
Site Address:	30 Daisy Mead, Waterlooville, PO7 8HG		
Proposal:	Construction of a decking area with privacy screen.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/23/00772	Expiry Date:	06/11/2023
Applicant:	Mr Budden		
Agent:		Case Officer:	Josephine Lacey
Ward:	Stakes		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

30 Daisy Mead, Waterlooville is a two storey semi-detached brick dwellinghouse within the cul-de-sac of Daisy Mead. This proposal relates to the rear of the property which consists of a garden with levels lower than the property, which is the case for the neighbouring properties too. The garden of the application site consists of a grass lawn, and wooden decking area which this retrospective application relates to, which can be accessed through a set of patio doors.

2 Planning History

None recent or relevant.

3 Proposal

Construction of a decking area with privacy screen.

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
AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

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

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Councillor Diana Patrick

No formal representation.

Councillor Elizabeth (formerly Dianne) Lloyd

No formal representation.

Councillor S Milne

No formal representation.

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: 12

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
As a Havant resident of over 30 years I object strongly to the amount of time and my council tax being wasted on an inoffensive bit of decking ! The money spent on this rubbish could have been used in a much more productive way, it would probably equate to 6/7 weeks pay for a part time career. Is a bit of decking, which is not affecting anyone's life!!!	The decking is in breach of Permitted Development Rights outlined within the GPDO (2015) and was a Planning Enforcement case, leading to the requirement of this retrospective planning application. There was a need to assess the impact on the neighbouring properties and work with the applicant to mitigate any potential harm to amenities caused by the development, which required additional time.
This is retrospective planning permission, as the structure was built in May this year. [text redacted for data protection and GDPR] My understanding is that they have not met planning regulations relating to height, which are presumably in place for good reason. I have no objection to them building a decking area at an appropriate level to their garden, but I strongly object to the height of the existing structure and ask you to reject this retrospective planning application.	Noted - 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 development consists of a wooden decking area to the rear of the property, extending 3.1m from the rear elevation at a width of 4.5m. The height is 0.44m, which is in breach of permitted development rights by 0.14m, meaning that this retrospective application was required. There are steps that lead down to the patio and grass area of the garden at a width of 0.6m and a length of 1.4m. There are wooden framed black bars around the perimeter of the decking and there is a wooden fence acting as a privacy screen which extends upwards from the decking by 1.7m, as a solid screen. The materials and design are considered acceptable in context to the dwelling, and there will be no impact on the streetscene as the decking is located to the rear.

7.3 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

7.4 To the north is No.29 Daisy Mead. The proposal is adjacent to the boundary fence between the rear gardens of this neighbouring property and the application site. When the application was submitted, there was a privacy screen constructed with gaps between the battens to allow for light to reach both the application site and the neighbouring property, to a height of 1.86m above the 0.44m decking. The applicant then altered the fence so that the battens formed a solid screen without gaps to a reduced height of 1.7m from the decking. This allows for sufficient privacy screening without being overbearing or causing detrimental loss of light to either property. The solid screen extends adjacent to the full length of the decking on this boundary. The decking is also just 0.14m greater than what is acceptable as permitted development, so with the privacy screen in place to prevent overlooking, it is considered that the decking and screen will have limited and acceptable impact on this property in terms of light, privacy and outlook.

- 7.5 To the south is No.31 Daisy Mead. The boundary fence between these properties is around 2.2m from the southern edge of the decking, and is around 2m in height. The levels of the rear gardens are lower than the floor levels inside the properties, meaning that there is already some element of overlooking existing between the properties. The decking is the same level as the room that the patio doors at the rear serve. Taking these factors into consideration, it is considered that the impacts on privacy, light and outlook on this neighbouring property are considered limited and acceptable.
- 7.6 To the rear is No.2 Briony Way. There is already opportunity for overlooking from the rear of this property as the rear patio doors are at a higher level than the gardens; at 0.44m from ground level. The decking is the same height as this, and there is a privacy trellis existing on the boundary between these gardens which restricts view. Considering this, the decking is not likely to lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy to this property.
- 7.7 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy 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). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and 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/23/00772 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:

07 Dec 2023	ELEVATIONS OF PROPOSED PRIVACY SCREEN
07 Dec 2023	PRIVACY SCREEN PLANS ON PHOTO
09 Dec 2023	LOCATION PLAN
09 Oct 2023	BLOCK PLAN
09 Oct 2023	PHOTOS OF DECKING AND THE REAR OF PROPERTY BEFORE DECKING INSTALLED

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 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.