

---

Site Address: 54 The Brow, Waterlooville, PO7 5BZ  
Proposal: Demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions.  
Application No: APP/16/01098                      Expiry Date: 19/12/2016  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Smith  
Agent:                                                              Case Officer: Emma Chisnall  
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

---

## **1     Site Description**

54 The Brow is a large detached dwelling situated in Purbrook, Waterlooville and is constructed of red brick walls with a concrete tiled roof. The dwelling is located on a sharp incline from north to south and is also on an incline from west to east. The amenity space to the front of No 54 is moderate in size and is part hard-surfaced for the provision of parking two cars and is part lawn. The dwelling has an internal garage to the side and is set off the shared boundary to the east by more than 2m. The rear amenity space is large in size and is surrounded with a part 1.8m timber fence and part hedging along the curtilage boundary. There is a mature tree beech tree present in the rear amenity space of No 54 and two mature trees to the front of the dwelling outside of the curtilage boundary.

## **2     Planning History**

None

## **3     Proposal**

Demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions.

## **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

|      |                                                                                   |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CS11 | (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough) |
| CS16 | (High Quality Design)                                                             |
| DM13 | (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)                                |
| DM8  | (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)           |

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**

### **Portsmouth City Council Comment:**

No adverse comment made in regards to the 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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

No quarrel with first storey and continuing extension but have issues with second storey.

Objections based on daylight, privacy and outlook

Our property stretches to both boundaries so no access to rear of our home except house or garage. Front door and only access to our property is situated to west side of building as are bedroom, bathroom and kitchen windows. We mostly live on this side.

### *Privacy:*

Extension invasive to our everyday living accommodation and when receiving visitors and entering our home.

Proposed second storey a bedroom with two windows, one facing north and one south.

South window - direct view to almost whole of back garden.

North window provides full vision of our path to side door

Loss of privacy.

North facing window close to our entrance and bathroom where all conversations could be heard.

Direct vision into our master bedroom.

### *Light and Outlook:*

Existing tree impacts on light to kitchen, communal room and rear garden.

Proposed second storey will further diminish present light we receive later in the day to west side of our home.

Impact on bedroom, bathroom and kitchen outlook.

Loss of sunlight.

No reduction in tree proposed.

**Officer Comment:** Works to the tree are not proposed as part of the application and would not require consent by the Local Planning Authority as the tree is not subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

**Officer Comment:**

The majority of these comments will be addressed in Section 7 of the report under 'Planning Considerations'.

## **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 and appearance of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Trees

(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. Following a site visit it was clear that The Brow contains a variety of dwellings many of which have been extended over time. It is therefore felt that the works to No 54 will not be setting a precedent for this type of development and can be considered acceptable in principle subject to planning conditions.

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

7.3 The proposed two storey extension would feature a hipped roof and would be reasonable in scale in that it would not be out of keeping with the other roof lines present. The extension is proposed to be set significantly back from the main front wall elevation by 4.7m and will not extend past the existing rear elevation at two storey height. A single storey extension will project past the existing rear elevation. The land to the east side and rear of No 54 is set significantly lower in position than the boundary to the east and the neighbouring dwelling.

7.4 Concern has been raised by the occupants of No.56 to the east that the works will be in close proximity to the shared curtilage boundary which will prove invasive as the only access to No 56 is along the west elevation which will face onto the works. Two separate site visits have been performed in order to assess the impact caused to No 56 and although it is noted that the works will be in closer proximity to the boundary and that an impact will be caused it is noted that the works are proposed to be set off the shared boundary by approximately 1.8m which meets with guidance stipulated in the Borough Design Guide in relation to acceptable gaps to boundaries.

7.5 The design has also made efforts to reduce the potential impacts of the works by setting it off the boundary, setting it back from the front elevation by 4.7m and hipping the roof and setting the works down from the ridge line which reduces the mass and bulk of the extension and makes the development appear subservient in relation to the existing building. The position of No 54 and the land immediately around it is also lower in position to the shared curtilage boundary with No 56 meaning the extension would appear to be in a lower position than if this land was level, reducing the visual impact further. Therefore on balance it is considered that due to these measures and the position of No 54 that the impact caused is reduced significantly and is considered acceptable.

