
Site Address:	25 Alameda Way, Waterlooville, PO7 5HA		
Proposal:	Two storey side extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/23/01060	Expiry Date:	01/02/2024
Applicant:	Mr L Ong		
Agent:	Mr M Tuson	Case Officer:	Robert Riley
	MT Planning		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Alameda Way in Purbrook. The application site features a paved driveway fronting onto Alameda Way and a front and rear garden. The properties materials feature brown concrete tiles constructed in a pitched gable roof design and blue tilework and beige brickwork to form the external walls.

The application site, is in an area that is both urban and residential, with the character of the road featuring two storey semi detached dwellinghouses with brickwork and tile designs.

2 Planning History

No relevant planning history.

3 Proposal

- Erection of a two storey side extension on the eastern elevation and with a width of approximately 3.7 metres, a depth of approximately 8 metres and a maximum height of approximately 8 metres.

Officer note:

- The proposed plans also show the alteration to the materials on the front elevation and replacement of garage door with a window. The garage door has already been infilled with blockwork, this could be done under permitted development.

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)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Husky Patel

No comment received

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No comment received

Councillor Ryan Brent

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: 11

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

- (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 submitted application form states that materials would match the materials on the existing dwellinghouse which is and are considered to be acceptable. However, the submitted elevation plans show that the tile hanging would be removed from the front elevation and it is not clear what material would be used to replace this. Nonetheless, if officers were minded to approve the application materials could be agreed by condition.

Scale, bulk and mass and impact on the character of the area and streetscene

- 7.4 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states that two-storey side extensions should be set back behind the main building line. It also states that the ridge height of the extension can also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage.
- 7.5 The separation between the dwelling and the highway would be significantly reduced, with the works proposing to reduce the separation distance from the highway itself to approximately 0.5 metres. This would create a contrived and cramped appearance due to the proposed height and dominance and would damage the existing harmony of the streetscene.
- 7.6 The ridge height of the extension would be below the height of the main ridge by approximately 0.2 metres which is considered acceptable. The proposed works would be set back from the main building line in regards to its front elevation onto Alameda Way by approximately 0.5 metres. When viewed from the north the proposed extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
- 7.7 However on its eastern elevation, the proposed extension, would not respect the established building line along the streetscene and would project beyond the front elevation of number 23 by approximately 2.5 metres. This on the site visit was noted that it would significantly alter the streetscene and would appear unduly prominent in regards to nearby dwellings.
- 7.8 The proposed works to the dwelling are proposed on a corner location, this would make the works more visually prominent, due to the lack of shielding otherwise received from other dwellings. Furthermore, the flank eastern elevation would have no detailing removing an existing window and would appear stark and overbearing when viewed from the adjacent footpath in close proximity.
- 7.9 The scale, bulk and mass of the design and appearance of the proposal together with its design and appearance would result in harm to the streetscene, and therefore the works are considered to be unacceptable, not meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is considered that the scheme would result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality. This would result from a cramped feel of the road which would make the road feel less open and more enclosed.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 To the Western, Eastern, northern and southern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 27,52,44 and 23. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these properties.

No.27 Alameda Way

- 7.11 The proposed works would be fully shielded to No.27 due to the existing dwellinghouse, and therefore the impact upon No.27 is considered acceptable.

No.52 Alameda Way

- 7.12 The proposed works would not bring the dwelling to be closer to No.52, it would install windows on the ground and first floor, the ground floor windows would overlook front windows and the public realm and so are considered an acceptable impact upon No.52. The proposed first floor window would have a separation distance from No.52's of approximately 18.4 metres this is considered to be a sufficient separation distance between the dwellings. In regards to this the impacts upon No.52 are considered to be acceptable.

No.44 Alameda Way

- 7.13 The proposed works would remove a window that faces No.44 which would not be replaced. There would be a reduced separation distance of approximately 16.2 metres between the 2 dwellings, this is considered to be sufficient separation distance in regards to overshadowing concerns and is not considered to increase overlooking of this dwelling, therefore the works are considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.44.

No.23 Alameda Way

- 7.14 The proposed works would not reduce the separation distance between Nos 25 and 23. it would increase the sense of scale upon No.23, but due to the separation distance this is considered acceptable as it would not create overshadowing and loss of light. The rear elevation would have a window installed on the first floor to serve a bedroom, this would face the front garden of No.23 and is not considered to increase overlooking, as it would not face any windows on the first floor of No.23

- 7.15 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). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv.) Parking Provision

- 7.16 The proposal seeks the conversion of the existing integral garage and therefore would result in the loss of one parking space. However, it is noted that such a conversion could be carried out under permitted development, without the need for planning permission. Furthermore, the proposed extension would not result in an increase in bedroom numbers and such there would be no increase in demand for parking provision. Therefore on balance it is considered there would be no material harm in terms of parking provision.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The proposal by virtue of its scale, bulk and mass and location forward of the established building line on the eastern elevation and the prominent corner location of the application site would result in an unsympathetic development. It would be out of character with the established pattern of development within the nearby area and that would be detrimental to the visual amenity and streetscene character. The flank elevation would be unduly prominent and would have stark appearance and overbearing impact when viewed from the adjacent footpath. On this basis it is recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/23/01060

For the following reasons

- 1 The proposed side extension by virtue of its scale, bulk and mass with its location forward of the established building line on the eastern elevation and the prominent corner location of the application site would result in an unsympathetic development. It would be out of character with the established pattern of development within the nearby area and that would be detrimental to the visual amenity and streetscene character. The flank elevation would be unduly prominent and would have stark appearance and overbearing impact when viewed from the adjacent footpath. The proposal therefore is contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and Havant Borough Design Guide SPD which collectively require development to respect local context and create a positive relationship between buildings.