

1 Site Description

The site is located in residential street in Waterloooville called Gladys Avenue. It contains a mixture of both bungalows and two-storey dwellings, some of which are detached and some of which are semi-detached. The site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey property with a flat roof, attached single garage, porch and pitched roof canopy over the porch and the bay window. The front garden area has been paved to provide on site parking for approximately three vehicles. The rear garden is enclosed by a 1.8m high fence.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

To provide a first floor extension over the existing flat roof garage. The original plans proposed an extension which would extend the depth of the existing first floor, with the front building line sitting flush the existing front building line of the main house. The roof would be pitched with a hipped corner and would tie into the roof of the main dwelling. The garage would be retained at ground floor.

However, following officer concerns over the potential terracing impact which may occur, the plans were amended to show the extension set back by 500mm from the front elevation and also the roof set down by 200mm from the main ridge.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies
NPPF

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF
CS16 (High Quality Design)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None required.

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: 5

Number of site notices: 0

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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) Appropriateness of the design and effect on the streetscene
- (iii) Effect on the neighbouring properties

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The site is located in an urban area whereby development is considered to be acceptable subject to other development control considerations.

(ii) Appropriateness of the design and effect on the streetscene

7.3 The proposed roof would be separate to the main roof but would match in style and roof pitch and would therefore tie in sympathetically. The extension would be suitably subservient in terms of width and would be set back from the front building line which would achieved a degree of subservience. Matching materials are proposed.

7.4 The attached neighbour at No. 26 has been extended previously in a similar way to the proposal. However, this extension is not set back from the front building line, nor is the roof set down. No's 26 and 28 are a pair of semi-detached properties which are flanked either side by two further pairs of semis. By extending out to the side, there is a risk of creating a terracing effect by closing up the gaps between the pairs of properties. However, as the scheme has been amended to show the extension set back from the front building line and set down from the main ridge line, the extension is more likely to read as an extension, rather than a continuation of the main house and therefore should lessen the terracing effect. Although the gap would be lost to a degree, the set back sections would achieved some degree of spacing. Therefore on balance it is considered that the extension does accord with the advice laid out in Policy CS16 of the Local Plan.

(iii) Effect on the neighbouring properties

7.5 The extension would extend out the shared boundary with No. 30. As No. 30 has not been extended at the side there would be a separation gap between No. 30 and the side elevation of the extension of 3m. No windows are proposed in the north elevation of the extension and there is only an obscured landing window in the first floor side elevation of No. 30. Therefore it is unlikely that a loss of privacy or outlook would occur. The extension would be slightly set forward of the front building line of No. 30 however, this would be minimal and would not affect the outlook from the front elevation.

8 Conclusion

Given that the plans have now been amended to set the extension back and down from the main ridge, on balance it is considered that they now accord with Policy CS16

of the Local Plan and the application is therefore recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00471 subject to the following conditions: