

---

|                   |                                     |               |                |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Site Address:     | 9 Glenleigh Park, Havant, PO9 2PH   |               |                |
| Proposal:         | Proposed two storey rear extension. |               |                |
| Application Type: | Full Planning Permission            |               |                |
| Application No:   | APP/22/00314                        | Expiry Date:  | 23/05/2022     |
| Applicant:        | Mr & Mrs Bray                       |               |                |
| Agent:            | Mr Bessant                          | Case Officer: | Selina Donophy |
|                   | JB Architecture Design Ltd          |               |                |
| Ward:             | St Faiths                           |               |                |

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

---

## **1 Site Description**

This application site is a detached chalet bungalow located on the north side of Glenleigh Park, Havant. This property is of brick construction with a half hipped roof which projects forward at single storey level to the front elevation. To the rear is a tile hung dormer which projects forward of the ground floor. Towards the front of the site is a hard standing providing parking space and an area of lawn. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.

## **2 Planning History**

None relevant

## **3 Proposal**

Proposed two storey rear 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)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

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

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

**Councillor Imogen Payter**

No comment

**Councillor J Branson - St Faiths**

No comment

**Councillor T Pike - St Faith's**

No comment

## **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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

| <b>Comment</b>                                                                | <b>Officer Comment</b> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| A well planned extension in keeping with the other properties surrounding it. | Comment noted.         |
| Nice to see an extension that enhances the appearance of the property         |                        |

## **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
- (v) CIL

(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 This proposal has been amended following its initial submission due to case officer concerns raised in regard to mass and bulk of the proposal and potential overbearing impact on the neighbouring dwelling. The proposal has been altered with the rear gable feature removed and the side wall set further off the west side, also bringing down the extension ridge off the main roof ridge and reducing the extension depth by 50cms.
- 7.4 This proposal comprises a two storey rear extension. This would have a hipped back roof forming an area of flat roof at two storey height, with the ridge set just below that of the main dwelling. The extension would have dimensions of approximately 4 metres depth, 6.5 metres height and 6 metres depth, stepping down into single storey level to the east side. This would have a width of approximately 2.2 metres, coming level with the existing side elevation wall, it would have a flat roof with a roof light and height of approximately 2.9 metres. At ground floor level this space would create an open plan kitchen/diner with large doors and a window to the rear elevation. At first floor level this would create an additional rear bedroom with a bathroom, walk in wardrobe and alterations to the existing bedroom. The rear bedroom would be served by a Juliet balcony to the rear and the walk in wardrobe would be served by a rear elevation window. Proposed materials include brickwork at ground floor level and grey weatherboard cladding at first floor level. The door and window fittings would be in Anthracite Grey.
- 7.5 The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the main dwelling, leaving the front elevation remaining as existing and therefore any impact on the streetscene would be limited. The eaves height of the extension would be raised level with the half hip on the east elevation and the extension would comprise of a generous amount of flat roof however at two storey level this would not be highly visible. This extension is considered to be large when viewed within the context of the host dwelling which is a modestly sized bungalow with rooms in the roof space. The Havant Borough Design Guide states that extensions should be subservient additions to the existing property and whilst the size has been stated, it is also noted the plot is large enough to accommodate the additional footprint and the extension would not be visible within the streetscene. There is also some mix in building styles and heights in the immediate vicinity. The change in materials would help to break up the extension and the set down of the ridge and removal of the dormer have helped in softening the appearance of the extension, again within the context of the host dwelling. Overall, on balance the proposal is considered acceptable in this instance for the reasons given above.
- 7.6 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

- 7.7 To the east of the application site is no 11 Glenleigh Park which is a larger two storey property which has a frontage set back behind that of no 9. To the side elevation of no 11 is a blank side wall with a lean to structure at ground floor level . The proposed extension would not project beyond the rear of no 11 and therefore no overbearing or overshadowing impact has been identified. Whilst there would be windows at first floor level there were windows in the rear dormer previously and although these windows would be set further back, these would not have direct views into private amenity spaces and therefore impact is deemed to be acceptable.
- 7.8 To the west of the application site is no 7 Glenleigh Park. This property forms one of an arrangement of bungalows to the west of the site and has a reasonably small garden with a garage to the rear. As stated in the above section, case officer concerns were initially raised due to the two storey mass of the building line which would project to the east of no 7. The applicant has made the above described amendments in response to this with the reduction in depth by 50cms, removal of the gable feature roof and set in from the side. With the changes made, it is still expected that this extension would be a prominent feature from the rear garden of no 7 and would have some impact on outlook however it is noted that no objections have been received. There is an existing conservatory to the rear of no 7 and there would no impact on light to this window the proposal would not infringe upon the 45 degree line taken from the conservatory. Whilst it is noted there is a planning application approved for an extension at no 7 to replace the conservatory, this has not yet been constructed and therefore cannot be considered in this assessment. With the considerations above , on balance the proposal is deemed acceptable in terms of impact on this property.
- 7.9 To the rear (north) of the application site is no 5a Glenleigh Park and its rear garden which is sited directly at the end of the rear garden of the application site. It is considered that the rear garage of no 7 would block the front elevation windows of no 5a from view from the rear elevation windows of the proposed extension. The rear garden is approximately 19 metres in depth and whilst the design guide does not give a separation distance for rear to side elevations , there is a minimum of 20 metres back to back separation distance stipulated. Given that the relationship between these dwellings is staggered and indirect it is considered that the 19 metres is acceptable in this instance. A juliet balcony is not judged to have any increased overlooking impact than a standard rear elevation window as it does not step out. The property to the rear of the rear garden at no 5a would have a much larger separation distance and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of overlooking impact.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking 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

- 7.11 Three parking spaces are required on site as specified in the Havant Parking SPD- these could be provided for towards the front of the site on the driveway.

(v) CIL

7.12 This proposal would not result in 100m<sup>2</sup> or more floorspace and is therefore not CIL liable.

## **8 Conclusion**

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

---

## **9 RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00314 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:

PL.545.21.01 C Amended block and location plan  
PL.545.21.04 C Amended proposed floor plans  
PL.545.21.05 C Amended proposed elevations

**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.