storey extension or single storey link. No openings are proposed for the north facing elevation whilst the first floor windows facing east and west would be positioned at a high level so as not to afford views toward neighbouring properties. The south facing first floor glazing and balcony would be screened by an obscure glazed screens to the east and west which would slope upward from 1m in height (at southern edge of balcony) to 2m in height (at rear elevation of extension) to negate overlooking of the rear gardens of neighbouring dwellings. The ground floor windows to the east elevation of the extension and link would face an existing closeboard timber fence whilst those to the west elevation of the extension would be positioned at a high level. The west facing glazing to the link would afford views toward the rear garden of the neighbouring property as there is currently no visual screening between the two semi-detached dwellings, but no more so than is currently afforded from within the existing garden. Additionally, the link would be used as a means of access for the extension only and would not constitute habitable space.
- 7.7 Further concerns have been expressed regarding a loss of sea views and sunlight and a negative impact upon the outlook of neighbouring dwellings. Loss of views is not a planning consideration and thus cannot be considered in the assessment of the scheme. Advice regarding impact upon outlook and light is provided within the Havant Borough Design Guidance. Owing to the position of the extension relative to the existing dwelling and the distance to be maintained between the proposal and existing surrounding development it is considered that the proposed development would not be contrary to the guidance and would not have a significant negative impact upon the light or outlook of neighbouring properties. The extension would be situated 9m from the rear boundary of the property to north-east and 20m from the rear elevation of this property. A distance of 5.5m would be maintained between the extension and the western site boundary. The proposed extension would be located 3m from the eastern site boundary and 10m from the facing window of the neighbouring bungalow to the east. The extension would replace an existing outbuilding adjacent to the eastern boundary, thus the proposal would serve to increase the separation distance between development within the site and the neighbouring bungalow to the east. It is noted that no objections were received from the neighbouring properties to the immediate west or south-east of the application site.
- 7.8 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).

(iv) Flood risk

- 7.9 The application site is situated partially within Flood Zone 2, which covers part of the rear garden (to the south) and part of the front driveway area (to the north), and Flood Zone 3, which covers part of the property's front driveway area, as designated by the Environment Agency. The proposed rear extension, which would include a bedroom on the ground floor, would fall partially within the boundary of Flood Zone 2, with the extension extending 2m into the flood zone and the retaining wall positioned 4m within the flood zone boundary.
- 7.10 The floor level of the two storey extension and single storey link would be level with

that of the existing main property, as required by the Environment Agency's standing advice for minor residential developments within Flood Zone 2. This is reflected on the Flood Risk Assessment submitted as part of the current application.

- 7.11 Concerns have been expressed within third party comments that the proposed extension would exacerbate local flood risk. The scheme will be required to satisfy building regulations, to be assessed separately by Building Control, in addition to a grant of planning permission. Surface water run off and drainage would be considered by Building Control as part of their assessment.

(v) Other matters

- 7.12 As originally proposed the extension was tantamount to a new unit of accommodation in respect of the level of services provided within, which included a kitchen-living area and shower room downstairs and a habitable room and balcony on the first floor. The provision of services was reduced upon negotiation with the agent to result in an arrangement more suitable for an extension, with the kitchen to remain within the existing property. Ongoing use of the extension for purposes ancillary to the main dwelling only will be required by conditioned.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenities of 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/18/00758

(A) 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 ELEVATIONS (AMENDED SEPT 18)
PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR (AMENDED SEPT 18)
SECTION DRAWING (AMENDED SEPT 18)
PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR
SITE/LOCATION PLAN
FLOOD REPORT

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 a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the extension have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. 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 policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first use / occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted the first floor balcony screens facing east and west shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and 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.

- 5 The extension hereby permitted shall be used solely for purposes ancillary to the occupation and enjoyment of the existing dwelling and shall not be used as a separate unit of accommodation.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application and the extension is not in a satisfactory position to be occupied separately from the main dwelling having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 No development shall take place until finished floor levels for the proposed extension relative to agreed off-site datum point(s) and adjacent ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the building is set into the existing slope in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and that floor levels are commensurate to those of the existing dwelling to reduce flood risk having due regard to policies CS15 and CS16 of Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.