

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	8 Warfield Crescent, Waterlooville, PO7 7JP		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey rear extension to dwelling. Proposed single storey extension to existing outbuilding to create one bed annex accommodation.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00647	Expiry Date:	04/11/2024
Applicant:	Ms Proudfoot		
Agent:	Mr Gavin Page	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	GRP Architectural Design		
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to a detached bungalow located on the south side of Warfield Crescent. It has been recently extended (APP/21/01035) and renovated and finished in cream render with dark grey windows and doors, beneath a slate grey effect roof. There are two dropped kerbs at either side of the frontage, which is block paved providing parking for 2 to 3 vehicles. Due to the site's proximity to Waterloo school, there are double yellow lines in the vicinity of the site.
- 1.2 To the rear the extensions approved under APP/21/01035 have been implemented and there is also a detached, flat roofed outbuilding located close to the eastern boundary. The area between is paved for patio and due to the sites level includes a ramp down.
- 1.3 The site has a long rear garden, some 50m, which slopes quite steeply away. The bottom of the site's garden, and the adjacent few, is quite wooded with a cluster of several mature trees, and in particular there is a significant oak tree at the rear of the application site.
- 1.4 The surrounding area is residential in character, with a mix of styles and design - notably number 6 to the west is a chalet style bungalow, and number 10 to the east is a two storey dwelling.

2 Planning History

APP/21/00882 - Application for a certificate of lawfulness relating to existing four metre rear extension to detached bungalow., WD,28/09/2021

APP/21/01035 - Rear single storey extension with raised patio, steps and disability ramp (Retrospective Application), PERM.04/11/2021

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Proposed single storey rear extension to dwelling. Proposed single storey extension to existing outbuilding to create one bed annex accommodation.
- 3.2 As originally submitted the proposal included a new dropped kerb access, to provide a continuous dropped kerb across the site frontage, but because Warfield Crescent is

not a classified road, then extending the existing dropped kerbs at the site does not require planning permission and this element of the proposal has been omitted from the description and assessment.

3.3 During the course of determining the application, amended plans have also been received lowering the height of the outbuilding extension slightly. The extension to the outbuilding is to provide annexe accommodation for the applicant who uses a wheelchair, so the room sizes need to accommodate wheelchair access. The extension would add 13.1m to the existing 8.3m long outbuilding, with maximum depth of 6.85m. The roof is flat to match the existing, with lantern lights, but the amended plans have lowered the first 1.5m closest to the shared boundary by 280mm. Due to the slope of the site, this would result in a height to the shared boundary of between 3.1m and 3.5m.

3.4 The extension to the house itself would be 4m deep and 8m wide and flat roofed and would tie in with the existing flat roofed extension to the house.

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)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
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)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Tree Team

The Martin Dobson (MDAL) AIA is of a high quality and adequate to offer protection to the trees that are potentially affected by the development; if the AMS and TPP are strictly adhered to then there is unlikely to be any damage caused to the trees – the main concern being the Robinia and Ash.

I am happy for this to be signed off and raise no objection.

Community Infrastructure

CIL liable in respect of the self contained annex:

<http://www.havant.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy-charging-schedule>.

An application for self build annex relief has been submitted.

Southern Water

The development site is not located within Southern Water's statutory area for water supply/wastewater drainage services. Water for this development is provided by Portsmouth Water.

From the information received, we can see no evidence of the applicant using the existing wastewater connection and Surface Water scheme.

If this is the case, Southern Water will need to be informed. If the applicant is proposing to use a new connection, Southern Water will require a formal application for a connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service:

<https://developerservices.southernwater.co.uk> and please read our New

Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link:

<https://www.southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangement>

We request that should this planning application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent: Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul sewerage and surface water disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water.

Officer Comment:

The agent has confirmed that the proposed foul water will be connecting into the existing drainage and there will be no need for a new connection. The surface water is proposed to be a soakaway and both drainage would be dealt with via the building control application.

