
Site Address:	9 Salet Way, Waterlooville, PO7 8QS		
Proposal:	Single storey side/rear extension and front porch.		
Application No:	APP/22/00031	Expiry Date:	23/03/2022
Applicant:	Mr Hughes		
Agent:	Ms Linzi Hawkins	Case Officer:	Denise Sheath
	Thorns - Young Ltd		
Ward:	Cowplain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

9 Salet Way, Waterlooville, is a two storey property link attached by garage to No.7. The property is situated in the middle of a private drive. It has a brown tiled pitched roof and elevations of red multi brick. There is hardsurfaced area to the front leading to the attached garage, the front garage is open to the east with a laid to lawn frontage, the rear of the property has 1.8m close boarded fencing to all rear and rear side boundaries. The rear garden is mainly laid to lawn with an area of decking to the north west corner of the garden.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Single storey side/rear extension and front porch.

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

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None required

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: 4

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
Concerns Raised: • We are permitted to pull forward in front of no. 9 and reverse back into our parking space in front of our garage which is positioned further forward to the neighbouring property. Access from the proposed front porch would necessitate the vehicle parked outside no. 9 to be placed further forward allowing access to and from the vehicle and impeding our ability to reverse back into our drive. They would also have to enter and exit the vehicle on our property. • The porch would have an extended roof which would necessitate guttering and a downpipe. This would mean there is inadequate provision for drainage, and this in turn could lead to flooding of our parking space and garage as it is positioned slightly lower than no.9. • Although not part of this planning application the intention of our neighbours is to block pave the front of their property. This would increase the possibility of flooding even more. • Currently the rear garden of no.9 is prone to flooding, and ours is lower so the risk of our garden flooding is raised. Great consideration would need to be given to the positioning of downpipes and sewage	• See Section 7 • The use of a neighbouring properties land to maneuver and park vehicles would be a civil issue and not a planning consideration • This is not a planning consideration as the porch is wholly within the curtilage of the application site with no encroachment or overhanging • I am not able to comment on any future development. I am only able to comment on what is applied for as part of the current application. • This element would be dealt with by Building Regulations

drainage. • Loss of outlook and loss of daylight due to the rear extension • Delivery of materials by large vehicles would cause damage to the shared driveways	• See Section 7 • This is not a planning consideration and would be a civil issue

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

(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 Part of the proposal is for a porch to the front of the property, the porch will be situated in front of the existing entrance, it will have a depth of 1.8m, a width of 2m, an eaves height of 2.7m with a maximum height of 3.4m, the porch would be constructed with face brickwork and concrete tiles to match the materials on the existing property. The proposed porch is a high quality design and would not have a negative impact upon the character of the streetscene.

7.4 The second element to this application is for a single storey flat roofed side and rear extension which would replace an existing rear conservatory. The proposed extension would have a depth of 4.1m from the south side elevation spanning a width of 7.95m with a depth of 3m attaching to the rear north side elevation, a roof light is proposed to be inserted into the flat roof to provide natural light to the area to be used as a kitchen. The proposed rear/side extension would be partially visible from the streetscene to the rear of No. 7, due to the matching materials and similar extensions to the rear of the properties within Salet Way, the proposed extension is not considered to have a harmful or negative impact upon the character of the streetscene.

7.5 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

7.6 Due to the position of the proposed porch it is not considered to have a negative impact with regard to loss of light, outlook or overshadowing, to the neighbouring properties to the front (east), north or south elevations. It is therefore considered the

impact of the proposed porch would be minimal and acceptable.

- 7.7 The proposed side/rear extension would have a distance of approximately 9m from the neighbouring property to the rear (No.15) and would mainly face the side elevation of this property. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would have a minimal and acceptable impact upon this neighbouring property.
- 7.8 The proposed extension would have a 0.1m gap from the boundary with the neighbouring property to the south (No.11), the proposed extension be 0.2m less in depth than the existing conservatory which is to be replaced, it is noted that the No.11 have a side/rear extension along this shared boundary with a greater depth than the proposal. There are to be no windows or doors within this side facing elevation. It is therefore considered that the proposal would have a minimal overbearing impact on this property, and as such does not justify a reason for refusal on this matter.
- 7.9 The proposed extension would have a 0.1m gap from the boundary with the neighbouring property to the north (No.7), the proposed extension be 0.2m less in depth than the existing conservatory but would span 2.75m closer to the northern boundary, the depth of the proposed extension along the northern elevation would be 4.1m, it is noted that the neighbouring property has a moveable storage container along this shared boundary, and already has some loss of to their northern boundary due to the application site being sited back approximately 1.9m toward the west. It is considered that there may be some impact of increased overshadowing upon this neighbouring property. Despite this, it has been deemed that the development would be acceptable as the rear conservatory to the southern rear elevation of No. 7 would still receive adequate sunlight throughout the day, and any reduction in sunlight would not have a particularly adverse impact upon the amenity of the room or the garden area. Any additional impact of overshadowing to the setback rear northern element is not considered to create such a negative impact as to warrant a refusal of planning permission.
- 7.10 The proposed extension would have a flat roof which would reduce potential overshadowing and there is existing screening from the 1.8 metre fencing on the boundary between the properties. It is therefore considered that the proposal would have a limited and acceptable impact.
- 7.11 Concerns have been raised with regard to the addition of the porch having an impact on parking and turning of vehicles, the proposed porch would not be placed on the allocated parking area therefore would not create any additional issues with regard to the parking and turning of vehicles.
- 7.12 Drawing all the matters together it is considered that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties with regard to overbearing, loss of sunlight/daylight or overlooking to justify a reason for refusal on this matter and would meet the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

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/22/00031 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:

Application Form - Received 26 January 2022

Location Plan - Received 26 January 2022

Site Location Plan - Received 26 January 2022

Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations - Drawing No. 6008.22.1 - Received 22 January 2022

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used 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.