
Site Address: 6 Third Avenue, Havant, PO9 2QS
Proposal: Two storey rear and single storey side and rear extensions and flue.
Application No: APP/16/00110 Expiry Date: 09/05/2016
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Docherty
Agent: Mr C Fish Case Officer: Bee Crawford
Ward: St Faiths

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a detached older style two storey property and attached garage which is currently undergoing renovation. It has a brown tiled pitched roof and elevations of red multibrick. The site is level with open vehicular access to the front with an area of grass, a fence to the east, hedging to the west and a dwarf wall to the front. The rear garden has a depth in excess of 20 metres is mainly laid to lawn with shrubs and enclosed by fencing ranging in height from 1.4 metres to 1.8 metres.
- 1.2 Two storey detached properties are to the east, west and opposite and the rear garden of a large plot in First Avenue is to the rear. The area is of low to medium density with a mixture of two storey detached and semi-detached properties of individual and similar age, style and design.

2 Planning History

None relevant to this application.

3 Proposal

Two storey rear and single storey side and rear extensions, provision of new flue, chimney and first floor window to the east elevation.

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

FAO Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

I refer to the above application under the Town & Country Planning Acts passed to this Service for comment. I have perused the enclosed plans/documentation provided by the applicant. I cannot find any explanation related to the flue and the new stack. It will be assumed for the purpose of this application, that the proposed new flue will serve a wood/log burner installation; if not the applicant should advise Planning to the contrary. Based on the current proposed positioning and height of the flue, the potential for smoke nuisance and recurrence of same, to neighbouring properties is lessened in relation to other possible positions.

Similarly the new stack also shown on proposal drawings does not clarify its purpose; again one will assume it will serve a fireplace/s. The height of this unit appears to conform with similar stacks in the neighbourhood.

If consent is to be granted on this application, I would ask that the following informative be added to any positive decision notice.

Informative regarding Hours of Work:

You are hereby requested to ensure that no works or ancillary operations associated with any demolition, excavation, clearance and construction works at the development, which are audible at the site boundary, shall take place on any Sunday or Bank/Public Holiday, nor on any other day except between the following times: Monday to Friday: 8.00 – 18.00 and Saturday: 8.00 – 13.00.

This is in order to protect the occupants of nearby residential properties from noise and vibration nuisance.

Contamination Risks

I have reviewed application documents & environmental context of the site. I note that Mark Moss has already provided comment on the proposed stack / flue.

With respect to contamination risks arising from past use of land, I note that the property was constructed b/w 1898 & 1909 on greenfield land formerly associated with the Denvilles Estate. The only potential contamination source in the immediate vicinity is a substantial (approx. 30m x 5m) glasshouse that was previously present (broadly) within the curtilage of 8 Third Avenue.

Glasshouses, particularly those of reasonable scale, were often either commercially operated, or used to grow produce that would otherwise be either very expensive to import, or would not be expected to survive the journey - often cultivars from warmer climates. For this reason, these structures were often heated. Similarly, intensive cultivation under artificial conditions often lead to use of artificial soil improvers (e.g. potash) and the use of chemicals to control pests & fungal growth (e.g. arsenic, copper).

Contamination from this type of source is often confined to the footprint of the structure, however some contamination is possible at adjacent sites - particularly if oil burners were used to heat it, or if town gas was produced locally for the purpose of heating (e.g. presence of unmarked tar or liquor pits, or on-site disposal of spent fuels and solid wastes).

No associated structures appear to coincide with the subject site, and the presence of contamination at the application site is considered to be a low probability. While this is the case, if present, contamination could potentially be significant.

The type of contamination that could be present in connection with this structure (i.e.

liquid fuels, ammoniacal liquors or tars, or arsenic associated with local gas production) would be expected to be readily apparent and if present within the footprint of the proposed extension, is likely to be identified during groundwork.

Contaminants associated with cultivation would normally be confined to the footprint of the former structure and are not considered likely to represent a significant risk.

Due to the low probability of presence, and the likelihood that any contamination that may be present would be readily identifiable by visual & olfactory means, conditions requiring the proactive investigation of soils are not considered to be reasonable.

