
Site Address:	162 Park Avenue, Waterlooville, PO7 5HF		
Proposal:	Single story rear extension - Retrospective Planning Permission		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00153	Expiry Date:	22/04/2024
Applicant:	Mr Saunders		
Agent:	Mr Davey	Case Officer:	Joseph Toole
	Principal Design Ltd Ltd		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

162 Park Avenue, Waterlooville, is a semi detached bungalow located to the east side of Park Avenue. The property comprises of brickwork and pebble dash render with concrete roof tiles. Vehicular access is from Park Avenue with parking to the front.

The property is located within a residential area with surrounding properties being a mixture of one and two stories.

2 Planning History

APP/24/00066 - Application for Lawful Development Certificate relating to existing rear extension., WD,19/02/2024

3 Proposal

The proposal is for a retrospective single story rear extension. It has been attached to the existing flat roof rear extension along the southern boundary adjacent No.160 Park Avenue, with a width of approximately 2 metres, a depth of approximately 5 metres and a flat roof with a height of approximately 2.9 metres.

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

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Husky Patel

No Comment.

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No Comment.

Councillor Ryan Brent

No Comment.

Building Control Team

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2 objections 1 support

Comment	Officer Comment
Unattractive/ eyesore	Please see Section 7.
Blocks the daylight	Please see Section 7.
Noise issues	This is not a material planning consideration. There is Environmental Health Legislation which deals with noise issues.
My property was damaged and never put right	This is a private matter between the parties involved.
Impact on wildlife	Noted
Loss of privacy	Please see Section 7.
Building exterior unfinished	Please see Section 7.
Foundations encroaching	The extension is considered to be within the application site's boundary.
Devaluing my property	This is not a material planning consideration.
Main concern is the removal of the	Noted

hedge - not relevant	
The application is in line with other similar extensions in the immediate area	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
- (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 extension has currently been left unfinished with facing blockwork on the outer walls. It is the applicant's intention to apply a rendered finish and decorate the extension.

7.4 Due to the proposed development being located to the rear of the property it is considered to have a limited impact upon the street scene. Furthermore, the proposed extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling being of appropriate size to the plot and the retained amenity space. Therefore, it is considered to be inkeeping with the character of the area.

7.5 The design and appearance of the extension 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) in this respect. 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

7.6 Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy states all development should demonstrate that the development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

7.7 On the north side facing No.164 Park Avenue the extension is blocked by the existing extension therefore not considered to have any impact on this side.

7.8 On the south side facing No.160 Park Avenue the extension extends out directly along the shared boundary between the two properties. Due to concerns with regards to the loss of light to the rear bedroom window of No.160 Park Avenue a 45 degree test plan was requested in line with the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD standards. The applicant's agent provided this, which demonstrated whilst it failed on the floor plan, the elevations show the extension does not hit the centre point of the rear bedroom window. Therefore, based on this information it is not considered to cause a harmful loss of light on this window. However, due to the depth of the extension extending out

approximately 5 metres from the rear wall and being right up against the boundary it is dominant/overbearing and results in a harmful loss of outlook to the occupiers of No.160 from their bedroom window and their outdoor living environment. Therefore, the extension has an adverse impact on No.160 which is deemed to be unacceptable. It is also worth noting the existing hedging of 2.5 metres shown on the floor plans has since been removed.

- 7.9 To the rear there is no rear window or door within the extension therefore not considered to have an adverse impact.
- 7.10 Consequently, the extension is dominant and overbearing and results in the harmful loss of outlook to the occupiers of No.160 Park Avenue and an adverse impact on their outdoor living environment contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy), the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and the NPPF.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Overall, the extension has a dominant and overbearing impact upon the rear bedroom window at No.160 Park Avenue (nearest to the extension) and their outdoor living environment, therefore it is recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00153 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The extension has a dominant and overbearing impact and causes unacceptable harm to the outlook from the rear bedroom window at No.160 Park Avenue (nearest to the extension) and their outdoor living environment, contrary to Policy 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.