
Site Address:	73 Linkenholt Way, Havant, PO9 4AS		
Proposal:	Two storey side extension.		
Application No:	APP/14/00655	Expiry Date:	19/08/2014
Applicant:	Mr Couper	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Hinton	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Corinthian Architectural Design		
Ward:	Barncroft		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site lies on the south-western side of Linkenholt Way on the junction with Plaitford Grove and comprises an end-of-terrace two storey dwelling. The property is constructed of red brick beneath a red tiled roof and has a gable end. There is currently a small lean-to style conservatory on the end, south-eastern, elevation, another similar conservatory on the rear elevation, and a front porch with canopy roof across the whole frontage. A loft conversion has also taken place with a roof light fitted in each roof slope. At the rear of the garden, adjacent the boundary with 2 Plaitford Grove, is a detached flat roofed garage, and there are double gates in the boundary wall serving the garage.
- 1.2 The side elevation of the dwelling is currently set back 5.1m from the highway - Plaitford Grove. There is a boundary wall to Plaitford Grove comprising a 1.8m high brick wall at the edge of the highway, and at the corner onto Linkenholt Way the wall lowers to approximately 1m high. The whole frontage is block paved and available for the parking of cars - probably 3 cars could be parked off the highway, in an adhoc manner.

2 Planning History

02/65825/000 - rear extension and increase height of part of boundary wall to 1.86m
Permission 19/8/2002 *NB/ - appears wall was implemented but rear extension was not, which would make this pp extant*

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal involves removing the existing side conservatory and replacing it with a two storey side extension having a depth of 6.4m and a width of 5m. The eaves height would align with the main dwelling and the ridge is set down slightly, having an overall height of 8m. The design includes a bay window on the front elevation and just one window in the side elevation - at first floor level a bathroom window.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies
NPPF

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

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations), July 2014

AL1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

and Borough Design Guide, 2011

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Southern Water - Public foul sewer crosses site. If diverted a formal application must be made & there must be no loss of hydraulic capacity; 3m clearance either side must still be retained; no soakaways within 5m
Development Engineer - no adverse comment

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: 0

Summary:

Comment:

7 Planning Considerations

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Design and Impact on street scene
- (iii) Impact on neighbouring amenities
- (v) Highway and Public Sewer matters

- (i) Principle of development

- 7.1 The application site is located within a defined urban area for development plan purposes where the construction of an extension is acceptable in principle, subject to detailed considerations as follows:.

- (ii) Design and Impact on street scene

- 7.2 The proposed extension relates to the host dwelling and follows the overall design principles of the house. The ridge line is set down slightly but there is no recess back on the front elevation. However the size of the extension, at 5m wide is almost

doubling the size of the dwelling (the existing width is 5.7m). This is considered overly large and could be construed as tantamount to the creation of a new dwelling. The size of the proposed extension is considered to be excessive and of a mass that cannot be considered as an appropriately subservient extension.

- 7.3 The proposed width of the extension would extend the house right up to the existing boundary wall which sits at the back edge of the pavement. This would be particularly dominant and overbearing to the users of the highway and result in a loss of visual space about the dwelling on this prominent corner site. Opposite the site, No. 71, on the other corner, a single storey has been added to the side, but being single storey only it does not dominate the corner. Furthermore, it leaves considerable space to the side boundary retaining the appropriate visual openness on the corner. This would not be the case with the application at No 73 - being 2 storey so close to the highway boundary there would be no softening of the proposed mass and bulk which would harm the visual appearance of the street scene.
- 7.4 Furthermore the projection towards the highway extends considerably beyond the 'building line' of the terraced properties in Plaitford Grove. The strong uniformity of house alignment would be significantly encroached being harmful to this character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal is not considered to respect the immediate context of its surroundings and would be harmful to the visual amenity of the street scene. Therefore it does not comply with policy CS16 or the Borough Design Guide.

(iii) Impact on neighbouring amenities

- 7.5 Due to its corner location there would be no additional overshadowing or loss of privacy to adjacent residents as a result of the proposed extension. The only side window facing No 71 serves a bathroom and could be obscure glazed. The first floor window in the rear elevation serves a bedroom and would provide views down Plaitford Grove highway and not of any rear private garden area. Therefore in terms of impact on privacy and light, this proposal would be unlikely to cause any loss of amenity to neighbours.

(iv) Highway and public sewer matters.

- 7.6 It is not clear how many bedrooms in total this property would have as the loft area is not shown. But assuming there were 4 bedrooms, then 3 onsite parking spaces would be required. The front fore court area is hard surfaced and could probably park 3 cars; there is also the detached garage at the rear of the garden which could provide a further space if needed. Therefore it is considered that adequate car parking exists on site to serve the proposal.
- 7.7 The response from Southern Water and associated plan shows a main public foul sewer crossing the site. Whilst this does not prevent the issue of a planning permission, as it could be diverted, realistically this poses a significant issue for the applicant to overcome - particularly so as even if diverted it must still not be within 3m of any building or 5m of any soakaway. Given the tight linear layout of the surrounding area this would be difficult to achieve without diverting to the public highway. This issue must be noted on the decision notice as an Informative.

8 Conclusion

The construction of the proposed two storey extension, so close to the highways edge,

would represent an overly large and dominant building mass and bulk having a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the street scene and be harmful to the character of the area. This is contrary to policy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide and as such it is recommended to refuse the application.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00655

(A)

(B) for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its bulk and mass close to the back edge of the highway on a prominent corner location, would be an overbearing and incongruous feature within the streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. The siting of the proposed extension, forward of the building line set by development in Plaitford Grove, is not considered to respect the immediate surroundings and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the adopted Borough Design Guide, 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.