

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application property is a two-storey semi-detached house situated within an urban settlement in Waterloo, surrounded by residential development. The property and the attached neighbouring dwelling are set well back from the fronting road and relative to the neighbouring houses to the west, sharing a large paved private car parking area with the properties to the east (from which the pair maintain a good degree of separation). Properties within the street exhibit a high degree of uniformity with regards to form, style and materials.
- 1.2 The application property is constructed from facing red brick (to rear) and white uPVC fenestration with plain concrete tiles to its pitched roof. The modestly sized private garden area to the rear of the main house is bordered by a timber fence of 1.8m in height. The front and rear elevations of the property form a continuation of those of the attached neighbouring house to the east, with which the property maintains a high degree of visual symmetry.

2 Planning History

APP/11/00977 - Application for Non Material Amendment to Planning Permission 10/53728/009 relating to chimneys (plots 1-5), fenestration (excluding rooflights) (plots 1, 2 and 5), internal layout changes (bedrooms) (plots 1-5) and Omission of second floor false gable window (plot 5)., PERM,11/10/2011

APP/11/01040 - Installation of solar panels within roof covering to Plots 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21 & 22., PERM,09/08/2011

APP/11/01324 - Application for non-material changes to Planning Permission 10/53728/009 relating to window heads and cills to be brickwork (as constructed detail) - plot six; window head to first floor side window elevation to be straight edge brickwork (as constructed detail) - plots seven and nine; removal of ground floor side elevation window lounge room - plot seven. , NFA,09/09/2011

APP/11/01325 - Discharge of Condition No. 23 (i) and (ii) of Planning Permission 10/53728/009. , PERM,24/10/2011

APP/11/01326 - Discharge of Condition No's 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 30 and 31 of Planning Permission 10/53728/009. , PERM,02/04/2012

10/53728/009 - Construction of 31No. houses with associated access and landscaping., PERM,29/10/2010

APP/13/00872 - Application for written confirmation that the planning conditions imposed in relation to planning permission 10/53728/009 and the associated S106 Agreement (dated 29.10.10) requirements have been discharged. , PERM,18/11/2013

APP/17/00417 - Installation of side dormer windows., PERM,16/06/2017

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application proposes a single storey flat roof rear extension to be constructed from materials to match those of the existing property. The extension would protrude 3.1m from the rear elevation of the main house, spanning the width of the main property (4.9m) and achieving a maximum height of 2.65m above ground level. The extension would be constructed up to, but not exceeding, the common boundary with the attached neighbouring house. A fully glazed roof lantern of hipped roof design, to be stepped in 1m from each side edge of the roof, would achieve a ridge height of 0.6m above the flat roof of the extension.
- 3.2 The originally submitted scheme proposed a mono pitched extension of greater depth, which was considered to represent an over large and overbearing form of development which would not be capable of receiving Officer support. Following negotiations with the agent the proposal was amended by way of reducing its depth by 1m and reducing the

maximum roof height by 1.2m.

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)

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

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: 10

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
Loss of light: "The proposed extension will cause significant obstruction and loss of light to my adjoining property. Paragraph 5.43 of the council's design guide asserts that the design of a proposed rear extension should avoid loss of light to neighbours by ensuring that the existing windows are not within a 45 degree overshadowing zone. Applying the assessment criteria the proposed design contravenes the 45 degree assessment by a wide margin in both the plan and elevation planes for the main window on my property, which consists of large double doors onto my patio area. This window provides the majority of the light to my dining area and kitchen, which owing to its largely northerly aspect, is key to ensuring sufficient light into my	See section 7 of Officer Report

property. In addition, the smaller second window on the far side of my property from the development will also be overshadowed in plan when applying the outlined 45 degree assessment criteria laid out in paragraph 5.44."	
Overbearing: "...the position of the proposed extension is directly on the boundary line of my property. This is contrary to paragraph 5.42 that states a single story extension should be no closer than 1 metre to the neighbouring properties. This, in combination with the scale and bulk of the extension, compounds the potential overbearing impacts upon my property/garden and loss of light thereto."	See section 7 of Officer Report
Out of character with surrounding development: "The small estate that these houses are part of is a modern development and as a result all of the buildings are a consistent size, style and shape. They have been built efficiently maximising the use of the limited available land. The proposed extension would result in a property significantly out-of-scale and character with the rest of the estate."	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

(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.

7.3 The proposed extension (as amended) would, with regards to its dimensions, ordinarily have fallen just outside of permitted developments rights with regards to its depth (by 0.1m), however, such rights have been removed for this property by way of planning conditions placed upon the wider housing development of which the property is a part, so as to allow for greater control over further development, and as such cannot be considered a viable fall back.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.4 The proposed extension would be constructed to the rear of the main house where it

would not be readily visible from within the wider area. As such the extension would not have a significant or negative impact upon the visual amenity of the street scene or locality.

