
Site Address: 82 The Dale, Waterloooville, PO7 5DE
Proposal: Proposed extension and conversion of existing garage to create annex accommodation, along with new front boundary wall.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00340 Expiry Date: 28/06/2024
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Dixon
Agent: Mr Page Case Officer: Robert Riley
 GRP Architectural Design
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is to the south side of The Dale. It is approximately 0.5 miles east of the London Road (A3) running from Portsmouth through Widley, Purbrook and Waterloooville. The site features an outbuilding (garage) on the western side of the rear garden, and ample parking to the front of the dwelling with hedging adjacent to the pavement to the front of the driveway..
- 1.2 The housing around the site is a general mix of two storey detached dwellings and chalet style bungalows, along with a mixture of outbuildings forming garages, summer houses and annex accommodation in evidence.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant history

3 Proposal

- 3.1 There are 6 proposals to the application site:
- Proposed extension and conversion of existing garage to create annex accommodation, to feature a pitched gable roof. The annex would have a proposed maximum height of approximately 3.8 metres a proposed depth of approximately 7.8 metres and a proposed width of approximately 5.3 metres (approximate 8.2m depth by approximate 5.8m width including the roof).
 - Changes to materials of the outbuilding.
 - Changes to fenestration of the outbuilding.
 - New front boundary wall with a maximum proposed approximate height of 1.4 metres and a maximum proposed approximate piers height of approximately 1.7 metres.
 - Proposed new patio with height confirmed in email uploaded on 28/6/24 at no more than ground level.
 - New fencing with gate with height confirmed in email uploaded on 29/6/24 to be approximately 1.8 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)
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)

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 Husky Patel

No comments received

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No comments received

Councillor Ryan Brent

No comments received

Hampshire Highways

The proposal does not make any alteration to the existing highway access and with the proposed front boundary wall being set back to the alignment of the existing hedge line to the rear of the highway boundary the established visibility splays would not be compromised for pedestrians or vehicles.

No construction works shall be carried out within the Extent of Highway (verge and footway) without further approval of the Highway Authority to carry out works on the highway.

Subject to the Planning Authority, as Local Parking Authority, being satisfied that as the result of the change of use of the garage that the property retains adequate on site parking the Highway Authority would recommend - no objection.

Ecologist

This is fine. Small garage with a few rows of tiles to the front. Not likely to support 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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment

This application is to convert my neighbours' garage which is on the boundary between our two properties into new accommodation. I am not comfortable with this application on the following basis: -

1. The pitched roof will very likely affect light coming into my house and garden
2. The garage which it is proposed is converted is immediately on our boundary and converting this into a residence will significantly reduce my privacy
3. I am certain that a new residence in close proximity to the boundary between our properties will result in increased noise, as well as smells and fumes from cooking

Officer comment

Officers note that the changes to the roof of the outbuilding would increase the scale of the outbuilding, however, it is noted that this proposal would feature a pitched roof, and would feature an eaves height of only approximately 2.3 metres, in light of this officers consider the increase in scale and overshadowing to be acceptably impacted.

Regarding smells and fumes, It is noted that there would be no kitchen facilities in the proposed annex and officers, however, regarding noise, officers do note that this proposal may create more noise in the locality of the outbuilding, but that it would be likely to be at acceptable levels.

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) Use of the annex
- (v) CIL
- (vi) Parking
- (vii) Highways
- (viii) Ecology

