
Site Address:	36 Oaktree Drive, Emsworth, PO10 7UJ		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/17/01278	Expiry Date:	25/01/2018
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Carr		
Agent:	Mr Bessant	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Jimmy Bessant Architecture		
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

36 Oaktree Drive is a relatively new two storey detached dwelling located at the head of a private cul-de-sac; it is the northern most dwelling within the Urban Area before woodland to the north. It is constructed of a mix of cream painted render (front and side elevation) and red brick (rear elevation) beneath a slate effect roof. The property has an unusually large garden benefiting from a wide curtilage - the depth from the rear elevation is some 8m but the width extends to some 28m. It is bounded by 1.8m high close boarded fencing.

The land slopes up to the north-east and the recent housing development has resulted in some marked level differences with retaining walls. The garages and parking area immediately to the east of No 36 and south of the garden, is at a much lower level than the application site garden (approximately 1 - 1.5m lower) with retaining timbers below the close boarded fencing. The property has an 'L' shaped footprint with the recess and area across the rear paved as a patio area - and this is at a level but lower level with small retaining wall, with the garden then sloping up to the north-east.

The housing development was constructed by virtue of Planning Permission 09/72129/002 for the "Demolition of 2No dwellings and erection of 48No. dwellings with associated garages and parking with access from Oak Tree Drive." This was permitted on 28/02/2011 and condition 10 removed permitted development rights for Class A, D and E development i.e. Extensions to the houses, porches and incidental buildings or enclosures. The reason for the imposition of this condition was to ensure the appearance of the development was satisfactory having regard to relevant policies.

At the eastern end of the garden there is timber play equipment which received retrospective planning permission in January 2017.

2 Planning History

APP/14/00545 - Proposed demolition of unstable brick boundary wall and replacement with new brick boundary wall as detailed located to north of Plot 32 of Planning Approval ref 09/72129/002. Replacement stables., PERM,19/11/2014
APP/14/01285 - Application for variation of Condition No. 1 of Planning Permission APP/14/00337 to extend timescale from 31st December to March 31st 2015., PERM,23/01/2015
09/72129/002 - Demolition of 2No. dwellings and erection of 48No. dwellings with associated garages and parking with access from Oak Tree Drive., PERM,28/02/2011
APP/16/00722 - Retention of play equipment., REF,22/11/2016

3 Proposal

Single storey rear extension.

The single storey rear extensions proposed would, in footprint terms, infill the rear recess and extend across the full width of the rear by a 2m depth, plus a further 3m wide side extension and this south-western element would have a depth of 4.3m. The extension has 3 elements with varying roof designs: the recess infill is mono-pitched with roof lights; the central section slopes back to the rear elevation; and the south western projection has a full pitch roof.

During the course of determining the application amended plans have been received pulling the study element marginally away from the boundary to ensure the entire development, including eaves and guttering are within the application site; aswell as correcting a roof drawing.

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)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre:

Site within 50m Protected and Notable Species - Wild Strawberry, Bat Roost

Officer Comment: It is not considered that this domestic extension is likely to impact protected species.

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: 4

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1 - with 3 letters have been received from 1

neighbour - with ongoing enquires to agent which have been resolved/answered as follows

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>Fences</u> - seek confirmation that fences will remain and be untouched during the building phase and thereafter; distance of extension to fence line; <u>Height</u> - What is the maximum height of the extension? and Study area visible above fence? <u>Roof</u> - clarification re roof profiles, colours and materials <u>Materials</u> - of side elevation of the study that we will see over the fence prefer to be matching bricks and tiles <u>Difference</u> between the plans submitted on 6/12/17 and those on 12/12/17 and the reasoning behind the changes. <u>Rainwater</u> query on both the main area and the study area <u>Location of Study area</u> - why not built at the other end of the extension where it would not block our and other's view of the woods and change the nature of this corner of the existing environment?	private matter; 300mm to side; 215mm to front max of 3.8m to mono pitch roof; 3.15m to study ridge slate roof to match confirmed brick to match change in roof to study to lessen impact soakaway in applicants land applicants choice and plans to be determined as submitted
Following a site visit and discussing matters the final comments received: apart from getting confirmation of the brick elevations to the study area and that we receive confirmation that the fences will not be touched or if they are they will be replaced and that Mr & Mrs Carr supply 3 roses (Compassion) that we will plant to help hide the study area from both views we no longer have any objection to the proposal.	Noted - fence & roses a private matter

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. The site slopes but the area around the rear has previously been levelled and paved with small retaining wall to the grassed garden area - the extension would be entirely within this levelled area.

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

- 7.3 The property is sited at the head of the cul-de-sac surrounded by parking areas to its immediate sides. As such it is relatively prominent and set against the backdrop of the woods behind. From the front elevation the proposed western side extension would appear set back and with a traditional low pitched roof - almost like a detached structure, though it would be linked to the rear extension. Its small scale and height (eaves of 2.1m and ridge of 3.15m) is such that its impact above the existing fence line would not be over intrusive. The neighbour on this side at Nos 53 has an outlook in this direction and shared approach and concerned that the visual impact of the side extension is minimised to protect the spacious setting and visual appearance of the head of the cul-de-sac. There is a flower bed in front of the fence and the neighbours have agreed with the applicants for some climbing roses to be planted to screen the extension - but this is a private agreement and not required by planning condition.
- 7.4 Being single storey only with appropriate pitched/sloping roofs, the overall scale, 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

- 7.5 No 53 to the west has its drive/parking area immediately adjacent the side elevation of the application site and the proposed study side extension would infill the corner closest to No 53. Since the application site is marginally higher than No 53 this would add slightly to its impact. However being single storey and relatively low, sited to the east, there would be minimal overshadowing or overbearing effect from the bulk of the extension. It would be sited adjacent the neighbours shed/allotment area of garden and not the private sitting out area. Overall the impact of the study extension on the neighbours at 53 is considered to be minimal and acceptable. The application dwelling has mixed materials - render to the side and brick to the rear, and the side extension would be visually read with both - the occupiers of Nos 53 have expressed a wish for it to be constructed of brick rather than render to help it appear more subdued and recessive against the backdrop of the trees - the applicants have agreed to this.
- 7.6 Matters such as the long term retention of the boundary fence line and any damage during construction are private matters between the applicant and neighbour. Similarly the provision of a soakaway within the applicants own site are matters for Building Regulations.
- 7.7 With respect to the eastern side the infill extension is only single storey, adjacent a shared parking area and sufficiently separated from any neighbouring dwelling or amenity area to have any detrimental harm.
- 7.8 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).

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/17/01278

(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:

Site & Location Plan Drawing Number PL.157.17- 01 Rev D

Proposed Elevations Drawing Number PL.157.17- 04 Rev E

Existing & Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drawing Number PL.157.17- 02 Rev C

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The hereby approved extension shall be constructed of facing brick and roof tiles to match, in type, colour and texture, those of the rear 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.