

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	17 Bracken Heath, Waterlooville, PO7 8RH		
Proposal:	Second storey side extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00676	Expiry Date:	30/10/2024
Applicant:	Mr White		
Agent:	Mr Packham	Case Officer:	Robert Riley
Ward:	Cowplain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a two storey dwellinghouse located in Waterlooville. The dwelling features brickwork for its external walls and brown concrete tiles in a pitched gable style for the roof. The application site features a rear garden and to the front of the dwelling a paved driveway.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that would be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the street featuring render and brickwork for external materials and some variations in design.

2 Planning History

APP/19/00968 - Prior notification for single storey development extending 3.9 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 2.6 metres and a maximum height of 2.83 metres., GPDC,04/11/2019
APP/19/01211 - Fell 1 No Oak subject to TPO 1150., REF,30/01/2020

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Second storey side extension.

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)
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)
-----	--

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Tree Team

The tree on site has previously been removed and as such there are no Arb constraints for this application.

Councillor Andrew Briggs

No comments received

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

No comments received

Councillor Neil Bowdell - Cowplain

No comments received

Ecologist

This is fine. Interlocking roof tiles, modern uPVC soffit/fascia. No justification or further information

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: 10

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

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) 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

Character, bulk and the streetscene

- 7.3 The works would be readily visible on the streetscene.
- 7.4 Regarding the first floor side extension it is noted that this would create a reasonable increase of mass and bulk upon the dwelling, with the first floor addition being proposed to feature an approximate 2.7 metre width, an approximate 7 metre depth and an approximate 3.4 metre height.
- 7.5 The potential for a terracing impact is considered to be important to assess due to the reduced separation that would result between Nos 17 and 16's side elevations. It is noted that there would be between approximately 1.2 metre separation distance to No.16's curtilage and approximately a 2.5 metre separation distance between Nos 17 and 16's side walls. With the Havant Borough Design Guide ordinarily preferring at least a 1 metre separation distance between dwellings, to signify different developments, this proposal can be seen to accord with this and is acceptable.
- 7.6 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD with regards to subserviency of side extensions, states "*It is important that the extension remains subservient to the main building, so it can be read which part of the building is the original and which is a later addition. Two storey side extensions should be set back behind the main building line. The ridge height of the extension can also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage. The angle of the roof should be the same as or similar to the existing roof. Flat-roofed extensions are not normally acceptable, particularly at two storey height*". It is noted that side extension together would feature a pitched roof, but however would not feature a reduced ridge line compared to the existing dwelling or be set back. In consideration of this, though it is noted it does not accord with this guidance from the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, the extension would be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and is considered acceptable in this regard.
- 7.7 Regarding the streetscene, it is noted that though dwellings are generally of similar sizes, there is some non-uniformity on the streetscene with regards to a variety of materials, and dwellings featuring front extensions, side additions and a variety of roofplanes. With regards to this, though this proposal would add further bulk to the dwelling, with regards to that it does not breach building lines and that the streetscene features variations in designs, the proposal is not seen to be an unduly prominent addition to the streetscene, and on balance is not seen to be so unacceptable with regards to design to warrant a refusal of this planning application.

Materials

- 7.8 The proposal would feature matching materials to the existing dwellinghouse which is considered acceptable
- 7.9 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 2011). It is considered on balance that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 To the southern side of the application site is No.16 Bracken Heath. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to this property. Due to shielding received from the existing dwelling, No.18 is considered to be acceptably impacted. Furthermore, the proposal would feature a sufficient distance from properties to the front and rear of the application site, to prevent unacceptable neighbourly impacts.

No.16 Bracken Heath

- 7.11 To the southern side of the application site is No.16 Bracken Heath. Regarding overlooking concerns, there would be no additional side fenestration. There would be new fenestration at the front of the extension, but it would face the public realm and is considered acceptable. There would be rear fenestration, however, it would only be able to provide oblique views of No.16's rear garden, and this is considered acceptable. Regarding overbearing and overshadowing concerns, the extension would not extend further forwards or further than the rear of No.16, there is one door at ground floor level serving a kitchen pantry, however it is partially painted, and does not appear to serve as a primary source of fenestration to the room. Regarding that the extension' would primarily impact No.16's side elevation, which features no primary windows, and would not extend past No.16's rear to impact their primary rear amenity space, officers consider that the impact of the works on No.16 would be limited in impact and therefore would not warrant the refusal of this planning application.
- 7.12 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would 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 2011). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(v) Ecology

- 7.14 Due to substantial works at the first floor level, the Council's Ecologist was consulted regarding risk to protected bat species. The Council's Ecologist stated " *This is fine. Interlocking roof tiles, modern uPVC soffit/fascia. No justification or further information*". In light of this, 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) Arboriculture

- 7.15 The Council's Arboriculturist was consulted during the application process, whereby he stated "*The tree on site has previously been removed and as such there are no Arb constraints for this application*". In light of this, this proposal is considered to accord with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is

considered acceptable in this regard.

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/24/00676

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:

BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 4/9/24
EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS: Uploaded 4/9/24
EXISTING ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 4/9/24
LOCATION PLAN: Uploaded 4/9/24
PROPOSED ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 4/9/24

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.