Therefore it is not considered necessary to impose a pre-commencement condition as suggested, although an Informative can be added.

Hampshire Highways

The proposal here includes changes to the access to lengthen (join) the exiting dropped kerbs which currently serve the property to provide a full width dropped kerb across the site frontage. Currently the site has two dropped kerb accesses, the Design and Access Statement refers to the widening of the access across the frontage but gives no confirmation of why the widened access is required unless this is included within the parts of the text which are excluded from viewing on the planning portal.

The standard dropped kerb is provided at a standard maximum of 5.4 metres width and wider provisions would need to be fully justified. The proposed plan seeks to link the two existing provisions, it may be acceptable to consider the narrower of the two existing dropped kerbs being widened to the standard width 5.4 metres.

The Drawing Ref 24261 PL303 Rev A includes text relating to the widening of the access 'to allow for mobility car to access the driveway'. This may provide a justification for the proposed wide dropped kerb provision. However, it would require the provision of vehicle tracking for the type of vehicle to demonstrate how that vehicle would access and egress the site making use of the proposed dropped kerb.

Having regards to the above comments the Highway Authority would recommend a **holding objection** based on the requirement for 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: 6

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>On Original Plans:</u>	
do not object to the proposed plans but am concerned about the proximity of the proposed annex to two trees. The footings will no doubt damage the root system of the trees and this in turn may present a risk to the building in the future. I would not like anything bad to happen to my neighbours property and would not like to be held liable for it if it did. I feel sure that a suitable solution, which would allay my concerns, could be found prior to the commencement of construction.	see section 7 re trees
<u>Following re-notification of amended plans:</u>	
No objection to the build at the rear, but after 12 months they should have sorted it by now. Worry that parking on verges by contractors and delivery drivers will damage verge and look a disgrace. Please warn these people its unacceptable.	Should any damage to the highway kerb result then this can be reported to HCC who could pursue remedial works.

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) Impact on trees
- (v) Access and Parking
- (vi) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (vii) CIL

(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. The proposal would result in additional habitable accommodation that is potentially capable of being occupied independently. However a statement has been submitted explaining the annexe would provide wheelchair friendly accommodation for the mother of the occupier of the main house, enabling support with everyday tasks and opportunity to undertake crafting as a hobby for health and wellbeing. It is considered a genuine case of a family providing care and living together as an extended family whilst sharing the services of the main house and garden, parking area etc.
- 7.3 Given that there is no separate vehicular access and all occupiers would need to enter via the main house or cross the private garden of the main house, then it is considered that the annexe would be occupied on a genuine ancillary basis with appropriate functional link to the main house. With an appropriate condition ensuring ancillary occupation only, then there is no objection in principle to the proposed annexe.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

- 7.4 The works proposed are all to the rear so would have no impact on the visual appearance of the street scene. The flat roofed rear extension to the dwelling would match the existing, already implemented extensions, in terms of height and design. It is however proposed to introduce some vertical timber cladding, but this is not considered inappropriate in a rear screened area, on an already relatively contemporary bungalow.
- 7.5 The annexe extension would also be flat roofed to match the existing outbuilding and include sections of vertical timber cladding which would break up the elevations and provide a degree of cohesion with the main dwelling. Whilst in footprint terms the extension is quite significant, in the context of the large garden the site can readily accommodate a building of this scale.
- 7.6 It is considered that 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

- 7.7 The rear elevation of the application site currently approximately aligns with the rear elevation of number 6 to the west, and the proposed 4m rear extension would be within 1m of the shared boundary, where there are some mature/old trees and shrubs providing screening. These are located on the neighbours side and in their control. It is considered that due to the orientation lying east of number 6, and being only flat roofed and single storey, then there would be minimal adverse impacts on the amenity of number 6 in terms of overshadowing, overbearing or enclosing effects.
- 7.8 The proposed extension to the annexe is quite significant, adding 13m in length, which would be stepped off the boundary by between 0.5m and 0.75m. There are currently mature shrubs and a post and rail fence on this shared boundary. Due to the slope of the site and need for level wheelchair access internally, the apparent height on the shared boundary would be between 3.1m and 3.5m. The scale and siting of this development could potentially lead to some overshadowing and overbearing effects,

and sense of enclosure to the occupiers of number 10.

