

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

## 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)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020  
ENP\_D1 (General Design Policy)

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

## **5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

### **Councillor Grainne Rason**

No comment received

### **Councillor Lulu Bowerman**

No comment received

### **Councillor R Kennett**

No comment received

### **County Archaeologist**

Thank you for your consultation. When the estate was built evidence of a Saxon site was noted. However in view of the small scale of the development and the likely impact of the house, I would not raise any archaeological issues in relation to the extension.

### **Emsworth Residents Forum**

No comment 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: 12

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) Parking provision and highway safety

(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

### *Materials*

7.3 The proposed works would feature red brick with vertical timber cladding to the front elevation, this is considered to give an attractive uplift to the dwelling and is considered acceptable. The materials to form the roof would match the existing dwelling and recessed solar panels would be installed on the southern side elevation, these are considered visually acceptable and furthermore, there is a permitted development fallback position for the installation of solar panels.

### *Character, bulk and the streetscene*

7.4 The proposed extensions to the dwelling would be modestly sized and would not add significant bulk to the dwelling, it is therefore considered that the works would be considered subservient to the existing dwelling.

7.5 Beacon Square is a street featuring traditional dwellings with pitched gable-designed roofs and some variation in terms of materials. The proposed works would feature a two-storey pitched roof extension, flat roof single-storey extensions, a flat roof garage and a flat roof canopy. It is acknowledged that the Council's Design Guide SPD states in paragraph 5.39 *'In general flat roofs are not acceptable. The roof of the extension should mirror that of the main building, in terms of its angle, eaves detail, materials, doors and windows. There may be exceptions to this rule, providing the results do not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties or the streetscene.'*

7.6 While flat roofs do not accord with the SPD, the proposal would feature a modern architectural design, with the traditional pitched roof being retained with this proposal. Officers are satisfied in this instance that the flat roof design of the extensions, together with the proposed materials comprising modern vertical timber cladding and dark grey aluminium window frames would provide a high quality design. The removal of the chimney would also complement the contemporary design. Furthermore, on a site visit, whilst noting that the character of the road is fairly traditional, it was noted that No.14 features modern fenestration and a timber wooden canopy readily visible on the streetscene. On balance, it is considered that the proposed modern and contemporary design would provide a cohesive uplift to the appearance of the principal elevation without making dwelling unduly prominent within the streetscene.

- 7.7 The proposed works would also affect the street's pre-existing building line. The front extension to serve the store would project forward of the existing dwelling by approximately 1.4 metres. Due to the small scale of this, it is considered an acceptable impact upon the character and streetscene of the dwelling. The front extension to serve the proposed snug would have a depth of approximately 0.9 metres and would have an acceptable impact on the street's building line.
- 7.8 The proposed two-storey rear extension would not be readily visible within the streetscene, nonetheless this is considered to be visually acceptable with an acceptable scale, bulk, mass and design.
- 7.9 The widening of the driveway would result in an increase in hard standing, however, officers are satisfied that there would be adequate soft landscaping retained to the front of the site if permission was forthcoming - furthermore, there is a permitted development fallback position for the installation of the driveway and demolition of the wall.
- 7.10 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) and Policy D1 of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan. 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

- 7.11 To the northern and southern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 10 and 14 Beacon Square. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these two properties. Due to the nature of the works, it is not considered that properties opposite the front elevation would be affected. Additionally due to large trees and significant foliage and the small scale of the works Fowley Cottage to the rear of the application site is not considered to be affected.

*No.10 Beacon Square*

- 7.12 To the Northern side of the application site is No.10 Beacon Square. The works would not increase overlooking of No.10 and would remove a window on the northern elevation.
- 7.13 The front extensions and canopy are not considered to affect No.10 due to their small modest scales and the side extension is shielded by the existing dwelling and would therefore have acceptable impacts. The rear extensions are set back beyond the main dwelling's northern elevation and in addition this would receive screening from foliage and an approximate 1.8 metre boundary fence. Furthermore the two storey rear elevation would have a sufficient separation distance of approximately 11 metres to No.10's dwelling. The ground floor rear extension would be proposed to have a minimum separation distance of approximately 7 metres from No.10's dwelling. With regards to this the effects of the works upon No.10 are considered to be limited and acceptable regarding the separation distances.

*No.14 Beacon Square*

- 7.14 To the southern side of the application site is No.14 Beacon Square. There would be a set of windows removed on the ground floor southern elevation of No.12, with a new

window installed to serve the first floor rear extension serving a bedroom. This would due to its placement on the dwelling not face out upon a neighbouring window and there would be no direct views into the garden. Whilst the window would be closer to the garden area of No. 14 there would only be oblique views and as such it is considered that there would be no adverse impact by way of loss of privacy. Furthermore, there is foliage which would provide some limited screening which would lessen impacts upon No.14. There would be no windows at ground floor level in the southern elevation of the proposed side extension

- 7.15 With regards to the scale of the works of the front extensions and front canopy, due to the proposed modest scales they are not considered to have an unacceptable impact upon No.14 in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact.
- 7.16 The single-storey flat roof rear extension wrap-around though increasing the footprint significantly would replace an existing single-storey rear extension of a smaller scale, this aspect would be single-storey and have a maximum height of approximately 2.7 metres. With regards to this and the existing boundary screening it is considered that this extension would be sufficiently shielded and would not adversely affect No.14. The first floor rear extension would be of a modest scale with a proposed width of approximately 4.6 metres and a proposed depth of approximately 2.3 metres. It would not extend beyond the rear building line of No.14 and therefore would not have unacceptable impacts in terms of overshadowing.
- 7.17 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) and Policy D1 of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan. It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Parking Provision and highway safety

- 7.18 The proposals would retain the same level of occupancy as before, however, the plans show part demolition of the wall and widening of the drive. The plans do not show a wider crossover outside of the site, however, under permitted development rights it would be possible to extend the driveway and remove part of the wall and therefore officers are satisfied that the parking provision would be acceptable.

## 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/24/00051 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:

Drawing Number: 23008/05: BLOCK AND LOCATION PLAN

Drawing Number: 23008/06: EXISTING AND PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLANS

Drawing Number: 23008/07: EXISTING AND PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLANS

Drawing Number: 23008/08: EXISTING AND PROPOSED ROOF PLANS

Drawing Number: 23008/09: EXISTING AND PROPOSED FRONT (EAST) ELEVATIONS

Drawing Number: 23008/10: EXISTING & PROPOSED REAR (WEST) ELEVATIONS

Drawing Number: 23008/11: FRONT AND REAR PERSPECTIVES, PROPOSED MATERIALS

**Reason:** - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 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.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, the windows serving the bathroom and ensuite on the first floor shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

**Reason:** In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework