
Site Address:	7 Glenleigh Park, Havant, PO9 2PH		
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/21/01157	Expiry Date:	01/12/2021
Applicant:	Mr Lincoln		
Agent:	Mr M Farrer	Case Officer:	Joseph Toole
	MF Designs Ltd		
Ward:	St Faiths		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

7 Glenleigh Park, Havant, is located to the north side of Glenleigh Park. The application site is a detached bungalow comprising brickwork and painted render with concrete roof tiles. Vehicular access is from Glenleigh Park with parking to the side.

The property is located within a residential area with some properties of similar design and others differing. It is located within a medium density area.

Note - Due to Coronavirus a site visit was not possible but the applicant/agent supplied photos of the application site which have been used to inform this decision.

2 Planning History

00/50386/003 - Crown reduction and thin a Copper Beech Tree (T1) within the front garden of 7 Glenleigh Park subject to TPO 626, PERM,19/06/2000

94/50386/002 - Raise to 5m and thin by 15% (max) crown and remove selected limbs overhanging roof and shorten others by .5 on Copper Beech covered by TPO 626. , PERM,04/03/1994

07/50386/004 - Crown reduction of 25% to a Copper Beech tree (T1) subject to TPO 0626. , PERM,29/08/2007

APP/13/00793 - Tree works., UNK,

APP/15/01082 - Crown reduce 1No. Copper Beech by 1.5m to previous pruning points. Subject to TPO 0626., PERM,13/11/2015

3 Proposal

Single storey side and 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)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist (1)

There is no longer a tree at the front of this property as it was removed in 2017 so in terms of the proposed extension I have no objection however, a replacement tree was required to be planted for the TPO'd Beech which was removed. Could the applicant provide a plan which shows a replacement tree to be planted in the front garden or can this be conditioned please. The species should be Sorbus Aucuparia or another that the applicant might wish to suggest.

Officer Comment

This was passed onto the applicant's agent who said they would prefer to plant a "Prunus hillieri Spire" - a Blushing Bride Cherry Blossom Tree. This was agreed by the Arboriculturalist and a plan was submitted.

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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) Trees

(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 development would involve the erection of a single storey side and rear extension to be used as an extended kitchen, living space, utility room and hall.

7.4 The proposed development would have facing brickwork and painted render with concrete roof tiles matching the existing property. This is considered to be inkeeping with the context of the main dwellinghouse.

7.5 Part of the proposed side extension would be visible from the street scene however it would be minimal. The majority of the proposed works are to the back of the property thus it is considered to have a limited impact upon the street scene. Furthermore, the proposed extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling being of appropriate size to the plot and the retained amenity space. Therefore, it is considered to be inkeeping with the character of the area.

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 There would be a new door within the existing porch replacing a window. This is not considered to have any impact upon neighbouring properties.

7.8 On the east side the proposed side/rear extension would extend closer to the shared boundary with No.9 Glenleigh Park with a new door, windows and 2 rooflights. Due to the proposed hipped roof design off the boundary and being partially screened by the existing 1.8 metre high fencing it is not considered to cause overlooking, appear overbearing or result in the harmful loss of light to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

- 7.9 On the west side there would be a window and rooflight within the proposed rear extension. This views would face out onto the rear garden and be screened by the existing 1.8 metre high fencing along the boundary of the access to No.5 and No.5A Glenleigh Park, thus not considered to cause any form of overlooking. Furthermore, due to the distance off this boundary and being an access on this side it is not considered to appear overbearing or result in the harmful loss of light to any surrounding properties.
- 7.10 To the rear there would be doors within the proposed extension. This would face out onto the rear garden and be screened by the existing 1.8 metre high fencing and garage therefore not considered to cause any form of overlooking.
- 7.11 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) Trees

- 7.12 A plan showing where the replace tree would be provided was added to the applicaion. Furthermore, information has been provided showing the tree has been planted.

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/21/01157

- 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:

Location and Block Plan with replacement tree - 3213P03B
Proposed Elevations - 3213P02
Proposed Floor Plans - 3213P01

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.