- 7.9 However, in the context of these large garden sites, the development along the boundary would only cover about half the garden depth. The outlook from number 10 would still include the longer open aspect of the large wooded garden. There are also some existing trees in the neighbours garden close to the shared boundary and close to where the extension would end, that do provide some screening on the boundary. The submitted Arboricultural information indicates these can be accommodated. However, the neighbour has informally indicated a desire to remove these trees to avoid any future liability issues, which would in turn expose the side elevation of the development more starkly. But the removal of the trees is not essential, they could be retained in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural information, and therefore that would be the neighbours choice.
- 7.10 It is also noted that there are no objections in principle to the extensions - the third party comments received relate to trees and verges, not the actual extensions. Whilst it is accepted that on many sites the scale and height of the proposed development close to a boundary would be unacceptable, in this instance the scale of the gardens can accommodate the development without representing an overdevelopment. The length of the outbuilding would remain proportionate to the length of the garden. The mature shrubbed borders would help screen and soften the side elevation, and the outlook would remain over the long wooded garden. On balance, given these circumstances, it is considered that the annexe extension would not be overly harmful to the amenity or outlook of the neighbouring occupiers of number 10, and thus would not be contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Impact on trees

- 7.11 As noted above there are 2 trees close to the shared boundary that are constraints to the annexe extension, an ash and a robinia. The oak tree at the end of the garden is sufficiently distanced from the development to be unaffected. Because none of the trees offer public amenity value they would not be TPO'd.
- 7.12 The submitted Arboricultural information proposes the use of piled raft foundations to minimise ground disturbance and root severance to the ash and robinia. The Councils Arboricultural officer has confirmed no objection, provided the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protect Plan are conditioned.

(v) Access and Parking

- 7.13 As a result of the extension and internal reconfiguration to the bungalow, the site would have 4 bedrooms plus the bedroom in the annexe. As such 3 on site parking spaces are required to meet the adopted Parking SPD, which can be achieved on the existing frontage.
- 7.14 As noted at paragraph 3.2, the original inclusion of an extension to the dropped kerb has been omitted from the description because it does not require planning permission. Therefore the HCC highways holding objection is not considered relevant, and although their concern is noted about the justification for an extended dropped kerb, this will be a matter between the applicant & HCC during the licence application process, details of which have been shared with the agent and can be added as an Informative. Whether the kerb is extended or not does not impact the ability to park 3 cars at the site.

(vi) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.15 It is noted that this householder application, for an annexe within the curtilage of the existing dwelling, is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

(vii) CIL

- 7.16 As a detached annexe the development is CIL liable although self-build exemption has been claimed.

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/24/00647

(A) 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:

Design and Access Statement by GRP Architectural Design, August 2024
Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, and Arboricultural Method statement by Martin Dobson Associates, MDA ref U85, dated 7th September 2024

Tree Constraints Plan by Martin Dobson Associates

Tree Protection Plan by Martin Dobson Associates

Existing Site Plan & Location Plan - Drawing Number 24261 PL301 Rev B

Proposed Site and Block Plan- Drawing Number 24261 PL303 Rev C

Proposed Floor & Elevations - Drawing Number 24261 PL302 Rev A

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes ancillary 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 in a satisfactory position and has insufficient separate amenity space and on-site parking to be occupied separately from the main dwelling, 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 The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan by Martin Dobson Associates, MDA ref U85, dated 7th September 2024.
Reason: To protect the health of adjacent trees in accordance with policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.