

3 Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a number of alterations and extensions. Planning conditions attached to the original planning permission for the building limit the scope of development that can be carried out as permitted development at the site which is material to the determination of this application.

Single storey rear extension - A single-storey rear extension is proposed to the southern half of the rear elevation. This would measure approximately 6.1 metres wide, 4 metres deep and would be topped with a flat roof with an eaves height of approximately 2.8 metres. This would be constructed in matching brickwork with windows/doors to each elevation and a roof lantern within the flat roof.

Hip-to-gable - To the rear, a hip-to-gable build-up is proposed replacing the existing large dormer window. The extension would be constructed in matching materials and maintain the existing roof pitch to the north and south facing roof slopes. A barn hip would be incorporated to the north facing elevation replicating an existing feature of the dormer roof.

Dormer extension - A small pitched roof dormer is proposed to the south facing elevation to serve a bathroom following internal changes to the layout. This would be designed to replicate a similar feature to the west facing roof slope and would be constructed in matching materials.

Front extension - To the front of the dwelling the existing double garage would be altered and extended to join the main dwellinghouse. The southern section of the existing garage would be retained on its existing footprint, with the northern section extended 0.9m further forwards and 0.8m further to the rear, maintaining a 1m gap to the boundary with no.12 Lovedean Lane. The enlarged section of the resultant building would be topped with a pitched roof matching the pitch and eaves level of the main dwelling, and incorporate a flat cap to keep the overall height below a dormer extension on the main building. The extension would be constructed in matching materials. Internally the enlarged building would form a residential annexe with an internal link back to the existing dwelling.

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)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

Having read the submitted arboricultural report I am satisfied that the impact of the proposals on retained trees is acceptable provided the specified protection measures and construction methods are used. On that basis, if you are minded to permit this application it would be recommended that a suitably worded condition is imposed requiring the submitted method statement to be strictly adhered to.

Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design

Not CIL liable as the annex is inter-connected with the existing dwelling. The extension is less than 100 sqm and, therefore, not CIL liable.

Councillor David Jenner

No comments received.

Councillor E Shimbart - Hart Plain

No comments received.

Councillor P Bains - Hart Plain Ward

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
When this property was originally built it was nothing more than a garden grab and over development of an existing property, making it very unpopular with the surrounding neighborhood. If this application is approved the site will have been converted from a single home, to a 2 property site and ending up with 2.5 properties. If this proposed extension was submitted along with the original plans for the site, would it have been given planning permission? I doubt it. Or was this the intention all along? Build the initial property then add to it at a later stage! If a granny annex at the front of the property was the sole intention of the application, why is there a need for a 4m extension intruding into the back garden? If granted, it will also mean more inconvenience to the surrounding neighborhood again, with noise and noxious bonfires at all hours of the day, as happened during construction of the current property.	These concerns are noted and addressed within Section 7 below.

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) Other matters

- (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.

In terms of the use, it is indicated that the proposed annexe would be occupied by the applicant and his wife who currently reside within the existing dwelling. This would allow their daughter and her family to move into the main dwelling and offer opportunities for co-operative living and potential support if and when required as they age. A link is maintained internally to allow access between the main house and the annexe and the main garden and parking area/access would be shared.

The planning statement sets out the following: "Whilst the proposed annexe would benefit from its own entrance and contain all the facilities necessary for independent living without entering the main dwelling, the connection through the snug provides connection between the dwelling and the Annexe to ensure it remains ancillary. The annexe will remain incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse and be occupied by family member/s on an ancillary basis only and a second planning unit will not be created. There would be no sub-division of the garden, or residential curtilage and the applicant would be happy to accept a suitably worded condition or enter a legal agreement to control the use of the annex".

As laid out the proposed annexe could be occupied without any need to pass through or enter the main dwelling. However, this is not what the applicant is intending and is not what is proposed by this application. Having regard to the family link between the future occupiers, the shared use of facilities, and the internal link between the properties, it is considered that the use of the annexe could be regarded as ancillary to the main dwelling and no sub-division of the plot or separate planning unit would occur. However, it is considered necessary and reasonable to impose a planning condition requiring the annexe to be occupied on an ancillary basis only, to avoid any future independent occupation.

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

7.3 Taking each element of the proposal in turn and in combination:

Single storey rear extension – The proposed rear extension would be modest in scale and would relate appropriately limiting its height with the eaves of the recipient dwelling. With the use of matching materials, it is considered that this feature would appear as a subservient addition and would not detract from the character of the existing dwelling or its garden.

Hip-to-gable – The existing dwelling incorporates a large pitched roof dormer to the rear roof slope which does appear slightly top heavy and dominant. Whilst the hip-to-gable build up would result in greater bulk at roof level, it is not considered that this would be harmful to the overall character of the building, particularly when viewed from the north and south.

Dormer extension – This dormer is modest in scale, set up from the eaves, down from the ridge and aligned with a similar feature on the western roof slope. With the use of matching materials and the incorporation of a hipped roof to match the pitch of the main roof, it is considered that the dormer would appear subservient and relate appropriately with the design and character of the existing building.

