
Site Address: 41 Meadway, Waterloooville, PO7 7QJ
Proposal: Two storey side and single storey rear extension, along with a loft conversion and minor internal and external alterations.
Application No: APP/21/00965 Expiry Date: 11/11/2021
Applicant: Mr A Galliers
Agent: Mr Pickering Case Officer: Julie Terzoudis
 Helyer Davies Architects Ltd
Ward: Waterloo

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling located at 41 Meadway, within the neighbourhood of Waterloooville. The property benefits from open vehicular access to the front driveway which provides off-road parking provision as well as access to the single integral garage. The rear garden is primarily laid to lawn and is enclosed by a close boarded timber fence on all sides. The property currently benefits from a single-storey rear extension and a rear conservatory.
- 1.2 The site is located south of Queens Enclosure, a heavily wooded public space. The immediate locality is residential in nature with a relatively low density of dwellings with generous garden space forward and to the rear. Surrounding properties are of a similar age, albeit slightly varied in terms of size, scale, and design.
- 1.3 Existing dwellings within the locality have all been finished with similar materials, using a mix of light render, paint, and brick, with tiled roofs

2 Planning History

99/64228/000 - Single storey front extension and front canopy. Pitched roof to existing garage and single storey rear extension - PERM,14/07/1999

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of an existing conservatory and single-storey rear extension, and for the construction of a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension, and a loft conversion which would include the addition of a rear roof dormer.
- 3.2 The two-storey extension would absorb the existing garage and extend out from the southwestern elevation in line with the ridge height of the main roof, to a maximum depth of 3.4m. The two-storey extension would run the length of the dwelling from the front elevation along to the existing rear elevation.
- 3.3 The single-storey rear extension would extend out to a depth of 4.6m and run across the width of the dwelling, with a flat roof height of 3.1m. Three rooflights are also proposed.
- 3.4 A loft conversion is also proposed which would include the addition of a rear dormer

and a single rooflight on the front roof slope.

- 3.5 The permeable paving on the existing driveway forward of the dwelling would be extended to the north-east to create an additional on-site parking space.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021
Planning Practice Guidance 2016
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
E1* (High quality design)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Gwen Robinson

No comments received.

Councillor Mike Sceal

No comments received.

Councillor Peter Wade

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: 8

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) Highways safety and 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 single-storey extension and rear dormer would be set to the rear of the dwelling and, as they would not be visible from the public realm, no visual impacts would result to the existing character of the street.
- 7.4 Initial concerns were raised with the scale of the proposed dormer which would have presented as an overly dominant roof structure upon the existing dwelling. Positive amendments were made to reduce the scale of the proposed dormer, minimising the width, and providing a greater setback from the eaves of the main dwelling.
- 7.5 The proposed two-storey extension would extend out in line with the main ridge of the existing dwelling resulting in a larger two-storey dwelling, but with a similar design. The extension would remain subservient, and the matching materials proposed for the walls and roof which would allow the two-storey addition to merge successfully with the host dwelling. No visual harm would result from the proposed side extension to the existing character of the street, nor the host dwelling.
- 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 2011). 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 The proposed rear extension is a single-storey low-level structure, which would not raise any overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing concerns for either of the neighbouring occupiers.
- 7.8 The proposed roof dormer would introduce a level of overlooking to the row of rear gardens, however, the extent would not be any greater than that already achieved by the existing rear first floor windows. Overlooking of the rear amenity space is an established character of these dwellings and no additional concerns would be raised from the proposed rear dormer.
- 7.9 The significant works proposed in the form of a two-storey side extension are predominantly set to the south-west of the site, with the neighbouring dwelling No.43 to the north-east unaffected.
- 7.10 The two-storey side extension would be set on the south-western elevation and would incorporate the existing single-storey garage. No side elevation windows are proposed on the two-storey extension; therefore, no new overlooking would be introduced.
- 7.11 The extension would bring built form closer to the neighbouring dwelling at No. 39 and

introduce limited overshadowing to the first-floor window serving No. 39 at varying times of the day and year. It is acknowledged that this window is obscure glazed and likely serving a bathroom. A ground floor window below would also be considered to experience a limited reduction in natural light levels from the reduced setback. However, it should be acknowledged that overshadowing already occurs to this window from the existing 1.8m side boundary treatment. In addition, a generous side setback of 2.0m would still be retained between the dwellings. It is considered that the level of overshadowing introduced by the proposed development would not be significantly harmful enough to warrant a planning refusal.

- 7.12 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would 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 2011). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Highways safety and parking

- 7.13 The existing dwelling is a three-bedroomed property. The proposal development would result in a four, potentially five, bedroomed dwelling, which would trigger the requirement for the provision of a minimum of three on-site parking spaces in accordance with Havant's Car Parking SPD 2016.
- 7.14 Technically the site currently supports two on-site parking spaces, one internal within the existing integral garage and an additional external space forward of the dwelling. The case made by the applicant is accepted in that the existing integral garage should not be considered an 'existing parking space' as it is smaller than the standard outlined in the minimum dimension required in the SPD and therefore ineffectual. Therefore, it is agreed that realistically only one car parking space exists on-site.
- 7.15 As part of the proposal, the existing permeable driveway would be extended to provide two external on-site parking spaces forward of the dwelling. It is therefore accepted that the existing level of parking on site would increase through the expansion of the driveway to provide two spaces. Although, through the proposed development, a deficit of one space in the overall on-site parking requirement would still result.
- 7.16 Nonetheless, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021, Paragraph 111. states that *'development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'*.
- 7.17 As many dwellings along Meadway support off-road parking there is significant availability for on-street parking along the road. The on-site parking shortfall of one space cannot be concluded to result in a 'severe highways impact' and therefore no concerns would be raised with proposed shortfall of one on-site parking space.
- 7.18 To conclude, although the site could potentially support two additional spaces forward of the dwelling and provide the required three on-site spaces, considering the green open nature of Meadway, the retention of landscaping and the existing green verge would be preferable. A technical shortfall in the standard parking requirement of one space is therefore considered acceptable.

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/21/00965, 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:

Existing and Proposed Parking Plan Drw. No. 21089-05 - received 16 Sept 2021

Existing Floor Plans Elevations Section Site and Block Plan Drw. No. 21089-01 - received 15 Sept 2021

Proposed Floor Plans Elevations Section Site and Block Plan Drw. No. 21089-02 Rev. C - received 4 Nov 2021

Design and Access Statement (July 2021) - received 15 Sept 2021

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.