
Site Address: 25 Park Lane, Cowplain, Waterlooville, PO8 8AD
Proposal: Rear extension, new rear dormer, and replacement porch.
Replacement garage and works to front boundary wall.
Application No: APP/17/01240 Expiry Date: 15/01/2018
Applicant: Mr Cheyne
Agent: Mr M Critchley Case Officer: Tina Pickup
Ward: Cowplain
Site Visit Date:

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site relates to an older style detached chalet style dwelling with an 'eye-brow' style window in the front roofslope. It is constructed of red brick beneath a plain tile roof and still has crittle windows. Notably the dwelling is set a long way back from the road relative to its neighbours. It is set back some 29m whereas No 24 and 26 are set back only by 9 to 10m. There is a detached single garage located to the front, set against the south-western side boundary, aligned with No 24. Vehicular access is taken from the south-western corner and the frontage has a low boundary wall. The land slopes up very gradually to the north-east ie rear.

To the rear the property has some old lean-to style structures/shed. The side boundaries are a mix of hedging - the heights of which vary - approximately 3m high on the south-western side but only about 1.5m on the north-eastern. The rear boundary is not as shown on the Council's O.S plan (submission documents are correct) as some of the rear garden has been purchased by a neighbour to the rear - the rear fence line now matches the rear boundary line of No 26 giving a rear garden depth of about 15m from rear of original dwelling & some 12m from the rear of the lean-to additions. This rear boundary comprises a 1.8m high close boarded fence and there is an old fir tree within the garden providing some screening. The properties to the rear in Pine Tree Gardens are chalet bungalows and sited having a back to back separation distance of about 32m.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Rear extension, new rear dormer, and replacement porch. Replacement garage and works to front boundary wall.

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)
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

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
None received	

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) Highways and parking
- (v) CIL

(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 extensions are to the rear such that the front character of the property would largely remain unaltered - the critical windows would be replaced but the height and profile of the front elevation in street scene terms would be unaffected. A small flat roofed porch is proposed which would sit in the natural recess of the front elevation and be unobtrusive. However the frontage garage and boundary wall are to be replaced with the access widened and frontage parking re-configured with a replacement garage that is larger and higher (8.1m long x 3.9m wide with height to ridge of 3.55m). The garage would remain in the same forward position and not encroach forward of No 24. This linear siting is considered appropriate in street scene terms and not overly dominant.

- 7.4 The rear extension is quite large - extending out some 5m across the whole width of the dwelling. Due to the low profile of the existing dwelling the proposed extension is not subservient in terms of height and follows the existing ridge and eaves line. However during the course of determining the application amended plans were sought pulling the eastern flank wall in slightly to break up and recess what was otherwise a large expanse of side wall close to the shared boundary with No 26. In design terms this side elevation now has a degree of subserviency and would be less dominant. This has not been repeated on the western side as the separation to the side boundary is greater with higher screening.
- 7.5 Overall 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) and the Borough design guide SPD. 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

- 7.6 As noted above the proximity to the north-eastern boundary and siting relative to No 26 is such that the eastern flank wall could appear intrusive and overbearing when viewed from No 26. This adjacent garden is currently laid out with raised allotment beds against the shared boundary. The additional bulk and mass close to this boundary will have an impact and due to the orientation result in some overshadowing of an evening. However it is noted that this would affect a functional garden and not significantly any sitting out amenity area or any living space within the property. It is also noted that no letters of objection have been received from this or any other neighbour. On balance, with the improved design stepping back the brick work of this highly visible flank wall which would make it less dominant, then the actual harm caused would be minimal and not sufficient to justify a reason for refusal.
- 7.7 The property already has a rear dormer. The proposed rear elevation would be some 5m closer to the rear boundary with a larger rear dormer, but nevertheless the separation distance to the dwellings to the rear would still be in excess of the 20m minimum recommended in the Borough Design Guide SPD. Two side velux windows are proposed, both of which serve bathrooms, as well as two roof lights within the crown top. The agent has confirmed that the side velux's would have an internal floor to cill height of 2.1m which would preclude any overlooking issues. There is an existing first floor window in each of the side elevations and these remain unaltered. It is therefore considered that there would be no additional overlooking as a result of this proposal in this established residential area.
- 7.8 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to lead to additional 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) Highways and parking

- 7.9 Park Lane is an unclassified road so the widening of the vehicular access does not require permission in its own right. Whilst vehicles would not be able to turn on site to leave in a forward gear, this is an existing situation common to others in the vicinity. Sufficient parking is provided for the resultant 5 bedroom property. Therefore there is no objection on highway grounds.

(v) CIL

7.10 The net additional floorspace, including larger garage, amounts to about 81 sq m - which is below the 100sqm threshold and therefore the proposal is not CIL liable.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The amended 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/17/01240 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:
Location and Block Plan Drawing Number: 17107-101
Proposed Site Plan Drawing Number: 17107-103 Rev B
Proposed Elevations Drawing Number: 17107-501 Rev C
Proposed Floor Plans Drawing Number: 17107-401 Rev D
Proposed Garage and Entrance Drawing Number: 17107-402 Rev A
Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 The external materials used shall be as submitted or 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.