
Site Address:	19 Fir Copse Road, Waterloooville, PO7 5JA		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/21/00726	Expiry Date:	31/08/2021
Applicant:	Mr Evans		
Agent:	Ms Linzi Hawkins	Case Officer:	Graham Speller
	Thorns - Young Ltd		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located on the western side of Fir Copse Road and is occupied by a semi detached single storey bungalow with rear conservatory and detached garage, which is accessed via a shared driveway.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character and in this part of the road bungalows predominate and many have been extended with rooms in the roof and dormer windows.

2 Planning History

APP/21/00403 - Single storey rear extensions & 2no side facing dormers with gable build up., REF,10/06/2021

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Single storey rear extension. There would also be alteration to the existing rear window serving a bedroom which would be reduced in size.
- 3.2 The drawings also show a rear dormer window and a gable build up; however, the drawing is annotated that these elements are to be constructed under permitted development and not therefore subject of this application. Whether those elements do constitute permitted development is also not for consideration and that is a matter for the applicant and agent to determine or by submitting a Lawful Development Certificate application.

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)
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

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: 4

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 6

6 letters of representation raising the following issues:

- Not in keeping with current bungalows
- Noise and disturbance
- Loss of privacy
- Overshadowing
- Bulky
- Overbearing
- Overlooking
- Loss of light
- Out of scale and character

- Parking

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 project approximately 9m towards the current garage. It is of a size and scale that is disproportionate to the host dwelling. It is considered that the proposed development would result in a dominant impact on the host dwelling and be out of character in the locality and would be contrary to Policy CS16 (High Quality Design) of the HBLP (Core strategy) and the Design Guide.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.4 A number of objections refer to matters of overlooking and loss of privacy. It is understandable that these representations relate to the proposed dormer window element as it is shown on the submitted drawings. However, it is considered that there would be no adverse overlooking as a result of the proposed single storey rear extension.

7.5 Due to the orientation of the proposed development, which would be sited to the north east of the attached bungalow (No. 17), the loss of direct sunlight would not be significant. However, whilst the proposed development would be sited off the south western boundary, due to the significant rear projection it would appear overbearing to the neighbouring property (No.17). It would also result in loss of natural light and outlook.

7.6 In terms of impact on the neighbouring property No. 21, the proposed development would not infringe a 45 degree angle to that property and is sited sufficiently far enough away so as not to appear overbearing nor lead to any significant loss of light.

7.7 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would appear overbearing and result in loss of daylight and outlook to the neighbouring property No.17 contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and the Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iv) Parking

7.8 Only the proposed single storey rear extension is the subject of this application and parking requirements would therefore not change and there is off street parking available.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The proposed rear extension by reason of its siting and significant rear projection, would appear as an incongruous bulky addition which would dominate the host dwelling out of character in the locality and would adversely affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring property by reason of loss of natural light and outlook and being over bearing.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Core Strategy 2011 and the Borough Design Guide SPD and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00726 for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed rear extension by reason of its siting and significant rear projection, would appear as an incongruous bulky addition which would dominate the host dwelling out of character in the locality and would adversely affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring property by reason of loss of natural light and outlook and being over bearing.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Core Strategy 2011 and the Borough Design Guide SPD.