
Site Address:	4 Blackdown Crescent, Havant, PO9 5AZ		
Proposal:	Second storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/15/00205	Expiry Date:	17/04/2015
Applicant:	Mr Ayling	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Bramble-Stewart	Case Officer:	Richard Nash
	GBS Designs		
Ward:	Battins	DMC Lead Member	

Reason for Committee Consideration:

Density:

HDS Recommendation: Wrong Application type for recommendation code

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises a mid-terrace two storey dwelling of traditional character and brick and tile finish, located on the south side of Blackdown Crescent, east of its southernmost junction with Ellisfield Road. The site has a small area of front amenity space and a rear garden and yard area, with single storey flat-roofed and conservatory-style additions to the rear of the dwelling. To the rear of the site, boundary treatment comprises fencing and trellis. The locality is predominantly characterised by high density residential land use.

2 Planning History

94/59683/001: Single storey rear extension. Approved.

99/59683/002: Single storey rear extension. Approved.

03/59683/003: Single storey rear extension. Approved.

APP/10/00525: Part retrospective application for fencing and railings on roof single storey extension. Refused 10th December 2010 for the following reason: *The proposed railings located at first floor level on the rear elevation are considered to be visually intrusive and would give rise to the use or the perception of the use of the flat roof as a balcony. This would adversely affect the amenities of adjacent properties and is considered to be an unneighbourly form of development.*

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The current application proposes the construction of a single storey rear extension, above an existing flat roofed extension that adjoins the western boundary of the site.

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

Development Engineer: No Adverse Comments.

County Ecologist: Consider that due to the location of the dwelling and its age and design there would be minimal likelihood of legally-protected species such as roosting bats occurring. No further comment to make in respect to ecology.

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2 objections.

Summary:

Bulk and siting not in character with locality.

Loss of light, sunshine and privacy to 8 Blackdown Crescent.

Overlooking of 2 and 6 Blackdown Crescent and also properties in Purbrook Way

Comment:

These matters are discussed in Section 7.

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) Impact on the application site and locality
- (iii) Impact on neighbouring amenity

- (i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to Development Management criteria. Furthermore, the provision of an extension to a dwelling of this scale and character would also normally be considered acceptable in principle.

(ii) Impact on the application site and locality

- 7.3 In relation to the host dwelling, the proposed extension would appear as a complementary and subservient addition. Excluding the gable and roof element, the bulk of the extension would be relatively small (approximately 35 cubic metres). The proposal would be constructed above an existing single storey extension of the same width and greater depth, with the result that no additional external amenity space would be lost.
- 7.4 The roof of the extension would be at a pitch of approximately 50 degrees, as opposed to the principal roof of the dwelling at 40 degrees. However, the ridge height of the proposal would be lower than that of the main dwelling and, given that the property is mid-terrace and the extension to the rear, the differing roof slopes would not generally be seen in tandem views, this should not appear too incongruous.
- 7.5 The extension is required to allow accessibility to the first floor for the Applicant's disabled son who is now at an age and size where use of a conventional stairlift within a cramped stairwell is becoming unfeasible. The proposed extension would allow for the installation of a lift large enough to accommodate a wheelchair, without the need to carry out substantial internal alterations to the existing dwelling. The proposed eaves and ridge heights are required in order to accommodate the lift frame and mechanism. The Applicant's particular needs are relevant to Policy CS16 (4) in this regard: *'All development should demonstrate that its design...Is inclusive by considering the needs of those with disabilities, ensuring safe and convenient access for all...'*
- 7.6 Given its siting the proposal would not be visible within the street scene. Although there are no similar extensions in the immediate vicinity, approval of this relatively modest extension, with its specific purpose, should not set a precedent for inappropriate development.

(iii) Impact on neighbouring amenity

- 7.7 The density of dwellings is particularly high in this locality, with the result that the proposal would be visible from a number of other properties. However, given the number of existing dwellings, extensions, outbuildings and other structures providing context and backdrop, it could not be said to have a detrimental impact in terms of outlook.
- 7.8 As noted above, excluding the gable and roof element, the bulk of the extension would be relatively small. Correspondingly, the element of additional blank brick walling adjoining 2 Blackdown Crescent (to the west) would be limited (approximately 7.5 cubic metres), with the roof sloping away from the boundary (albeit somewhat steeply). The distance between the proposal and other boundaries would be approximately 4.8 metres to the east and 8.7 metres to the south (rear). It is therefore considered that the proposal would be unlikely to result in a sense of overbearing effect on neighbouring properties.
- 7.9 The siting of the proposal is such that any shadowing to the properties to the south (in Purbrook Way) would be very limited and within the context of that emanating from the existing dwelling. Shadowing to the dwellings to the west and east (numbers 2 and 6 Blackdown Crescent respectively) would be limited to early morning and evening respectively, and mainly across outbuildings and a small area of rear amenity space

close to the dwelling in each case. The boundary of 8 Blackdown Crescent would be approximately 12 metres from the proposal and it is considered that any resultant shadowing to that property would be of a minimal nature.

- 7.10 As noted above, the density of dwellings is particularly high in this locality. Because of this, rear first floor windows tend to afford quite extensive views. As an example, first floor rear windows at the application site currently provide views into and across the rear gardens of dwellings in Blackdown Crescent, Purbrook Way and Ellisfield Road - this involves around a dozen properties in total, both immediately adjoining the site and further afield. It is likely that other properties offer a similar extent and/or range of views. It is however considered that actual and perceived overlooking from windows would be more limited than that afforded by a balcony area such as that refused under reference APP/10/00525.
- 7.11 The proposal seeks to reuse two of the existing rear first floor windows of the host dwelling. This would result in one window being moved approximately 5 metres closer to properties in Purbrook Way. The other would be moved to approximately 4.8 metres from the eastern boundary of the site, a similar distance as now from properties in Blackdown Crescent (6 *et sequentia* Even), but turned through 45 degrees so it would now face directly towards them. These changes would clearly alter the overlooking relationship between the existing dwelling and those to the south and east.
- 7.12 An amended drawing has been submitted showing a rearrangement of the windows, so that the proposed east side window would be obscure glazed and set closer to the existing rear wall of the dwelling. The proposed rear window has been reduced from 1.0m width to 75cm. Given this, and the extent and range of overlooking that already exists between dwellings in the locality, it is considered that a reason for refusal of the current proposal on the basis of overlooking could not be sustained.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed rear extension would be acceptable in principle and would provide an example of inclusive design. Furthermore, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the application site or locality, or a significant impact on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties. The planning application is therefore recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to Wrong Application type for recommendation code for application APP/15/00205, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date on which this planning permission was granted.
Reason: To comply with 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:

AYL 02 B (Proposed Elevations)
AYL 03 C (Proposed Floor and Roof Plans)

AYL 05 B (Proposed Block Plan)
AYL 06 B (Proposed Site Plan)
AYL 07 B (Location Plan)

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture those on the existing building.

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 2012.

- 4 The proposed window at first floor level in the east side elevation of the first floor extension hereby approved shall at all times be and remain glazed entirely with obscure glass, the particular type of which glass shall provide a degree of obscuration no less obscure than that which is provided by Pilkington's Texture Glass Obscuration Level 4. Furthermore no part of the window shall be openable, with the exception of the top light in the central casement, provided that the cill level of this top light is at least 1.7m above internal floor level and maintained as such at all times.

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 2012.

Appendices:...