
Site Address:	33 Roman Way, Havant, PO9 3PR		
Proposal:	Single storey front extension.		
Application No:	APP/14/01005	Expiry Date:	21/11/2014
Applicant:	Mr Relf	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr Walker	Case Officer:	Richard Temple
	Island Design		
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site consists of a two storey semi-detached property with front and back gardens and driveway to side and garage to rear. The area is characterised by uniform semi-detached dwellings and is of medium residential density.

2 Planning History

No relevant planning history.

3 Proposal

The proposal is for a single storey front extension.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Borough Design Guide 2011

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Hampshire County Council, Strategic Environmental Delivery Group

The site is located close to the site of a Roman building. However the very small scale of the proposed extension (combined with the impact of the existing dwelling) leads me to believe that there is little merit to archaeological monitoring.

On that basis I would not raise any archaeological issues.

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: 2

Summary: Representations received from both adjacent neighbouring properties. Objections are on the grounds of:-

- overlooking to neighbouring properties
- design- that the front extension will be the only example in the street and it will disrupt the building line
- pressure on parking- that the extension of the front room may lead to further on street parking and the reduction of driveway size will also lead to further parking on-street
- non-planning issues such as third party wall agreement problems

Comment: These issues will be addressed in the main body of the report.

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) Design
- (iii) Impact on neighbouring residential amenity
- (iv) Parking

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The area is characterised by medium density residential properties and as such there is no objection to the principle of householder extensions.

(ii) Design

7.3 This would be the first front extension of this type within the street, although a number of properties have front porch extensions of various forms and designs. Number 27 has a front porch with pitched roof canopy spanning the width of the front elevation. As such the street scene is not uniform in this respect.

7.4 The extension would have a pitched roof to match the host property with materials to match existing. The extension is not considered large enough to alter the appearance of the property in the street scene to an extent that would warrant withholding planning permission. It is modest in size and its form is in character with the existing property and attached semi-detached property. As such the extension is considered acceptable in design terms.

(ii) Impact on neighbouring residential amenity

- 7.5 The extension would only project 1.55m adjacent to number 31 and 2.15m adjacent to number 35 (with the separation of the driveways). This coupled with the height of 3.6m sloping to 2.3m at eaves is not considered large enough to have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring dwellings. The impact would not be significantly different to the construction of a porch which are a common feature of Roman Way.
- 7.6 One of the objections points to the inclusion of the side window facing number 35 would lead to a loss of privacy to the front of that property. The side window would serve a porch and the side window would look over the driveway and front section of number 35. However, it is not considered that the porch would create a level of overlooking that would be damaging to the amenities of number 35 as this is the front garden not the more sensitive rear garden. The level of overlooking generated from a side window of a porch is not considered to be significantly different to the level generated from the steps to the front door. As such it is not considered expedient to include a condition to ensure the window is obscure glazed and fixed shut as this would be unreasonable.
- 7.7 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of impact on neighbour amenity.

(iv) Parking

- 7.8 Both objection letters refer to the issue of the proposal creating further on-street parking. However, there would not be an increase in bedrooms from the proposal, so it is not considered that the level of parking generation would increase. The extension would impinge on the driveway to an extent but would not result in it not being able to accommodate vehicles which currently park to the side of the house as well as to the front. It is not considered that planning permission could be withheld on the grounds of loss of off-street parking.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of the policies set out in section 4 and as such the proposal is recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/14/01005

(A)

(B) for the following reasons/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 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.

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

Site/Location Plan, Existing Ground Floor, Part First Floor, Section Drawing, Proposed Ground Floor & Existing and Proposed Elevations received 29th September 2014

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.