- 7.6 The impact caused to the visual amenity of The Brow as a result of the development is considered limited and acceptable given the subservient design of the extension and the gap retained to the site boundary. The two storey side and single storey rear extension would not be overbearing to the main property and sufficient amenity space would be retained in the rear garden. Matching materials are proposed.
- 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 It is considered that No 54 The Brow has the amenity space available to accommodate the proposed works and that the development will be set adequately away from the dwellings to the front, rear and west to ensure that amenity levels are maintained and protected.
- 7.9 Concern has been raised by the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling to the east that the works proposed to No 54 will cause over-looking and a loss of privacy into the front and rear amenity space and that light levels will be impacted as a result of the works. There are also concerns in relation to the potential to overhear conversations from windows in the extension.
- 7.10 The design of the works at No 54 includes a window to the front and rear of the first floor extension which will serve a bedroom. There are no proposed first floor windows along the east facing side elevation of the extension. Ground floor windows and a door are proposed along the side elevation of No 54 however due to the screening in place between the dwellings and the position of the works being lower than the land to the east the windows are not considered to lead to over-looking nor cause a loss of privacy. One window is proposed to be obscure glazed in order to protect amenity.
- 7.11 It is acknowledged that the windows at first floor level have the potential to give the perception of over-looking however the windows serve a bedroom which is not considered to be a primary room use and would not have a regular occupancy throughout the day and therefore this will reduce the over-looking potential more than if it had been proposed for a lounge or kitchen for example. The window to the front will look directly over to the front amenity space of No 54 and only at an angle to the front and side of No 56. It should be noted that these areas are already viewable from the streetscene. Front amenity space is not considered to have the same privacy levels as to the rear and it is considered that there would not be a significant increase in over-looking sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission. The curtilage boundary is considered adequate in height which will contribute to reducing the impact further. It is noted that a bedroom window serves the side of No 56 that this is the window most impacted as a result of the development, however, this bedroom is dual aspect and the main larger window is positioned to the front of No 56 and is not overlooked. The window in the front of the proposed extension would look directly down the drive of No.54 and only at an angle towards the small side bedroom window in No.56. As a result of the alignment and the dual aspect nature of the bedroom this would limit any impact and loss of privacy. It is not considered that any impact from overlooking would be sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.
- 7.12 Concern has been expressed in relation to the privacy of conversations being

compromised due to the proposed first floor window and its relationship to the entrance to No.54 and west facing windows. Whilst this concern is noted it is not considered that this relationship between dwellings is unusual and there remains a gap between the side boundary and the extension. A reason for refusal could not be substantiated in relation to this matter.

- 7.13 Both dwellings have mature trees within the rear amenity space which provide screening and coverage of the works to No 56. The window proposed at first floor to the rear elevation would look directly over the rear garden of the application property and would be set away from the side elevation. Due to the use of the room and the angle of No 56 coupled with the screening in place it is considered that any overlooking would be limited and acceptable.
- 7.14 Light levels have been considered and assessed in relation to the impact of the development on No 56. Comments made include concerns in relation to a mature Beech tree contributing to reduced light. There are no proposals to alter the tree and as it is not subject to a Tree Preservation Order consent from the Council would not be required for such works. The sun rises in the east and sets in the west meaning that due to the position of No 56 being east of No 54 that if the two storey element was to extend past the existing rear elevation there may be an impact to mid-afternoon and evening sunlight to No 56. The development has ensured that the two storey development will not extend past this elevation with only a single storey rear extension to the rear. Although the width of the development at two storey is to be extended to the side this is considered to have a limited impact on light levels due to the distance the works will be maintained off the shared boundary and the reduced ridge height and hipped roof form included as part of the design. The development is therefore considered to have a limited and acceptable impact in this regard and would not be refusable on these grounds.
- 7.15 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to unacceptable 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) Trees

- 7.16 Following comments received by the Arboricultural Officer it has been considered necessary that a Root Protection Plan be submitted as part of the application to ascertain the distance of the proposed works from the mature Beech tree located in the rear amenity space of No 54. This has been submitted and assessed and it has been concluded that if the RPA is followed and protective fencing is in place before and during construction then the tree should remain un-harmed and the works to No 54 can proceed. This will be conditioned as part of the decision to ensure the welfare of the tree.

## **8 Conclusion**

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have a limited and acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and an acceptable impact on neighbours residential amenities. It 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/16/01098 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 external materials used shall 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.
- 3 No development shall take place until the Beech Tree positioned in the rear amenity space of No 54 The Brow has been enclosed with protective fencing in accordance with the Root Protection Area Plan submitted on the 18.12.2016. The fencing shall be retained throughout the period of construction and no activity prohibited by BS:5877:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.  
**Reason:** To safeguard the continued health and presence of such existing tree and protect the amenities of the locality and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:  
  
Location and Block Plan: Drawing 1620-101  
Existing Ground and First Plan: Drawing No 1620-201B  
Existing Elevations: Drawing No 1620-301A  
Proposed Floor Plans: Drawing No 1620-405  
Proposed Elevations Plan: Drawing No 1620-505A  
Existing and Proposed Roof Plan: Drawing No 1620-406  
Root Protection Area Plan submitted via email 18.12.2016  
  
**Reason:** - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.