- 7.5 Notwithstanding the above, the proposed extension would not appear out of keeping in respect of its form, style or materials relative to the existing house or surrounding development and would not represent a significant negative impact upon the appearance or character of the host property or application site.
- 7.6 As originally proposed the rear extension was considered to represent an over large form of development within the context of the modest application site. Following negotiations with the agent the scheme was revised such that the scale, mass and bulk was reduced by a significant degree. The resulting flat roof extension with a depth of 3.1m is considered to be of an acceptable scale, in respect of appearance, relative to the existing main property and its curtilage.
- 7.7 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

- 7.8 The proposed extension would be single storey with no side-facing openings. the glazed door unit to the rear elevation would not look directly toward any surrounding development. As such the proposed extension would not have a significant impact upon the privacy of surrounding residential properties. The application property is set well back relative to the neighbouring property to the west, with the two storey facing elevation of the application property covering almost the full length of the neighbouring property's rear curtilage. Relative to the present arrangement and in considering the separation of the two dwellings by a footpath bordered on both sides by intervening boundary fences, the single storey extension would not be expected to have a significant negative impact upon the outlook or light of neighbouring development to the west of the application site. An acceptable degree of separation would be maintained between the proposed extension and development to the rear of the application site.
- 7.9 The proposed extension would span the width of the rear elevation of the main property and would be constructed up to the common boundary shared with the attached neighbouring dwelling to the east, no. 7 Blossom Drive. An objection comment was received from the occupant of the neighbouring house with regards to the originally submitted extension, which was subsequently revised to result in the current scheme, which is of a reduced height and depth. The objection has been upheld and resubmitted in respect of the present scheme, citing that the proposal would still be in breach of HBC design guidance, with specific regard for protruding beyond 45 degrees as measured from the centre of the closest rear facing ground floor window of the neighbouring house and to within 1m from the common boundary. A further attempt was made to negotiate with the applicant a reduction in the width of the extension in from the common boundary, however, a preference was expressed for the application to be determined on the basis of the present scheme and no further amendments were submitted.
- 7.10 The HBC supplementary planning document referred to in the above mentioned objection comment contains guidance which aims to advise on how development can best, or will be most likely, to achieve accordance with relevant policies of the HBLP Core Strategy. Exceptions may occur, dependent on the unique setting, merits and constraints of each individual application, where a scheme contravenes the design guidance whilst still fulfilling the requirements of local planning policy and the NPPF. Of

greatest relevance to the current application are policy CS16 of the HBLP and core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which comment on design and impact upon public and neighbour amenity. CS16 requires that "development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking". Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that "planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise", whilst paragraph 17 requires that planning decisions should "always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings".

- 7.11 The extension would have a some impact upon the outlook of the neighbouring property to the east owing to the combination of its mass and depth and, most pertinently, its immediate proximity to the common boundary. The existing 1.8m high close board timber fence to the curtilage boundary would, however, screen a substantial portion of the bulk of the extension. The depth and overall mass of the extension would be somewhat mitigated by the modest height of its flat roof at 2.65m above ground level. It is acknowledged that the proposed roof lantern would take the maximum height of the structure, as measured to the ridge of the roof lantern, to 3.2m above ground level (achieving maximum height at a distance of 1.7m from the common boundary); however, this element would not be expected to contribute significantly to the perceived mass, bulk or overall scale of the extension owing to its lightweight glazed construction. The north-facing orientation of the rear curtilages of both properties and the position of the extension to the immediate west of the neighbouring curtilage is noted; the extension would therefore result in some impact upon natural light to the neighbouring garden and into the room served by the closest rear-facing ground floor opening (French doors), at least during the later afternoon and evening. Whilst the French doors are the principle source of light and outlook for this room, which is a habitable room (an open plan kitchen-dining area), it is noted that the room is also served by a secondary window which would be further from, and not significantly affected by, the proposed development.
- 7.12 On balance, with regard to the presumption in favour of development within defined urban areas, as outlined by the HBLP (Allocations) (AL1) and NPPF, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to result in a negative impact upon the quality of life of neighbouring residents with regard to privacy, outlook or light to as significant an extent as would represent a contravention with the policies of the HBLP (Core Strategy). As such, grounds which would warrant the refusal of the scheme (as amended) have not been established and a recommendation for approval must therefore be given.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would, on balance, 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/18/00053 subject to the following conditions