

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	48 Fir Copse Road, Waterloooville, PO7 5HZ		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00753	Expiry Date:	29/11/2024
Applicant:	Mr Williams		
Agent:	Mr Rosenthal	Case Officer:	Robert Riley
	signature Design Architecture Ltd		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 48 Fir Copse Road, Waterloooville is semi-detached bungalow constructed in off-white walls with roughcast finish, and a hipped roof with concrete slate tiles in grey colour and rustic red hips and ridge. To the front area of the property is a paved driveway leading to the rear garden and allowing for approximately two car parking spaces, a paved area and a retained grass area. The rear garden comprises a patio closer to the main building, a grass area with an existing tree in the middle, and two outbuildings, one to the north side and one to the rear. The different areas of the rear garden are connected through paved steps due to the sloping characteristic from west to east of the application site.
- 1.2 The boundary treatment consists of a low brick wall to the front, and standard wood fencing of approximately 1.8 metres to the north side boundaries of the rear garden, coupled with thick hedging to the south side, and tall trees with tall hedges to the west rear boundaries.
- 1.3 The surrounding area is mainly residential in character with a mix of semi-detached bungalows with hipped roofs and two-storey dwellinghouses.

2 Planning History

APP/24/00174 - One and half storey rear extension off the back of a bungalow with raised roof height., REF,07/06/2024

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Single storey rear extension with a proposed width of approximately 5.8 metres a proposed depth of approximately 13.3 metres and a proposed maximum height of approximately 3.279 metres.

Officer comment:

- 3.2 There are inconsistencies in the plans between the proposed materials, with the application documents advising, the external walls of the rear extension and existing dwelling would feature white render and olive green cladding or olive green render. This change has been omitted from this applications description. Clarification about the material changes, which would require planning permission in this case, has not been received.

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)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
-----	--

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Antonia Harrison

No comments received

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No comments received

Councillor Paul Tansom

No comments received

Developer Services, Southern Water

From reviewing the submitted documents, Southern Water can see no evidence of the applicant using the existing connection. If the existing connection is proposed, we will have no objections to the works proceeding.

Please see attached our GIS document in which indicates an existing sewer in the vicinity of the development, please be aware of this for any future works.

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre

Within 50m: Priority Habitat: Lower Mixed Deciduous Woodland.

Within 50m: SINCC: Sandy Dell

Officer Comment: The works would be at ground floor level and unacceptable impacts to ecology are considered unlikely.

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: 1.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (v) Ecology
- (vi) Flood Zone
- (vii) Arboriculture

(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 extension would be a very deep addition to the original dwelling, with a very long proposed flat roof section extension connecting to the original rear of the dwelling. It would however feature a single storey nature. It is considered that it would result in an addition that would have little bearing to the design of the original dwelling, and would lead to a predominantly flat roofed property. In light of that the additional footprint would be over double the depth of the original dwelling it is not seen as a subservient addition to the main dwelling, thereby not meeting the requirements of Policy CS16.

It is considered that as the extension works would be visible at select vantage points through the shared pathway on Fir Copse Road and due to its very long deep nature that this extension would be seen to have an unacceptable impact regarding the character of the area and the dwelling.

Materials

- 7.4 The plans are inconsistent regarding the external wall materials. The plans state that the materials would be flat roof for the roof, and white render and olive green render/cladding for the external walls. The roof materials and white render are considered acceptable for the dwelling. However officers note the plans are inconsistent surrounding whether the walls would feature olive green render or cladding. Nonetheless, if officers were minded to approve the application materials could be agreed by condition.
- 7.5 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, thereby not meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy 2011). It is considered that the scheme would result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.6 To the northeastern and southwestern sides of the application site are properties at No 50 and No 46 Fir Copse. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these two properties. Due to the nature scale and location of the works, properties to the front and rear of the application site are considered to be acceptably impacted.