Front extension – The front extension would add significant bulk towards the front of the dwelling and would wrap around the driveway and parking area. However, following pre-application discussions, the proposed annexe has been designed to appear as an extension to the dwelling rather than an outbuilding that has been extended to meet the dwelling. Whilst the incorporation of a large flat cap to the roof is not typically a good design solution and can be an indication of excessive scale, having regard to the changes in levels, it is considered that the building has been designed to minimise its overall bulk and relate more sympathetically with the host dwelling.

The pitched roof would match the eaves height and pitch of the main dwelling assisting with its integration. Overall, it is considered that the combined scale and bulk is acceptable and the extension would relate appropriately to the host building wrapping around what would become a front courtyard area.

In isolation and in combination, the design and appearance of the proposed additions and alterations are considered to be acceptable in design terms relating appropriately to the recipient dwelling and the character of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore, meet the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy).

7.4 (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

Single storey rear extension – The extension would be located between 1.5-2m from the southern boundary. Having regard to its modest height, the existing boundary treatments, modest separation distance and position to the north, it is not considered that this feature would result in any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties to the south (No.106). There is sufficient separation distance to prevent any significant adverse impacts on the amenities of occupiers to the north and east.

Hip-to-gable – This extension would add additional bulk at roof level which would be perceptible to neighbouring occupiers. However, given the existing presence of the rear dormer, the orientation of the site to the north of no.106, the relative alignment of the property with no.112 and distance from neighbouring properties to the east (34m), it is not considered that this element of the proposal would result in any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties to the north, south or east in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact. Having regard to the presence of the existing dormer, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any additional overlooking or loss of privacy.

Dormer extension – This feature would be visible to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties to the south, but as a result of its limited scale would not result in any significant amenity concerns in terms of overbearing impact. The window would offer direct and short distance views into neighbouring gardens that would result in a loss of privacy. However, the window would serve a bathroom and is annotated as obscured glazing on the proposed drawings. On the basis this window would only serve a bathroom it is considered that a planning condition restricting the opening of this window and the use of obscure glazing would be sufficient to prevent any loss of privacy from occurring.

Front extension – The extension would be sited close to the shared boundaries with nos. 108 and 112 Lovedean Lane. A tall fence and a mix of shrubs provides the boundary with no.112 which in turn has a large car port located on its southern boundary limiting view of the neighbouring site. A section of the proposed extension would be visible above the boundary between the car port and the main dwelling. However, having regard to the limited views, the boundary treatments which are intended to be retained and the slight offset from the boundary (1m), it is not considered that the extension would appear particularly prominent or result in any significant amenity impacts.

The flank elevation of the existing garage abuts the boundary with no.108. Here the relative heights on the boundary would decrease with the replacement of the pitched roof with a flat roof over the retained element of the garage. Whilst the taller extension would be visible beyond the retained garage, it is not considered that this would result in any significant impacts on the occupiers of no.108 or no.110 which is situated just to the north-west.

Whilst an objection has been received from a property to the rear, it is noted that no objections have been received from the properties located to the north, south or west.

7.5 (iv) Impact on trees

There are a number of mature trees located on the site boundary around the rear garden but within neighbouring properties. The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement indicating how the development can proceed without impacting the health and stability of these features. This document has been considered by the Council's Arboricultural Officer who raises no objection subject to the development proceeding as set out in the report. A condition to this effect is proposed.

7.6 (v) Other matters

The submitted drawings demonstrate that adequate parking can be provided on site in line with the Parking Standards SPD.

In response to the objection received, the LPA can only consider what is submitted, and whether there was an intention to extend the property when originally approved in 2013 is not material to the determination of this application. It would appear that there has been a personal change in circumstances with the owners/occupiers and alterations are required to provide additional living accommodation at the site which has been considered on its merits and found to be acceptable.

Whilst there is always a risk of noise and disturbance occurring during construction, the alterations are relatively minor and demolition limited in comparison to when the two dwellings were constructed. As such, it is not considered that the impacts would be significant, and legislation is available beyond the planning system to address any nuisance that would occur.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposed alterations and additions are considered to be acceptable in design terms relating appropriately with the recipient dwelling and the surrounding area and would have limited and acceptable impacts on the neighbours of adjoining properties. The proposal would therefore, comply with the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and is recommended for approval.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00330 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:

220209_R4_000 Rev R.1 - (Location Plan);
220209_R4_001 Rev R.0 - (Block Plan);
220209_R4_200 Rev R.0 - (Proposed Floorplans);
220209_R4_201 Rev R.0 - (Proposed Roof Plan);
220209_R4_202 Rev R.0 - (Proposed North & South Elevations);
220209_R4_203 Rev R.0 - (Proposed East & West Elevations);

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement (Arboricultural Report - ref.B/0367/22 dated April 2022). All temporary protective fencing shall be installed in accordance with BS:5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations' and the approved Arboricultural Method Statement, and shall be retained throughout the period of construction work.

Reason: To safeguard the continued health and presence of such existing vegetation and protect the amenities of the locality and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 The external materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture those on the existing building.

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 additional living accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes incidental and ancillary to the occupation and enjoyment of the existing dwelling known as 108A Lovedean Lane and shall not be used as a separate unit of accommodation.

Reason: The additional living accommodation created is not in a satisfactory position 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.

- 6 The dormer window to the south facing roof slope hereby permitted shall be constructed with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level of the room it serves, non-opening lights and textured glass with obscuration level of no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and thereafter permanently retained in such condition.

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