(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 proposed works would feature 6 elements; being an extension and conversion of the garage to become an annex, and a front boundary wall, changes to external materials of the outbuilding and changes to fenestration of the outbuilding. It would furthermore feature new patio and a new fence with a gate.
- 7.4 The proposed patio and fence with a gate are considered to be limited and acceptable with regards to design and character.
- 7.5 The existing garage outbuilding to the rear of the dwellinghouse would be converted and extended, with a pitched roof, featuring a change in external materials of the outbuilding and changes to fenestration in order to create an annex. At present the existing outbuilding features a maximum height of approximately 3.1 metres and a depth of approximately 6.4 metres. The proposal was amended in order to reduce the height of the annex by the agent and is proposed to feature a pitched gable roof with a proposed maximum height of approximately 3.8 metres a proposed depth of approximately 8.2 metres and a proposed width of approximately 5.8 metres.
- 7.6 The changes to the garage to create the annex, would be readily viewable in the street scene. The proposed changes would make the outbuilding slightly more visible due to an increased scale from the pitched roof and increased height, however, given the setback behind the main dwelling and limited increase in scale this impact is considered to be limited and acceptable. The annex would be subservient and proportionate in appearance to the main dwelling and therefore officers consider the changes in scale of this outbuilding to be considered acceptable.
- 7.7 The changes to fenestration of the outbuilding is considered to be in keeping and acceptable.
- 7.8 The front boundary wall proposed to the front of the dwellinghouse was considered to be prominent with regards to the streetscene and immediate neighbours and in the superseded plans was proposed to be approximately 1.9 metres tall at the highest piers section and a maximum of approximately 1.7 metres at the infill section between the piers. The agent in response to correspondence, amended the plans in order to reduce the height of the wall. In light of this, the wall was amended to feature an approximate maximum height of 1.7 metres at the piers section and 1.43 metres at the infill section between piers. With regards to the prominence of the proposed works, it is considered that the wall would still contrast with the character of the streetscene, however, it is noted that there are other front boundary walls in vicinity to the application site in evidence, with No.63 The Dale featuring a similar sized wall to the proposal, and No.82 which features a similarly sized front wall; though featuring a wooden fence inbetween piers. Furthermore Nos 65 and 92 also feature front walls of not too dissimilar sizes to the one proposed at No.82. Furthermore, it is noted that the eastern half of the proposed boundary wall features a height at the infill section that is not dissimilar to the permitted development right of front boundary walls of one metre. In light of this, on balance, the officers consider that the wall would not be unduly prominent upon the streetscene and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Materials

- 7.9 The annex would feature render to the top section with horizontal cladding to the gable end with facing brick work at the bottom section, it would feature clay interlocking tiles in a pitched design to form the roof. These materials are considered acceptable. The front boundary wall would feature brickwork and dry cast reconstituted stone to piers which is considered acceptable.
- 7.10 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and on balance in context to the streetscene and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.11 To the western side of the application site is No.80 The Dale. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to this property. Due to the location, scale and separation distances of the works to the properties to the front and rear are considered to be acceptably impacted by this proposal. Furthermore, due to a sufficient separation distance of approximately 8.8 metres and that the proposal is single storey only, No.91 The Brow is considered to be acceptably impacted. The addition of new patio was confirmed to be at no more than ground level and is not considered to unacceptably increase overlooking, furthermore the proposed fence with a gate is considered have an acceptable impact.

No.80 The Dale

- 7.12 To the west of the application site is No.80 The Dale. With regards to the proposed works, regarding overlooking, the door was confirmed and will be conditioned to feature obscure glass and could not overlook No.80's garden and would have an acceptable impact, furthermore, the rooflights are proposed to have a sufficiently high sill level above finished floor level that they could not overlook No.80's garden, with regards to this, officers consider that this proposal would have an acceptable impact upon overlooking. A condition is recommended to be added if permission is forthcoming to ensure that no mezzanine floor is installed.
- 7.13 With regards to overshadowing and the sense of overbearing, it is noted that this proposal would feature an increased depth and height of the outbuilding. With regards to the increased depth, as this would face boundary treatment and No.80's flank wall and not face fenestration, the impacts are considered limited and acceptable upon No.80 The Dale. With regards to the proposed works, it has been considered important to assess the impacts of the proposed height increase of the outbuilding, due to a limited separation distance to No.80's rear garden and rear extension of approximately 1.5 metres. In light of this, a site visit to No.80's rear garden was undertaken in order to assess the impact upon this dwelling. It was noted that at present, the existing garage, is readily visible from No.80's rear garden, and that the proposed works to the outbuilding would not feature any significant shielding to lessen the impacts of the height increase. However, it is noted, that though there may be an increase in the sense of bulk of the proposal that the pitched roof design would mean the height increase regarding eaves height would only be approximately 2.3 metres and 3.8 metres at the ridge line. In light of this, officers consider that there would be only a modest increase in a sense of overbearing and overshadowing, that on balance the impacts of the modest increase in scale would be limited and therefore acceptable with regards to No.80.