No.50 Fir Copse

- 7.7 To Northeastern side of the application site is No.50 Fir Copse. Regarding overlooking concerns, to the rear there would be rear fenestration, however this would face the rear garden, and any views of No.50 Fir Copse would be oblique which is considered acceptable. There would be 3 windows on the northern (side elevation) facing No.50. The 2 westernmost windows would face boundary treatment but given the extension would have a finished floor level of approximately 0.4 metres above the existing ground level there would be views of No.50's side wall from these 2 windows. The easternmost window would face No.50's rear garden, and plans show the proposed floor levels to be approximately 0.5 metres above ground level at this location, in consideration of the location of this window, it is considered that it would lead to an unacceptable level of overlooking of No.50's rear garden leading to a loss of privacy for this dwelling. Regarding the overshadowing and overbearing impact, It is noted that the extension would be approximately, 7.6 metres beyond No.50's rear wall and be approximately 0.55 metres from the boundary, and would be in close proximity to approximately 4.4 metres of No.50's rear terrace area, it would furthermore, significantly fail the 45 degree angle test in the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD regarding depth. At approximately 3.3 metres in height above ground level next to the terrace area, it would also increase a sense of overbearing which is considered to be dominant on the rear amenity space of No.50. The works are also seen to be considered to be overdevelopment of the site in consideration of this dwelling.

No.46 Fir Copse

- 7.8 There would be no fenestration facing No.46 Fir Copse Road, and rear fenestration would face No.48's rear garden, and at oblique views would face boundary treatment, with this consideration this proposal is considered acceptable regarding overlooking. No.46 features trees in their rear garden, It is noted that this rear extension would feature an approximate 0.75 metre separation distance from No.46's curtilage and at its rear would be 3.279 metres tall, it is also noted that this proposal would significantly fail the 45 degree angle depth test set out in the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, albeit currently there are trees on the boundary as such it is considered the proposal would unlikely result in a loss of light above that of the existing situation. It is furthermore noted that the extension would extend approximately 13.1 metres beyond No.46's northern section of the rear elevation. Whilst there are currently a lot of trees within No.46's rear garden as set out in the Arboricultural section of this report it has not been demonstrated that the offsite trees would be safeguarded. In the event that trees are lost on the neighbouring site as a result of the development, the proposed development would result in urbanisation, furthermore given the depth and height of the proposal it could result in an overbearing impact on No.46.
- 7.9 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would appear overbearing, would lead to a loss of light, outlook and privacy and would have an unacceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site, not meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy 2011). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.10 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

(v) Ecology

- 7.11 The application site has been found to be within 50 metres of a Priority Habitat; Lower Mixed Deciduous Woodland and within 50 metres of a SIN; Sandy Dell. In light of that the works would be at ground floor level, unacceptable impacts to ecology are considered unlikely and this proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(vi) Flood Zone

- 7.12 Due to part of the curtilage falling under Flood Zone 3, a flood risk assessment form has been received during the application process. The form annotated that the floor levels would be set no lower than existing floor levels and that flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where appropriate, given the limited nature of the development officers consider this acceptable. Furthermore, this proposal is noted to be in proximity to a watercourse. The closest aspect of the rear extension would feature an approximate 31 metre separation distance from the watercourse to the rear. In light of this, officers are satisfied that with the consideration of the scale of the changes and the separation distances, that the works would have an acceptable impact regarding flood risk and would accord with Policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(vii) Arboriculture

- 7.13 The proposed rear extension would be in close proximity to numerous trees located in No.46's rear curtilage. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed works at the proposed location would have acceptable impact on these nearby trees located near the application site. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the provisions of Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is inappropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and would have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. Furthermore, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed works at the proposed location would have acceptable impact on these nearby trees located near the application site. On this basis it is recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00753 for the following reasons

- 1 The extension by virtue of its bulk and depth would amount to overdevelopment of the site and would be contrary to the guidance contained within the Council's Design Guide SPD. The proposed extension, would have a dominant, overshadowing and overbearing impact and would cause unacceptable harm to No.50 Fir Copse. Furthermore, the rearmost window on the northern side elevation would be able to provide unacceptable levels of overlooking of No.50's rear garden area leading to a loss of privacy to this neighbouring dwelling. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would safeguard offsite trees within No.46's rear curtilage and thereby could result in harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers by way of loss of soft landscaping and introduction of a large extension with an excessive depth adjacent to the site boundary resulting in urbanisation and an overbearing impact. By virtue of its mass, bulk and flat roof nature the proposed extension would not be in keeping with the character of the dwelling and given the potential to be viewed from the street would be harmful to the streetscene character. The proposal is therefore, contrary to Policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.