
Site Address: 31 Roman Way, Havant, PO9 3PR
Proposal: Two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and erection of detached garden outbuilding to be used as home office.
Application No: APP/22/00738 Expiry Date: 21/09/2022
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Hardy
Agent: Mr Andrews Case Officer: Denise Sheath
 SDA Planning and Architecture
Ward: Bedhampton
Site Visit Date: 20/09/2022

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

31 Roman Way, Havant, is a two storey semi detached property constructed with red/brown brick, with brown clay hung tiles to the first floor front elevation. The property benefits front a pitched roof porch to the front of the property with a single storey extension to the rear and a detached flat roof garage to the rear eastern side elevation of the property. The frontage of the property has a hardsurfaced area leading to the porch and along the eastern side elevation to the detached garage, with the front western section of the front laid to lawn. There is a small brick wall to part of the front boundary. The rear of the property has a block paved patio area adjacent the rear elevation, with a laid to lawn rear garden area. The boundary treatment to the rear and rear side elevations consists of 1.8m close boarded wooden fencing.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and erection of detached garden outbuilding to be used as home office.

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

Not Required

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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Summary of Objections:

- Concerns regarding the proposed Two storey extension and the outbuilding being built up to the boundary for access and maintenance purposes
Officer Comments: See section 7 of the report.
- Concerns regarding encroachment from gutting and opening of windows
Officer Comment: The agent has confirmed no guttering would encroach onto the neighbouring property and the window would be non-opening and would therefore not encroach over the boundary line.
- Loss of privacy from the additional window facing neighbouring property
Officers Comment: See section 7 of the report.
- Loss of afternoon and evening light due to the projection of the two storey element projecting further into the rear garden
Officers Comment: See section 7 of the report.
- These properties were designed to have shared driveways and there was an agreement that neighbours could access their vehicles by using each other's driveways, this was mentioned in the deeds.
Officer Comment: This is a civil issue between the parties involved
- Not possible to utilise the existing driveway for 3No. vehicles following the erection of Two storey extension causing on road parking to Roman Way which is already congested during the evening period.
Officers Comment: A parking plan has been provided to show the availability for the parking of 3No. vehicles.
- Concerns regarding property damage to neighbouring property due to the closeness of the extension.
Officers Comment: This is a civil issue between the parties involved.
- The planned 2 storey and single storey extension and garden room is an over development.
Officers Comment: See section 7 of the report.
- Devaluation of property
Officers Comment: Devaluation of property not a planning consideration.
- Don't want at any stage the fence removed on the boundary as I don't want my dogs to escape and be harmed.
Officers Comment: This is a civil issue between the parties involved.
- Concerns regarding noise from the construction of the development and works being carried out during evenings and weekends
Officers Comments: If there are any noise disturbances during construction period advice should be sought from the Environmental Health Department.

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) Parking

- (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 property at present has a single storey rear conservatory and a detached garage. The garage is located to the rear eastern side elevation of the property. These two elements are proposed to be demolished prior to the erection of the proposals listed below.

Two Storey Side/Rear Extension:

7.4 This element of the proposal relates to a proposed two storey side extension which will wrap around partially the rear elevation. The proposed extension will be set back 7.6m from the front elevation of the porch and 6.6m from the two storey front elevation. The proposal would have a width of 2m bringing the extension up to the eastern boundary line, with a 4.9m depth wrapping around the rear elevation with a 6.1m width attaching to the original rear wall with a 4m depth. The two storey element would have a hipped roof design with an eaves height of 5.7m, a maximum height of 6.9m, with the ridge line of the roof of the extension 1m lower than the ridge of the main dwellinghouse. Due to the siting of the 2 storey element, set back within the site, it would not have a material impact on the street scene.

Single Storey Rear Extensions:

7.5 A single storey flat roof rear extension is proposed to be attached to the south east rear elevation of the proposed two storey extension. This extension would have a depth of 3.4m from the rear elevation of the extension a width of 2.3m with a maximum height of 3.2m. The proposed extension would replace the existing single storey detached garage along this elevation. Although the proposed extension would be up to and adjacent the eastern side boundary it would be adjacent to the existing detached garage within the boundary of No.29 and would not have a greater height or depth than the existing garage to be demolished. As such, it is considered that there would be no adverse effect on the character of the area as a result of this single storey element.

7.6 There is also a single storey flat rear extension proposed to the south western rear elevation. This extension would have a depth of 3.8m and a width of 2.9m attaching to the rear wall of the rear two storey element, the maximum height of this extension would be 3.2m. This proposed single storey element would be up to the shared boundary with No.33 who benefits from a single storey flat roof extension. This element of the proposal would not be visible from the public realm due to its location at the rear of the property. It is therefore not considered that this element of the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the host dwelling or the character of the streetscene.

7.7 The proposed materials of the two storey and single storey extensions would be similar in appearance to the materials on the main dwellinghouse and would therefore not have a harmful impact upon the visual amenities of the main dwellinghouse.

Erection of an Outbuilding:

- 7.8 The final element of the proposal is for the erection of a detached outbuilding along the rear eastern boundary. The proposed use of the outbuilding is a home office and would have the following dimensions, a width of 8m, a depth of 3.4m with a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.4m. The materials to be used in the construction include timber cladding to all the elevations. Due to the location of the proposed outbuilding, to the rear of the site, it would not be readily visible from the public realm.
- 7.9 The design, appearance and siting of the development is deemed appropriate in context of the street scene, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is considered that these elements of the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 Policy CS16 promotes and recognises the value of high quality design, an aim positively promoted by the National Planning Policy Framework and Havant's Design Guide SPD, which applies to all new development. Policy CS16 also requires that:

"The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking."

- 7.11 Havant's Borough Design Guide states that " It is important that applications for new development consider the impact of the development on existing residents."
- 7.12 The two storey element would be partially visible to the neighbouring properties to the front (Nos. 44 & 46 Roman Way) of the application site. There will be an approximate 30m distance from the front facing elevation of the extension to the front facing elevations of these neighbouring properties. It is therefore considered the impact upon these neighbouring properties would be minimal and acceptable.
- 7.13 The proposed two storey extension and single storey infill extension would have a distance of approximately 17.8m from the rear boundary and a minimum distance of approximately 33.4m from the rear facing elevations of the neighbouring properties to the rear (Nos. 22 & 24 Queens Anne Drive). The single storey attachment to the rear elevation of the two storey element would have an approximate minimum 31.4m distance from their rear facing elevations. It is therefore considered that the proposals would have a minimal and acceptable impact upon these neighbouring properties.
- 7.14 The proposed two storey element of the extension would have a 3m distance to the boundary to the neighbouring property to the west (No.33 Roman Way). There would be no windows within the first floor side facing elevation of this extension. The single storey element which is along the shared boundary will have an approximate 1m greater depth than the single rear storey extension with No.33. The single storey flat roof extension along the eastern boundary would have a 6.4m distance to the shared boundary with No.33 and would be partially screened by the boundary treatment along this boundary consisting of 1.8m close boarded wooden fencing. It is not considered these elements of the proposal would have a harmful or negative impact upon this neighbouring property with any impact considered acceptable.
- 7.15 The proposed two storey element of the extension would be along the shared boundary with the neighbouring property to the east (No.29 Roman Way). The proposed two storey extension would have a 4.9m depth and be erected up to the shared boundary, with an eaves height of 5.5m and a maximum height of 6.9m. Due to its height, mass and bulk, it would result in an excessive overbearing bulk adjacent to the neighbouring property to the east (No. 29), to the detriment of the amenities and

outlook of the occupiers of this property.

As stated above, adopted and national policy promote quality design, which seeks to resist development which would adversely impact on neighbouring properties.

Paragraph 5.38 of the Havant Borough Design Guide states:

It is important that gaps are retained between buildings. This helps form the pattern of development in an area, which in turn influences local character. Therefore, side extensions which have a negative effect on the gap between buildings should be resisted. This is particularly important for two storey extensions, which can also cause adverse effects on neighbouring properties, such as overshadowing. In general, the extension should not be closer than two metres from the boundary with neighbouring properties. (The two storey element would site on the boundary).

- 7.16 During the assessment process an alternative solution was presented to the Agent suggesting the reduction of the side/rear extension from a two storey extension to a single storey extension. This alternative alteration is considered to be more suitable and would help alleviate the impact of the proposal upon the adjacent neighbouring property. That said, any alternative design would need to be assessed fully with amended plans. The agent declined to amend the current application and asked to continue with the application as submitted, which is determined on that basis
- 7.17 Information has been provided by the agent showing other examples of two storey side extensions within the area (the nearest examples being within Parkside which is located to the west of Roman Way). The other properties presented (Nos 4, 28 and 38 Parkside) are materially different to the current proposal in that the two-storey extensions are located only to the side elevation and do not project pass their rear walls and do not wrap around their rear elevations. Therefore, this proposal has been assessed on its individual merit, having full regard to CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 7.18 The proposed two storey side/rear extension would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbouring property to the east, contrary Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) Havant's Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 7.19 The single storey element attached to the rear of the two storey element would not have a greater impact to the neighbouring property to the east (No.29) than what is existing from the existing detached garage which is to be demolished. It is therefore considered that this element of the proposal would have a minimal and acceptable impact.
- 7.20 The proposed outbuilding adjacent to the rear south eastern boundary would have a significant distance to the facing elevations of the adjoining neighbouring properties, and would be partially screened by the boundary treatment of 1.8m close boarded wooden fencing. It is considered that this element of the proposal would have a minimal and acceptable impact on the adjacent neighbouring properties.
- 7.21 Consequently, whilst the single storey elements are considered acceptable, the two storey extension by reason of its height, bulk and siting would be overbearing and would adversely impact on the amenities of the adjacent neighbouring property to the east contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy), Havant's Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework.

(iv) Parking

- 7.22 The proposed extension would create an additional bedroom taking the property from a 3 bedroom property to a 4 bedroom property. In order to comply with the Borough's Parking SPD, three parking spaces are required to be provided onsite. The proposal Block Plan has shown there is sufficient space to the front and eastern side of the property for the parking of 3no. vehicles. Therefore, the works are considered to be acceptable and accord with Havant's Car Parking SPD.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Whilst the single storey elements are considered to be acceptable, the proximity of the proposed two storey extension to the eastern side boundary would result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring property to the east No. 29 Roman Way and would be significantly harmful to their amenity. The proposal is therefore, contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant's Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00738 for the following reasons

1. The proposed development would by reason of its positioning on the site boundary together with its height, mass and bulk would result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk which would adversely impact on the neighbouring property to the east No. 29 Roman Way. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant's Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.