
Site Address: 26 Manor Close, Havant, PO9 1BD
Proposal: Retrospective application for a single storey rear extension (revised scheme).
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/22/01038 Expiry Date: 23/12/2022
Applicant: Ms Sullivan
Agent: Mr Packman Case Officer: Joseph Toole
Southern Planning Practice
Ward: St Faiths

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

26 Manor Close, Havant, is located to the west side of Manor Close which is a pedestrian walkway with Prince George Street to the west. The application site is a two storey semi detached property comprising of brickwork and tile hanging with concrete roof tiles. Vehicular access is from Prince George Street with parking to the rear.

The property is located within a residential area with surrounding properties of similar style and design. It is located within St Faith's Conservation Area.

2 Planning History

APP/21/01149 - Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of replacement single storey rear extension., PERM,01/12/2021

3 Proposal

Retrospective application for a single storey rear extension (revised scheme).

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)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: St Faiths

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer

As per the response given back in 2021, it is considered that whilst the flat roof design is not wholly in keeping with the traditional character of the main property, the extension is not highly visible from the public realm and therefore its impact within the CA is of limited harm.

Conclusion: No objection

Councillor Imogen Payter

No Comment.

Councillor Phil Munday - St Faiths

No Comment.

Councillor T Pike - St Faith's

No Comment.

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: 9

Number of site notices: At least one site notice exists - check the number.

Statutory advertisement: 18/11/2022

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Significant increase in height of previously approved extension	Please see Section 7.
Dominating, overbearing and loss of light	Please see Section 7.
Out of keeping with Conservation Area	Please see Section 7.
Obtrusive, close to the boundary	Please see Section 7.
Removal of hedging	This is not a materially planning considerations
Outside property boundary	The applicant agent confirmed the extension is within the boundary of the

Re-instate original permission	application site
	Please see Section 7.

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 and conservation area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

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

7.3 The proposed development is for retrospective permission the removal for a rear single storey extension. It would be used as a kitchen, bedroom and en-suite and would have a width of approximately 7.6 metres, 1.7 metres out further than the original side wall, a depth of approximately 5.5 metres and a flat roof with a maximum height of approximately 3.37 metres. This is approximately 0.5 metres higher than the previous planning permission reference APP/21/01149.

7.4 The extension has red brick to match the existing property and a flat roof. The Council's Conservation Officer commented on the application stating the flat roof design is not wholly in keeping with the traditional character of the main property however, it would not be highly visible from the public realm, within its context. Overall it is considered that the proposal would meet the test of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and would preserve the Conservation Area.

7.5 The extension is visible from the street scene along Prince George Street however it would be well set back and is not considered to have an adverse impact upon the character of the area. Furthermore, the proposed extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling being of appropriate size to the plot and the retained amenity space following the removal of the existing extension. Therefore, it is considered to be in keeping with the conservation area.

7.6 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

7.7 On the south side there are no side windows within the extension. The extension only extends out partly from No.27 Manor Close's rear extension therefore it is not considered to appear overbearing and due to its orientation it is not considered to cause a harmful loss of light to the neighbouring occupiers. It is worth noting the increase in the height of the extension from the previous approval is not considered to be materially harmful to warrant a refusal.

7.8 On the north side there is a side window serving the new en-suite within the extension.

This is obscurely glazed and would face out onto the 1.8 metre high fencing therefore not concerning any form of overlooking to No.25 Manor Close. Due to the existing screening along the shared boundary and only extending out slightly further than the previous extension it is not considered to appear overbearing or result in the harmful loss of light to the occupiers of No.25 Manor Close. It is worth noting the increase in the height of the extension from the previous approval is not considered to be materially harmful to warrant a refusal.

- 7.9 To the rear there is a door and windows within the extension. This would face out onto the rear garden, as a result would not cause any form of harmful overlooking.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal does not 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 extension has 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/22/01038

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Proposed Plans - 21.008.SP 03D1

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.