
Site Address: 8 Post Office Road, Waterloo, PO7 5LS
Proposal: Two storey front and side extension including gable to hip roof and increase of ridge height. (Resubmission).
Application No: APP/17/00992 Expiry Date: 09/11/2017
Applicant: Mr R Ewins
Agent: Mr D P Manns Case Officer: Bee Crawford
 D M Designs
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is an older style two storey end of terraced property. It has a brown tiled pitched, hipped and barn hipped roof and elevations of red multibrick, pebble dash render and cladding. There is a slight south/north incline to the site which has vehicular access leading to an area of shingle, enclosed by 1.8 metre high fencing. The garden of the property is to the front, side and rear consisting of grass, shrubs, several sheds and a patio area, enclosed by 1.8 metre high fencing to the northern and western boundaries and a 1.4 metre high fence to the eastern boundary.
- 1.2 The adjoining two storey terraced property is to the west, a pair of modern two storey semi-detached properties are to the east, the rear gardens of properties in Crofton Close are to the rear and the side aspect of a bungalow in Old Van Diemens Road is opposite. The area is of medium density with two storey semi-detached and terraced properties and detached bungalows of similar and different age, style and design.

2 Planning History

APP/17/00742 - Two storey side extension, withdrawn 29/08/2017.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is for the construction of a two storey front and side extension including gable to hip roof and increase of ridge height. (Resubmission).

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**

Arboriculturalist

There are three trees at the front of 7 Post Office Road on the boundary with number 8, but they should not be affected by the proposal as they are sufficient distance away. They are poor quality specimens which may have originally be planted as a hedge but allowed to grow. No objection in arboricultural terms.

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: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
I have had time to study the revised and resubmitted proposal for extension onto 8 Post Office Rd. I am writing this observational report to object in full to the latest planning application for the same reasons as before and to extend further my complete objection to the latest plans. Reasons : Width of the extension is a major factor as this still impedes the light into my conservatory and will cause problems to having the light on in the kitchen during day light hours. The closeness of the property will still be overpowering and impacting on our small property .I estimate that there will be considerably less than the 3 metre gap illustrated on the plans; between the edge of my conservatory and the outer side wall of the extension and coupled	See section 7.

with the height is going to still reduce the light into conservatory and kitchen. (see below*).	
This distance between the two properties walls with the height of the extension is also going to effect the light received into my landing window and bathroom window.	See section 7.
I also object to the 45 degree angle measured from the conservatory door, as my conservatory is glass and a bit of plastic this should be measured from the closest corner next to the boundary edge between my property to that of 8 Post Office Rd. In this case the proposed width of extension fails the test when lined up with the leading edge of my conservatory.	See section 7.
*Looking at the plans the 3 metre gap is measured from the front of the garden boundary with the public access path way. The boundary between the two properties narrows to the back of the garden and proceeds in an angular direction and not perpendicular with the public access path.	The boundaries between the application site and neighbouring properties is a civil matter which would need to be resolved between the applicant and his neighbour.
Therefore the distance between the two properties at the closest point of approach (edge of my conservatory closest to the boundary) is considerably less than 3 metres.	.
Furthermore, I would like to also make the following observation by my estimations of visual looking over the fence at 8 Post Office Rd I think the area of existing cottage to be 35m ² approximately. The proposed extension is in my opinion still the size of another cottage slotted into the existing area I have calculated is 30.482m ² .	Noted.
This equates to a 87%(approximately) increase in size, surely that is not an extension but still considered to be another large dwelling.	Noted.
I have also consulted with my two neighbours at 27 and 29 Crofton Close and they are in complete agreement with my comments and observations.	Noted.

The impact of the new dwelling is going to impact upon them but to a lesser degree.	
I also oppose the natural screening proposed as well.	The proposed 2 metre high screening would not require planning permission.

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 substantial extension which includes a two storey front and side extension which has a depth of 6.85 metres and a width of 4 metres, together with a new front porch. It would provide generous additional accommodation including a substantial lounge/diner, a bathroom, a fourth bedroom with en-suite shower room and a larger third bedroom.

7.4 Following Officer concerns regarding the size of the proposal submitted under APP/17/00742, this application was subsequently withdrawn. Whilst the amended scheme has been reduced in size from the original proposal, it is considered the 0.41 metre decrease in the width together with the 0.7 metre decrease in the depth does not address the previous concerns raised. It is also noted there has been no change in the proposed height of 6.6 metres. The property would virtually double in size and be tantamount to an additional dwelling.

7.5 Consequently it is considered that an extension of this scale would appear overbearing and incongruous in relation to the original property and would result in an excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring property at 25 Crofton Close, detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011.

7.6 The agent was advised that the revised scheme would not receive officer support for the reasons above, but he confirmed that it was his client's wishes to continue with this current application.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.7 It is considered that the proposal to extend the property with a significant two storey addition would significantly increase the overall bulk of number 8 and that this would be highly overbearing to the occupier of 25 Crofton Close, particularly when using the rear amenity space. As such, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring property which is contrary to the advice laid out in policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011.

- 7.8 With respect to the point at which the 45 degree angle test is measured from, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide advises this measurement is taken from the centre of the main window of the rear elevation irrespective of the materials of this elevation. However, for the purposes of this particular scheme, a further 45 degree angle test was carried out from the northern corner of the conservatory at 25 Crofton Close, which indicates that the proposal falls outside the 45 degree overshadowing in this instance.
- 7.9 Notwithstanding the above, the extension would be highly overbearing and adversely effect the daylight and outlook of this neighbouring property. Additionally, whilst this property is set forward of 8 Post Office Road, the western elevation does not run parallel with the boundary, with a distance of approximately 0.5 metres between the corner of the conservatory and the fence. It is judged this would exacerbate the impact of the extension.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed extent of the two storey extension, is considered excessively large and it would result in an overbearing presence on the occupiers of the neighbouring property at 25 Crofton Close. As such, the application is contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011 and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/17/00992 for the following reason

- 1 The proposed extension is considered to be overbearing and would result in an excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring property at 25 Crofton Close, detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011
- 2 A proposed extension of this scale would appear overbearing and incongruous in relation to the original property resulting in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011