

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 A Briggs - Cowplain
No comments received.

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain
No comments received.

Councillor Narinder Bains - Cowplain
No comments received.

Portsmouth Water Company

The above application and proposals is a small side extension to a house and does not present a risk to groundwater quality. Therefore we have no conditions to recommend.

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) 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 previous approved scheme was for a similar development; however, the roof was

set lower by approximately 0.3 metres and the extension set back 0.3 metres from the front elevation of the property and 0.4 metres from the rear. It was considered that this was subservient to the main dwelling.

- 7.4 The current proposals seek a similar proposal, however, there would be no set back and the ridge height would be the same as the existing dwelling.
- 7.5 The Havant Borough Design Guide states, inter alia, that it is important that the extension remains subservient to the main building, so it can be read which part of the building is the original and which is a later addition. It further states that two storey side extensions should be set back behind the main building line and that the ridge height should also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage.
- 7.6 Whilst the design principles of the design guide are noted, the rationale behind such guidance is to ensure that the extension does not dominate the main frontage. In this instance, the existing garage is relatively narrow, and the resultant development would also be relatively narrow. It is considered that, as a matter of judgement, in this instance the current proposals would not dominate the main frontage.
- 7.7 It is also noted that the adjacent property, No.12, is orientated differently and, as such, a terracing effect would not occur. It is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the host dwelling and the resultant impact in the street scene and the character of the area.
- 7.8 The proposed rear addition was previously considered acceptable in the approved scheme.
- 7.9 It is noted that there are examples in the immediate locality of first floor side extensions. These are set back from the frontage and have a lower ridge height than the main dwelling, however, for the reasons stated above, in this instance the resultant building would not result in any significant adverse effect on the visual amenities of the street scene and is considered acceptable.
- 7.10 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

- 7.11 The approved scheme was considered acceptable in terms of impact on neighbouring properties. Whilst this revised scheme proposes a larger development, it is considered that there would be no unacceptable adverse impacts to neighbouring properties as a result of the revised scheme.
- 7.12 Whilst no objections have been received regarding the current scheme, it is noted that an objection was raised to the approved scheme.
- 7.13 The revised scheme, the subject of this application, would result in a larger development, however, it is not considered that the small increase in the scale and massing of the development would result in any significantly different impact on neighbouring properties than the approved scheme.
- 7.14 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 revised scheme, however, the previous objection to the approved scheme has been noted.

(iv) Parking

- 7.15 As noted in the approved scheme, the proposed conversion of the garage would result in a loss of a parking site, however, as before, a parking plan has been submitted demonstrating that adequate parking provision can be achieved. This was previously a condition of the approved scheme and it is considered necessary to reimpose such a condition to ensure adequate parking provision is available.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the revised proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the character of the area, the visual amenities of the street scene and 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/21/00849 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:

LOCATION PLAN

REV C - EXISTING AND PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN

AMENDED EXISTING AND PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLANS

REV C - EXISTING AND PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION

REV C - EXISTING AND PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION

REV C - EXISTING AND PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION

PARKING PLAN

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.

- 4 The development shall not be brought into use until a minimum of 3 parking spaces have been provided within the curtilage of the site and thereafter all of those spaces kept available for such purposes.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.