
Site Address:	1 The Brow, Waterlooville, PO7 5BX		
Proposal:	Single storey rear and side extensions.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00325	Expiry Date:	24/06/2024
Applicant:	Ms D Cobb		
Agent:	Mr J Ralph	Case Officer:	Denise Sheath
	JM Ralph Associates		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

1 The Brow, Waterlooville, is a two storey semi-detached property constructed with red/brown brick, with a pebble dash render to the front first floor elevation, the roof design is a hipped style roof design with a tiled roof and a pebble dash chimney to the front roof slope. A block paved patio area is located directly adjacent the rear elevation leading to and adjacent the timber framed shed which is located within the rear north western section of the rear garden, the rest of the rear garden is a laid to lawn garden area. The frontage of the property has a concrete hardsurface with some shrubbery to the front eastern side, the front western and side area is used for the parking of vehicles.

2 Planning History

APP/24/00258 - Prior notification for single storey development extending 4 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 2.97 metres and a maximum height of 3.45 metres. WD - 18/04/2024

3 Proposal

Single storey rear and side extensions.

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 Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

I wish to object to the above proposed plans.

It is over development of the site.

The property will be over the foundations of 10 London Road Widley.

There has been removal of a boundary hedge, there is a covenant in place to protect the boundary hedge.

The proposed development would not be in keeping with the area, and also the core strategy of the local plan

R28

R111

R132

R133

R135

R136

R137

Officer Comment:

The Chairman of the Planning Committee and the Head of Service have determined that the application did not give rise to issues that should be escalated to the planning committee.

Councillor Diamond has been updated with regard to this decision.

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: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
I feel the proposed development is over development of the site and not in keeping with the area.	See section 7.
I am generally supportive of improvement and development to property but in respect of this planning application I must object for the following reasons;	

1 The proposed development almost doubles the footprint of the original dwelling. A more modest development in line with what would be allowed under permitted development and/or under the Havant Borough Design Guide (which is a supplementary planning document) would be more appropriate.	Each application is assessed on its own merits.
2. A large area of flat roof is proposed, again not seen as acceptable in the Havant Design Guide (5.39). A more sensitive approach using a combination of pitched roofs would be more satisfactory and more in keeping with the approach adopted by neighbouring properties.	Each application is assessed on its own merits and the Design Guide SPD acknowledges that there may be exceptions providing the results do not have an adverse affect on neighbouring properties or the streetscene.
3. The garage proposed is on the narrow side for modern cars. It is around 2.5 metres in width, whereas the Havant Borough Council Parking Supplementary Planning Document item 4.09, requires a minimum of 3 metres and is unlikely therefore to be regularly used for them. Being built on the boundary of the property, it changes the street scene dramatically and is contrary to the Havant Borough Design Guide (5.4).	See Section 7. In terms of the width of the garage, whilst this is less wide than the 3m width recommended it is very similar in width to the existing side area to No.1. there are no new bedrooms proposed and no increase in the existing parking requirements.
4. A more modest development and a reduction in flat roof would also obviate the need for the lantern style roof light, which are often an annoyance to immediate neighbours because of light pollution, particularly affecting first floor windows. Lantern lights rarely have blinds or curtains.	See Section 7.
5 It would appear that the mature 3 metre hedge to the west of the property was removed and no replacement boundary fencing provided in order to facilitate the erection of the extension on the boundary. A more sensitive approach would be to replace the boundary fence or preferably hedge, given what is proposed, and building the development at least 1 metre inside the boundary, in accordance with the Havant Borough Design Guide.	Each application is assessed on its own merits. A replacement boundary treatment would be a civil issue between the parties involved. It is noted that other properties in the vicinity have extended to the common boundary for example at No's 5 and 4.

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 proposal is for a single storey flat roofed wrap around style extension. The proposed extension would be set back from the front principle elevation by approximately 1.4m with a width of approximately 2.7m and a depth of approximately 6.55m this element of the extension would be used as garage area. The extension would then reduce in width by 0.4m to the western elevation before extending a further 4.7m toward the rear wrapping around the whole rear elevation spanning a width of 8.1m attaching the rear eastern elevation at a depth of 4m. The extension would have a maximum height of 2.8m, a roof light is proposed within the rear eastern element which would have a maximum height of 3.3m from the ground level. The materials to be used in the construction would include face brickwork similar in appearance to the host dwellinghouse.

7.4 The only element of the extension which would be visible from the public realm would be the front elevation of the extension. It is noted that the adjacent neighbouring property No.8 London Road benefits from a single storey flat roof garage along the shared western boundary with the application site. This neighbouring garage has access to and from and faces onto the same section of streetscene of The Brow as the application site. It is therefore not considered that the proposed extension would have a harmful impact upon the character of the streetscene which is diverse in style and design. Whilst the proposal incorporates a flat roof design, this is located mainly to the rear and the side element is set back and remains subservient in appearance to the main dwelling.

7.5 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

7.6 The proposed extension would be a significant distance from the neighbouring property to the rear and front and therefore any impact from the proposal would be considered negligible.

- 7.7 The adjoining neighbouring property No.3 The Brow benefits from a single storey rear conservatory. The proposed extension would protrude a further 1.8m than the neighbouring conservatory extension. It is not considered that the proposed extension would have a harmful impact with regard to loss of outlook nor would the extension have an overbearing impact upon this neighbouring property. The proposed extension may have an impact with regard to loss of light to the side facing windows which sit above the 1.8m boundary fence level during the evening, this impact it not considered to be so significant to warrant a refusal of the application. It is therefore considered the impact upon this neighbouring property would be limited and acceptable.
- 7.8 The proposed western side elevation of the proposed extension would have a 200mm distance between the side wall of the extension and the shared boundary with No.10 London Road with a distance in excess of 20m to the rear facing elevation of No.10. No.10 has a slightly higher ground level and would be mainly screened by the outbuildings adjacent the shared boundary as well as the boundary treatment of 1.8m fencing. It is not considered that the proposed extension would have a harmful impact with regard to loss of light, outlook nor would the extension have an overbearing impact upon this neighbouring property. It is therefore considered the impact upon this neighbouring property would be minimal and acceptable.
- 7.9 The proposed front western side elevation of the proposed extension would be constructed up to the shared boundary with No.8 London Road with a distance in excess of 20m to the rear facing elevation of No.8. No.8 has a slightly higher ground level and would be screened by mainly by the single storey garage within their curtilage which is built up to the shared boundary line. It is not considered that the proposed extension would have a harmful impact with regard to loss of light, outlook nor would the extension have an overbearing impact upon this neighbouring property. It is therefore considered the impact upon this neighbouring property would be minimal and acceptable.
- 7.10 A concern was raised with regard to the impact of the installation of a roof light within the centre of the rear extension element. The proposed rooflight is not considered to have a harmful impact upon the first floor windows of the nearest neighbouring property of No.3 The Brow. It is noted no objection have been received form the adjoining neighbouring property.
- 7.11 A concern was raised with regard to the proposal being an over development of the site. The proposed extension could easily be accommodated within overall coverage of the site, retaining an adequate 11m depth of rear garden amenity area. It s therefore considered the proposal would not result in an overdevelopment of the site.
- 7.12 The agent has confirmed that the proposed extension would be wholly within the application site curtilage with no encroachment upon neighbouring properties.
- 7.13 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).

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/24/00325 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:

Application Form - Received 30 April 2024
Location Plan, Existing Block Plan, and Floor plans and Elevations - Drawing No.23/064/001 P2 - Received 30 April 2024
Proposed Block Plan, Floor plans and Elevations - Drawing No.23/064/002 REV P11 - Received 12 June 2024

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.