
Site Address:	8 Stephen Close, Waterlooville, PO8 8BE		
Proposal:	First floor side extension.		
Application No:	APP/14/00703	Expiry Date:	29/08/2014
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Jones	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Jenkins	Case Officer:	Heather Lealan
	Jenkins Architecture Ltd		
Ward:	Cowplain		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site consists of a detached two storey dwelling with a pitched roof and gable end section at the front and rear. To the east is a two storey projection with a hipped roof and a gable end presenting east wards. To the west of the dwelling is a single storey side extension which is set back from the principle elevation of the dwelling house. The site occupies a corner location and consequently shares a boundary with five other dwellings.
- 1.2 To the east the neighbouring dwelling (No.10 Stephen Close) is screened from view due to the side elevation of the dwelling located within the application site. Along the south eastern boundary there are three large TPO'd Oak Trees. These trees offer some screening to the dwellings located to the south of the application site (No. 38 and 40 Grassmere Way). The boundary treatment here consists of a 1.8m close boarded fence. The rear elevation of No. 38 Grassmere Way overlooks the site and the front elevation of No. 40 Grassmere Way overlooks the application site.
- 1.3 To the south west the neighbouring dwelling is screened by large conifer hedge. To the immediate west there is a detached dwelling with a gable end.
- 1.4 The level at the site decreases from the front to the back of the site.

2 Planning History

APP/10/00964

Garage conversion and single storey rear extension - permitted

3 Proposal

- 3.1 First floor side extension with a flat roof
- 3.2 It is proposed that this extension will be developed within the footprint of the existing single storey extension located to the western elevation of the dwelling.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

The National Planning Policy Framework, March 2014

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Local Plan (Allocations) 2014
AL1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

The Havant Bough Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist - Not consulted; the proposal is over an existing footprint and does not move closer development to the TPO trees that are located to the rear of the site. If the application were to be permitted a tree protect plan would be required.

Southern Water - No objection to the proposal.

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: None

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) Impact of the design on the character and appearance of the immediate area
- (iii) Impact on neighbour amenity
- (iv) Impact on trees

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The site lies in the urban area. The proposal represents an extension to an existing dwelling and is considered acceptable in principle, subject to meeting the requirements of the development considerations below.

(ii) Impact of the design on the character and appearance of the immediate area

7.3 The guidance set out in Section 5.37 of the Borough Design Guide regarding extensions to existing residential properties advises that two storey side extensions

with flat roofs are not normally acceptable. It is considered that in this case, although the proposal is set back from the principle elevation, the flat roofed scheme would not accord with the Borough Design Guide as it would be visible from vantage points within the turning head of the cul-de-sac and it would be out of keeping with the elevational treatment of the existing dwelling and therefore would detract from the appearance of the premises and the surrounding area.

- 7.4 Furthermore, the two storey extension would also be detrimental in terms of the visual appearance of the existing streetscene because it would increase the amount of two storey development to almost the full width of the plot. Whilst views are limited to be within the turning head of the cul-de-sac due to the setting back of the proposed extension, the incursion into the existing space is important; the small amount of remaining space is not considered sufficient to counter-balance the large mass of the building. It would detrimentally impact the on the more typically spacious character of the cul-de-sac. Such an impact would be to such a detrimental extent that it would conflict with the requirements of paragraph 5.38 of the Borough Design Guide. The Borough Design Guide states that it is important that gaps are retained between buildings and the proposal subject of this report would result in a loss of space about the buildings. This would result in a cramped and congested corner of this cul-de-sac contrary to the requirements of Core strategy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document of the Havant Borough Council Development Framework.
- 7.5 The NPPF requires that Local Planning Authorities take a positive and proactive approach and work with applicants/agents on development proposals in a manner focused on solutions, in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187. However, in this case it is not considered that there is a solution that would overcome officer concerns on the impact of a first floor extension to the side of this dwelling. A revised proposal which incorporates a pitched roof to overcome the concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposed flat roof would not overcome the second concern, that being the loss of space around the dwelling which would result in detriment of the visual amenities of the streetscene.

(iii) Impact on neighbour amenity

- 7.6 When considering the policy context for the impact of development on neighbouring amenity, Policy CS16 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) builds on the guidance in the NPPF regarding the relationship of new development to neighbouring buildings and requires that new development should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through, amongst other criteria, loss of outlook. It is not considered that this first floor extension will cause an unacceptable level of over bearing to the adjacent neighbours to the north west of the site due to the mature, dense vegetation that separates the two dwellings and that it does not extended beyond the rear elevation of this adjacent neighbouring dwelling. In regard to all other dwelling surrounding the site it is considered that there is sufficient separation distances to avoid any unacceptable detrimental impact.

(iv) Impact on Trees

- 7.7 The proposal is over an existing footprint and does not move closer development to the TPO trees that are located to the rear of the site. If the application were to be permitted a tree protect plan would be required.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The proposed development is not considered to be acceptable in terms of its design in relation to the host property. In that it is of a flat roofed design and would result in development across virtually the full width of the plot. Therefore, the development would not meet relevant Local Plan policy and adopted design guidance. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.
-

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00703 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed extension, which incorporates a flat roof, is considered to be out of keeping with the elevational treatment of the existing dwellings and therefore would detract from the appearance of the premises and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and the Havant Borough Design Guide 2011.
- 2 The proposal would result in development of a 2-storey height across virtually the whole width of the plot, the resulting in a loss of space about the building in relation to the large mass of the building would be detrimental to the visual amenities and spatial characteristics of the streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and the Havant Borough Design Guide 2011.