
Site Address:	2A Billett Avenue, Waterloo, PO7 7SZ		
Proposal:	Single storey rear and side extension, new pitched roof over existing flat roof side extension, new front porch.		
Application No:	APP/16/00846	Expiry Date:	10/10/2016
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Russell		
Agent:	Mr Edwards	Case Officer:	Bee Crawford
	Town & Country Architecture Ltd		
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a modern two storey detached property and attached garage. It has a brown tiled pitched roof and elevations of red multibrick and tile hanging. The site is level with open vehicular access to the front which is block paved with an area of grass. There is a hedge to the western and part of the front boundary and a low chain link fence and shrubs to the eastern boundary. The rear garden is mainly laid to lawn with a patio area and shed and is enclosed by a 1.8 metre high wall, 2 metre hedging and 1.6 metre high fencing.
- 1.2 Modern two storey detached properties are to the east and west, a large two storey detached property is opposite and the rear garden of a property in London Road is to the rear. The area is of medium density with two storey detached properties of similar and different age, style and design.

2 Planning History

APP/13/00191 - Single storey rear extension; single storey front extension to garage including new pitched roof and canopy over front extension, permitted 30/04/2013. This permission has not been implemented and has subsequently expired.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Removal of rear / side conservatory. Erection of a single storey rear extension / side extension. Erection of a single storey front extension to the garage including new pitched roof and new canopy of the front entrance door. The development would consist of various roof forms including a mono pitch on the rear extension which then extends out to a gable end on the rear / side corner. The full height of this gable would be 4m. The side extension would have a mono-pitch roof which would extend up to a height of 4.3m. The height of the roof then drops down to 3.6m at the point of the front extension to the garage and then forms gable end which fronts the highway. From this gable end, a mono-pitch canopy extends over the front entrance door.
- 3.2 It is worthy to note that part of this development could be carried out under permitted development. That being the rear section which only extends out to 3.8m and does not exceed 4m in height with a pitched roof. The central section which forms the side extension linked to the rear section, does need planning permission but only because the

roof exceeds the 4m height limit by 0.3m. The section forward of the front building line does require planning permission. The proposal is identical to the scheme which was permitted under APP/13/00191 on 30 April 2013.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

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

Following the receipt of further information, I now raise no objection to the application and the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan should form one of the conditions if the application is approved.

FAO Mr P Marshall, Development Engineer

No adverse comment

Southern Water

No response 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: 12

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Two representations have been received from two addresses raising the following concerns:

- 6.1 The scale and appearance of the extension would be visually overbearing and would have an impact on outlook and cause a loss of daylight to both front and rear aspect of the living room in No. 2b.
- 6.2 The proposed extension runs parallel and close to a public sewer and the integrity of this was compromised when the existing conservatory was built. Therefore measures should be taken to ensure that the integrity of the sewerage system is protected - noted.
- 6.3 Potential damage to the root system of the oak tree in the front garden of number 2b and

close proximity of garage roof in relation to future canopy growth - see section 5 above.

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 upon the streetscene
- (iii) Impact on the neighbouring properties

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact upon the streetscene

7.3 The proposal would replace the existing wrap around conservatory structure with a grander extension including varying roof forms and more elaborate glazing sections. The overall structure relates well to the main dwelling and would achieve an attractive, cohesive design. Matching materials are proposed. The front extension would replace the flat roof with a pitched roof and a canopy over the front entrance. This would be an improvement on the existing flat roof elements.

7.4 The application property is one of a group of four. Whilst these are very similar in design, there are some variations including No. 2b which has a car port, No. 2c which has parking at the rear and No. 2 which has a detached garage. The front building lines of Nos 2a and 2b are similar and the proposal for the front extension would alter this. However, as this would only extend out by 0.9m from the front line of the existing porch, it is not considered that this would appear highly incongruous. Furthermore, other than this group of four properties, dwellings in Billet Avenue vary considerably in design and layout and therefore there is not a set character with regards to this aspect.

(iii) Impact on the neighbouring properties

7.5 In terms of an increase to footprint, there would only be a 0.5m increase in depth to the rear element. However, the roof of the rear /side element would build up from a hip to a full gable end immediately adjacent to the boundary with No. 2b. This would therefore have more visual impact on No. 2b. However, as referred to in section 3, this element could be built as permitted development and therefore its impact has effectively already been considered acceptable.

7.6 The section of the extension which extends along the side elevation would include a roof which slopes away from the south eastern boundary. However, the height of this roof to the ridge would be 4.3m and therefore requires approval (as it is 0.3m over the PD limit). The height of the eaves adjacent to the south eastern boundary would be only 2.4m and the point at which the roof reaches 4.3m, would be 2.5m from the south eastern boundary. This roof line would be visible from a side facing window within No. 2b however, as it would slope downwards, it is not considered that it would result in a significant loss of light or outlook. Furthermore, the bedroom is dual aspect and the main window overlooks front of the property.

7.7 The front extension would extend forward of the principle elevation by 2.2m. It would extend forward of the existing porch extension by 0.9m. No. 2b is located 1m from the south eastern boundary, on the same building line so the front extension would extend

forward of their building line by 2.2m.

- 7.8 Following a site visit to the neighbouring property at No. 2b, a 45 degree angle test was carried out from the centre of the rear bay window and the centre of the front living room window. This demonstrated the extension would not extend past 45 degrees to both the front and rear and is therefore considered not to have an adverse impact.

8 **Conclusion**

The elements of the proposal which require planning permission are considered to be acceptable and therefore the scheme is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/16/00846 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 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.
- 3 The development must be undertaken in accordance with the arboricultural method statement dated 19/09/16 and tree protection plan supplied by Paul Edwards, Architectural Consultant from Town and Country Architecture.
Reason: Policy DM8 to protect the conservation and enhancement of existing natural features.
- 4 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drg No. 12/24/01 Rev A Existing floor and elevations plan
Drg No. 12/24/02 Rev A Location plan, block plan, proposed floor and elevations plan
Drg No. 12/24/03 Tree protection plan
Arboricultural Method Statement dated 19/09/16

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.