
Site Address: 24 Shillinglee, Waterlooville, PO7 5RW
Proposal: Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory.
Loft conversion with side facing dormer
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/22/00546 Expiry Date: 22/07/2022
Applicant: Ms Kellaway
Agent: Mr McIlveen Case Officer: Gary Christie
 Apple Tree Architecture
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

This application relates to a semi-detached bungalow located to the northern side of Shillinglee, Waterlooville. The property is set back from the highway by a front garden and separated from its neighbour to the west by a driveway leading to a garage to the rear of the dwelling.

The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows of various designs set back from the carriageway by front gardens/driveways and grass verges. A number of dwellings within the road have been altered and extended at roof level.

2 Planning History

There is no relevant planning history.

3 Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single-storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory, and the construction of a side facing dormer roof extension to facilitate a loft conversion.

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)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Gary Hughes

No comments received.

Councillor Husky Patel

No comments received.

Councillor Ms C Howard - Purbrook 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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
While I have no objection in principle to the plans submitted I would like to see restrictions placed during the work to ensure a limit to the disruption and damage caused by builders and contractors. In particular:- 1) No damage to roadside verges caused by parking of vehicles or by storage of building or waste materials. 2) A limit of two on the maximum number of commercial vehicles allowed in the immediate vicinity at any one time.	See 7.3 below.

3) A strict ban on any non-essential noise pollution such as site radios etc.	
4) General considerations to minimise disturbance to local residents.	
5) A responsible site manager should be identified and contact details provided to handle any matters arising during the work.	

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

(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 proposed rear extension would replace a marginally smaller conservatory that already spans the width of the rear elevation. The extension would be constructed in matching materials and topped with a flat roof to match the height of the eaves of the main roof. The extension would incorporate large bi-folding doors to its north facing elevation and a small lantern within the roof. A step in the footprint would maintain an access into the rear garden. Overall the extension is considered to be modest in scale representing a subservient addition that would relate appropriately with the host building and neighbouring properties.

7.4 At roof level a dormer roof extension is proposed to the west facing roof slope to facilitate a loft conversion. The dormer would be constructed in matching materials and incorporate a fully hipped roof within its ridge line set just below that of the main roof. Whilst the dormer is large in relation to this roof slope and is set close to the eaves and the ridge, it is considered that it is of an acceptable design and would be comparable to other roof extensions found throughout Shillinglee. Regard is also made to the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) that would allow for the construction of similar roof and ground floor extensions which would undermine any objection on design grounds.

7.5 The design and appearance of the proposal is therefore deemed to be acceptable in context to the main building 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 rear extension would replace an existing conservatory to the rear of the building. To the west, the extension would be screened by the garage to the rear of the application building and an existing extension to the rear of No.26. This would minimise any potential impact on the occupiers at No.26. To the east, the extension would project approximately 20cm beyond a conservatory to the rear of No.22 and would be finished to a similar height. Given this modest increase in depth and position to a north elevation, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant adverse impacts in terms of loss of light, outlook or increased sense of enclosure. A distance of 41m to dwellings to the north would ensure that adequate separation is maintained to avoid any significant amenity impacts occurring.
- 7.7 There are no concerns in respect of overlooking or loss of privacy as a result of the window placement within the rear extension.
- 7.8 The side roof extension would incorporate two windows serving a bedroom and would look out onto the blank elevation and roof slope of No.26. Given the absence of any windows to the side facing elevations and the presence of an existing extension to the rear of No.26, and the degree of separation provided by the driveway, it is not considered that the roof extension would result in any significant adverse impacts in terms of loss of light, overbearing impact or loss of privacy.
- 7.9 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would have limited and acceptable impacts 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).
- 7.10 One letter of representation has been received raising no objection to the proposal in principle, but requesting that conditions be imposed to restrict damage to roadside verges, the number of commercial vehicles at the site, noise and disruption impacts during construction works, and the identification of a site manager. Whilst these concerns are noted, having regard to the minor nature of the proposed works and the provisions of the GDPO which would allow for similar development to take place without the express permission of the LPA, it is not considered that the imposition of a planning condition requiring a construction environmental management plan would be reasonable in this instance. There will be an element of disruption during construction works, however this would be minimal and over a short period. Legislation beyond the planning system is available to ensure that disruption and damage is limited.

(iv) Parking

- 7.11 The proposal would increase the size of the living space at ground floor level by replacing a bedroom with that proposed within the enlarged roof space. As such, there would be no increase in bedroom accommodation at the site or associated demand for parking.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and the street scene and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00546 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:

312 Sheet 1 Rev-2 (Location Plan and Existing & Proposed Ground Floor Plans);

312 Sheet 2 Rev-1 (Existing & Proposed First Floor Plan);

312 Sheet 3 Rev-1 (Existing & Proposed Elevations).

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 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.