
Site Address:	98A The Brow, Waterlooville, PO7 5DA		
Proposal:	Front two storey extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/23/00762	Expiry Date:	29/11/2023
Applicant:	Mr D Morley		
Agent:	Mr D Treagus	Case Officer:	Josephine Lacey
	Derek Treagus Associates		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

98A The Brow, Waterlooville, is a detached two storey dwelling constructed with brick. There is tilehanging to the first floor area of the front elevation, which is stepped due to two front gables adjoining the hipped roof. The front door and window above sit backward from the building line between the two gables, with a roof between the gables above the door creating a porch area. The dwelling sits around 12m back from the public domain on the bend of the road, with a grass lawn within the front garden and a hardstanding driveway. There also lies a hedge between the dwelling and the public domain on the front boundary, shielding some of the view of the property from the highway.

2 Planning History

APP/17/00551 - Single storey rear extension with velux windows and glazed balcony.,
PERM,19/07/2017

3 Proposal

Front two storey 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
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 Husky Patel

No comments received.

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No comments received.

Councillor Ryan Brent

No comments received.

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: 3

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

Comment	Officer Comment
We strongly object to the proposed application to add a two storey extension to the front of 98A The Brow.	
A Chartered Surveyor has reviewed the application on the HBC Planning site, he has said that we have grounds to object on the basis of the overbearing nature of the two storey front extension projecting beyond the main building line. We may also have grounds to object on Right of Light (RoL), although this is a civil matter, it should be assessed in planning. We have been given the contact details of a company that deals in ROL issues.	Noted, see section 7.
We have included a collage of photos, the proposed extension will be up to the edge of the outside porch area and will block light into the front of our property.	Noted, see section 7.
We strongly object to the proposed application. From the available drawings, the proposed extension will [redacted]	

The extension will significantly restrict the natural light on all three floors on the [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] The previous application, APP/17/00551 has already added to the original footprint of the house. The recent addition of a large free-standing pool structure on a deep concrete base (approximately 10 m x 3 m, which is easily viewable from [redacted] has added to the light pollution and noise. There is a marked absence of birds and other wildlife, particularly the nocturnal species, over the last year. [redacted] When the original property was demolished, and the proposal was for four properties, the residents here at the time objected so strongly that the developer was forced to reduce the dwellings to two properties. This will also be in your 2004 records (Application 03/68175/001). To develop 98A to the front will aesthetically unbalance a property that is already inherently uncharacteristic of 'The Brow'. After so much trauma and lost sleep over this planning application, we hope and trust that you will see that it is totally inappropriate.	Noted, see section 7. This is not relevant in determining this application. Noted, see section 7.
Can we please stop ruining this road with awful planning. These beautiful houses are being turned into ugly houses, in a "modern" style and it doesn't work- these plans included. Houses with no nature, houses with no character and gardens swapped for car parks! There should be some consideration for what it looks like and it is not in keeping with this beautiful street. It devalues the rest of the street.	Value of property is not a material consideration within planning.
I'm concerned about the potential	

overdevelopment of this property. This property has a relatively modest front garden for the size of the house, and there is clearly already an issue with the current outside space, as the front lawn is often used for the parking of vehicles. A further extension to the front of this property will clearly exacerbate this issue. Double yellows were recently added directly outside this property due to previous problem parking on the bend, I'm concerned this will become an issue again. This property was already generously extended to the rear a few years ago, and a large swimming pool was recently added in the rear garden. Consideration should be made for green areas, preservation of wildlife habitat and the general visual amenity for the local neighbourhood	The front extension is small in scale and unlikely to have any parking implications. Not relevant with regards to this application. Noted, see section 7.
The plans are not in keeping with the road, and ruin the aesthetics of the serene neighbourhood in which I have lived [redacted]	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 proposal is for a front extension of the western gable by 1.9m, as well as bringing the porch area forward by 1.7m with an added second storey to this central element, and the new flat porch roof extending to be in line with the western gable. This would create a stepped front elevation with the western gable extending towards the front curtilage boundary the most and the eastern gable the least as this is to remain as existing. The centre of the front of the property would be constructed in a similar style

to the gables either side, extending up to the second storey with a pitched roof at a lower height than the gables, with roof tiles proposed to match existing. The perimeter of the central element would be rendered surrounding the front door and a large window within the first floor to provide more light to the entrance and hallway. There would also be two vertical windows either side of the front door. The materials on the western front gable extension would be facebrick to match existing.

- 7.4 Comments received regarding this application state that the proposal is uncharacteristic of The Brow. The design of this proposal is not deemed to be inappropriate in context to the streetscene; originally, there was a larger section of glass proposed within the central element, but the elevations have been revised to reduce this, meaning the dwelling will not appear 'commercial' as it did initially. The proposal is now considered acceptable within this regard. It sits approximately 12m back from the public domain and is partially screened by hedgerows along the front boundary. There are a variety of types of dwelling within the area; some with large glass elements, and the design of the proposal is subservient to the dwelling and the surrounding locality. Whilst the strength of the neighbours objection is acknowledged, a number of revisions have been made to the proposed scheme throughout the course of the application, and it is considered that the final revised proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the overall character and appearance of the area. Therefore, a refusal of this application on design grounds would not be justified.
- 7.5 Concerns over overdevelopment of the site have been raised, however, given the footprint, scale and mass of the original dwelling and the size of the the plot, it is considered that the proposed development would not amount to an overdevelopment. Concerns over previous development on the site have also been raised, however, this is not considered relevant to the consideration of this application. 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 To the west of the application site is No.96 The Brow, about 3.5m from the proposal. The development is proposed to extend in line with the porch of this neighbouring property. The development may cause some loss of light to the front porch in the morning, but there is already a hedge adjacent to the porch window between the dwellings, which already blocks some light to the porch. A porch is not classed as a habitable room and any adverse impacts on residential amenity enjoyed within it would not justify a reason to refuse this application. The proposal is not deemed to be overbearing to this adjacent property, and it will not cause a loss of privacy. Therefore, the impact on this neighbouring property is limited and is considered acceptable.
- 7.7 To the northeast is No.98B The Brow, which is 9m from the proposal. This dwelling shares access with the application site and is of similar scale and design. The proposal would not be unacceptably overbearing, cause loss of light or privacy to this neighbouring dwelling due to the distance between the proposal and No.98B.
- 7.8 Opposite the proposal is the rear garden of No.89 The Brow. There is a 43m distance between the proposal and the south elevation of this dwelling. The view is obstructed between the proposal and this dwelling due to a number of trees along the boundary fence. The proposal will have little to no impact on light, outlook and privacy to this dwelling.

- 7.9 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).

(iv) Ecology

- 7.10 It is noted that the application site is within 50m of the notable and protected species Butcher's-broom at Portsmouth Golf Course Wood 2, and the priority habitat of Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland. The proposal is not likely to have a detrimental impact on the protected species or priority habitat due to its small scale.

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/23/00762 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:

14 Feb 2024	23/310/02 REV A	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS,
		LOCATION PLAN AND BLOCK PLAN
14 Feb 2024	23/310/03 REV A	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS

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.