

The Service Manager (Planning Development)
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire PO9 2AX

Your ref: APP/14/01153

Attention: Tina Pickup

Dear Sir

17 Tanners Ridge, Waterlooville PO7 5RF
Single storey front and side extensions.

1. We have been invited by Richard Garfoot to review your Council's refusal of his planning application APP/14/01153 and advise how he should best respond. We have visited the site and scrutinised the Officers' delegated decision report which led to the decision.

2. No.17 Tanners Ridge is a low-profile detached 'L'-shaped bungalow that stands on the west side of Tanners Ridge, immediately to the south of its junction with Sovereign Lane. It is a modest three-bedroomed bungalow with a substantial side-garden that is open to public view and offers little advantage to Mr Garfoot for the enjoyment of his private amenities. He has proposed a modest (2 metre) extension to the front bedroom and a more substantial (5 metre) extension at its northeast elevation. Both proposals would be subservient to the main building and reiterate the design principles of the host, in roof-pitch and the use of materials. While eleven neighbours were directly notified about the proposal only one commented about the accuracy of the boundary line and that matter was settled by the submission of amended plans on 21st November.

3. Your Officers' report relies on *unspecified* elements of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy CS16 and *unspecified* part(s) of the Design Guide SPD. The vagueness of the references makes it difficult to appreciate the particular concern that led to rejection of the proposal. It is apparent, however, that the 'Front/east extension' was acceptable because '*...it would maintain the strong building line within the street scene*' but the 'Side/north' extension was unacceptable because it '*...would encroach into the existing open plan grassed area that provides the setting to this bungalow and the character for this area...(and)...be overly dominant and imposing to the street scene*'. As one extension proposal was acceptable but the other was not, it is unclear why no advantage was taken of the opportunity to issue a 'split' decision, in order that the 'front' extension may be progressed while a resolution is sought for the 'side' proposal.

4. Core Strategy Policy CS16 re 'High Quality Design' sets down an array of criteria that are intended to apply to the gamut of proposals that will come before Havant Borough Council from across the whole of its administrative area between 2011 and 2026, so its tests are inevitably generalised and one needs to look hard to find a criterion that specifically relates to such a modest proposal as a single-storey domestic extension and have been set

down in the decision notice – criterion 1(a), for example, calls for a proposal to ‘...respond positively to existing features of...local character within or close to the proposed development site’ and criterion 1(c) calls for ‘...the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development, including heights, massing, existing building lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors’ but specific charges have not been laid down in the decision notice to record your Council’s concerns and point the way to a resolution. Section 21b.020.20140306 of Planning Practice Guidance requires the local planning authority to ‘...state clearly and precisely the full reasons for refusal, specifying all policies and proposals in the development plan that are relevant to the decision’. We would respectfully suggest the vague sweeping reference to Policy CS16 does not satisfy that test.

5. While Section 4 of the Officers’ report records that the ‘Havant Borough Design Supplementary Planning Document’ was relied upon, it is unclear which parts of its 51 pages actually led to the decision; further, the decision notice offers no assistance in that regard. Our scrutiny of the guidance relating to ‘Side Extensions’ has revealed calls for such a proposal to be ‘...subservient to the main building...the angle of the roof should be the same as or similar to the existing roof’. In similar vein, the ‘Single Storey’ advice calls for a proposal to ‘...be more modest in scale than the main building...The roof of the extension should mirror that of the main building, in terms of its angle, eaves detail, materials, doors and windows...(and)...Single storey extensions should therefore be at least 1 metre from the boundary with adjacent properties’.

6. We have visited the site and scrutinised the detailed requirements of Core Strategy CS16 and the ‘General Guidance on Extensions’ set down in the SPD. We have come to the judgement that all of those requirements would be satisfied if the side extension was to be reduced from 5 metres to 3.5 metres in width; we have advised Richard Garfoot to present a revised proposal to that effect. We naturally hope that you will find that arrangement acceptable but please do not hesitate to call or email Martin Moyse if you continue to have concerns, in order that Richard Garfoot may reconsider his position. Thank you.

Yours faithfully



Robert Tutton
Director