I would however recommend that an informative be placed on any decision notice issued, in order to highlight the possibility of contamination, and the actions expected to be undertaken in the event that suspected contamination is identified during groundwork. Suggested wording below:

It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the development is safe and suitable for its consented future use upon completion. Contamination may be present at the site as a result of its current use, or the former use of adjacent land, and there is a possibility that such contamination might be identified during the course of development. In the event that any discoloured soils or groundwater, oily sheens, foul or solvent odours, or deposits / inclusions comprising obvious waste materials are encountered during groundwork, or if groundwork staff report acute symptoms (skin, eye or respiratory); works in that area of the site should cease until an appropriate assessment of the nature and extent of the suspected contamination has been undertaken. The local planning authority should be notified of the nature of the contamination, and how that contamination is to be dealt with.

No conditions are proposed.

NB: Informatives added.

Arboriculturalist

No tree removal is required to facilitate this project. The supporting arboricultural evidence is comprehensive and provided that the methodology prescribed in the method statement and tree protection plan is strictly adhered to (inclusive of site monitoring works) the trees will survive the development unscathed and to continue to grow on safely and healthily in the future.

Therefore I have no objections to this scheme in arboricultural terms.

The arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection plan must form a condition if permission is given for this project.

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: 5

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 streetscene
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

(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 control criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the streetscene .

7.3 The proposal is to the rear, side and roof of the dwelling and parts of it would be visible from the public realm, with the property being situated approximately 5 metres from the highway. The development would result in a generous increase in the volume of the original property, however it is considered that this can be adequately accommodated within the extent of the site and sufficient amenity space would be retained in the rear garden area. The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is considered that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.4 The proposed rear extensions would project a total of approximately 5.8 metres beyond the original wall of the existing dwellinghouse, consisting of 4 metres at two storey and 1.8 metres at single storey. Whilst the extension would be sizeable, the two storey rear element is a continuation of the existing property and does not extend beyond the side elevations of the house, and follows the line of the existing ridge. The design of the roof is hipped and pitches away from the neighbouring properties which would lessen any perception of the development being overbearing. Whilst the the single storey side extension is close to the eastern boundary, in isolation this part of the scheme could be built within the realms of permitted development. The property at number 4 is a minimum of 3.5 metres and a maximum of 8 metres from the eastern boundary and the property at number 8 is 5 metres from the western boundary. A 45 degree angle test was carried out and whilst there could be some bearing, the degree of impact is not considered so great as to constitute a defensible reason for refusal.

7.5 Whilst there are rooflights in the single storey part of the extension, there are no new windows in the side elevations of the proposal. However a new window is proposed in the existing first floor eastern elevation serving a bathroom, and in order to protect the

amenities of the neighbouring property at number 4, a condition is recommended for this window to be fitted with obscured glazing with only the top half of the window being openable.

- 7.6 The back elevation of the proposal would be in excess of 16 metres from the rear boundary of the application site, and the properties to the rear are considered to be a sufficient distance away for any impact to be negligible.
- 7.7 As stated by the Council's Environmental Health Officer, the proposed new chimney and flue are at a height which conform to similar in the surrounding area and as such any potential for smoke nuisance would be lessened in relation to other possible positions on the property.
- 7.8 It is therefore considered that the proposal is unlikely to appear overbearing or lead to harmful overlooking and the impact would be deemed to be acceptable on the properties immediately adjacent to, opposite and to the rear of the application site, meeting the requirements of policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is noted no objections were received for the scheme.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/16/00110 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 Compulsary 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 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the window at first floor level on the eastern elevation serving the bathroom, as shown on drawing no.82/16/06 shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter with only the top half of the window being openable.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties 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 be undertaken wholly in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan dated 07/03/2016 supplied by Kim Gifford, Arboricultural Consultant.

Reason: In the interests of the protection of nearby trees which contribute to the character of the locality, and having due regard to Policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan

Proposed block plan

Drg No 82/16/01 Existing floor plan

Drg No 82/16/02 Existing and proposed roof plan

Drg No 82/16/03 Existing elevations plan

Drg No 82/16/04 Proposed floor plan

Drg No 82/16/06 Proposed elevations plan

Design and Access Statement dated January 2016

Arboricultural Impact Assessment/Tree Protection Plan dated 07/03/2016

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.