7.14 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal on balance would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would on balance 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). It is noted one letter of objection was received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Use of the annex

7.15 The use of the proposed annex would be to provide accommodation for family use for the occupants of the main dwelling. The planning agent confirmed the family link between the occupants of the main house and the proposed annex being proposed to be used for the sole use of the mother / mother-in-law of the owners and their family relatives, which would allow support and a degree of independence for the occupants of the annex. On this basis the proposal would be considered ancillary to the main use of the site.

7.16 With regards to the proposed room uses of the annex. The annex was measured to feature an approximate 34 square metre chargeable area. Within the 34sqm useable space of the annex, there would be a living room, a bedroom, a bathroom an entrance and a cupboard. The annex would therefore still rely on the host building as there would be no laundry and kitchen facilities within the annex, therefore making room use ancillary to the main house.

7.17 Furthermore, the annex would be able to be accessed via, and located within the shared garden of the main dwellinghouse and thus is deemed to have a physical close functional link to the house. A condition regarding the use of the annex to remain ancillary to the main dwellinghouse has been recommended if permission is forthcoming.

(v) Cil

7.18 The works are CIL liable but the applicant has submitted an application for self build annex relief. The works would have CIL liability of £4,490.36 The Draft Liability Notice has been sent to the agent.

(vi) Parking

7.19 Due to the removal of the garage, and an increase of a bedroom in the proposed annex, parking was assessed during the application process. Space for 6 parking spaces were shown on the plans which would meet and exceed the Havant Parking SPD's requirements.

(vii) Highways

7.20 Due to the proposed brick front wall, Hampshire Highways was consulted during the application process. Hampshire Highways stated "*The proposal does not make any alteration to the existing highway access and with the proposed front boundary wall being set back to the alignment of the existing hedge line to the rear of the highway boundary the established visibility splays would not be compromised for pedestrians or vehicles*" They also stated " *Subject to the Planning Authority, as Local Parking Authority, being satisfied that as the result of the change of use of the garage that the property retains adequate on site parking the Highway Authority would recommend -*

no objection". Officers note that the property would retain sufficient on-site parking and are therefore satisfied that the works would have an acceptable impact regarding highway safety upon the locality.

(viii) Ecology

- 7.21 In light of works to the garage the ecologist was consulted to assess the potential risk upon bat species of the proposal. In light of this, the ecologist commented "*This is fine. Small garage with a few rows of tiles to the front. Not likely to support protected species*". In light of this, officers are satisfied with this proposal's potential impact upon bat species and upon ecology.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is on balance appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and on balance would have a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00340 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:

Drawing Number: 23251 EX100A: EXISTING SITE PLAN: Uploaded 3/5/24

Drawing Number: 23251 EX101A: EXISTING PLANS AND ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 3/5/24

Drawing Number: 23251 PL302A LOCATION AND BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 3/5/24

Drawing Number: 23251 PL300 Revision B: AMENDED FLOOR PLAN: Uploaded 13/6/24

Drawing Number: 23251 PL303 Revision A: AMENDED PROPOSED BOUNDARY WALL: Uploaded 13/6/24

Drawing Number: 23251 PL301 Revision A: AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 13/6/24

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes incidental to the occupation and enjoyment of the existing dwelling and shall not be used as a separate unit of accommodation.

Reason: The unit of accommodation is not a satisfactory position and has insufficient amenity space to be occupied separately from the main dwelling and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or 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.

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, hereby permitted the door serving the entrance on the plans hereby approved shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) at no time shall any mezzanine or first floor be inserted into the building hereby permitted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of safeguarding the neighbouring amenities and in accordance with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.