
Site Address: 5 Lone Valley, Waterlooville, PO7 5DZ
Proposal: Prior notification for single storey development extending 4.7 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 2.6 metres and a maximum height of 2.6 metres.
Application No: APP/14/00148 Expiry Date: 26/03/2014
Applicant: Mrs J Hutchings Team: Team 1
Agent: Case Officer: Daniel
 Gender-Sherry
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED AND REFUSED**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 5 Lone Valley is a semi detached bungalow with first floor accommodation in the roofspace. The property is rendered externally and has a tiled roof. It is set back from the Lone Valley, located at the convergence of Bushy Mead, Lone Valley and Valley Close.
- 1.2 The gardens of number 5 and its attached neighbour, number 54 Bushy Mead are rather irregular in shape. The area closest to the rear of the dwelling narrows on one side as you progress down the garden, resulting in the width changing from 7 metres at its widest point to 3.6 metres and then remaining at this width for the remaining length of the garden, the garden of No.54 Bushy Mead mirrors this. The reason for the narrowing of the garden on this property and its attached neighbour results from the corner plot location and the relationship to adjoining properties.

2 Planning History

04/69255/000 - Roof extension to form gable end, dormer window to front and rear elevations. Permitted April 2004

3 Proposal

- 3.1 This prior approval application is for the construction of a single storey rendered rear extension extending a maximum of 4.7 metres beyond the original dwelling, incorporating a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.6 metres.
- 3.2 The requirements of the amendment to the GPDO in regard to the Prior Approval Process states that "where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority is required as to the impact of the proposed development of any adjoining premises".
- 3.3 This report considers a representation made by the adjoining neighbour in regard to the perceived impact of the proposal and the findings of site visits, made to both the proposal site and adjoining dwelling. This officer report will then make a recommendation based on the same planning grounds/considerations as for a full householder planning application.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

The National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Council Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None

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: 2

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary:

(a) Overlooking and loss of privacy - *it is not considered that the proposal will create overlooking or loss of privacy.*

(b) Overshadowing and loss of light - *Noted*

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 character and appearance of the immediate area
- (iii) Impact on neighbour amenity

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The site lies in the built up area of Havant and as such further development in the form of extensions to existing residential properties is acceptable in principle so long as it accords with the development control considerations as set out below.

(iii) Impact on the character and appearance of the immediate area

- 7.3 The proposed rear extension is primarily visible from No.54 Bushy Mead and No.3 Lone Valley however in general design terms it is considered to be acceptable, reflecting the scale, materials and proportions of the host dwelling.

(ii) Impact on neighbour amenity

- 7.4 The adjoining dwelling to the north west (No.54 Bushy Mead) has previously extended approximately 2 metres out from the rear of the original dwelling. To the west of No.54 sits No.52 Bushy Mead which is designed in such a way that its rear most section extends along the immediate garden of No.54 up until the point where the garden narrows as previously mentioned. This currently existing relationship has by reason of its siting, height, mass and bulk a dominating presence upon the rear of No.54 and its immediate garden area. This would be exacerbated by the proposed extension of No.5 Lone Valley located to the south.
- 7.5 As a consequence the siting, height, depth, mass and bulk of the proposed extension would result in a tunnel effect to the rear dining area and outside amenity space of No.54 Bushy Mead. This is particularly unfortunate given the very restricted width of No.54's plot, the effect of existing neighbouring buildings and changes in levels. The proposal would therefore severely impact the outlook from the rear of this neighbour and would appear overbearing when viewed from the rear of this property and from the immediate garden area. In this respect it is considered that the development is contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, whereby subsection (e) states - All development should demonstrate that its design *"does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours....."*.
- 7.6 In addition to the above the design conflicts with guidance on rear extensions in the Havant Borough Council Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 which (para 5.41) requires rear extensions to have *"particular regard to neighbouring properties and should not cause an adverse effect....."*. Paragraph 2.02 of the Design Guide makes clear that the Guide's purpose is to supplement and help implement Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy.
- 7.7 The guidance from Policy 16 of the Core Strategy reflects the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly that planning decisions should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
- 7.8 It is considered that there would not be any adverse impact on the dwelling to the south due to that property already being extended to a very similar distance.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is concluded that the proposal would cause significant harm to the amenity of the neighbouring property to the north west, (No.54) and that therefore this prior approval should not be granted.
- 8.2 It is considered that the fall back position of a 3m rear extension, as allowed in accordance with the dwelling's Permitted Development Rights (still intact) under the GPDO is the maximum depth that should be permitted in this instance given the site constraints as described above.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to REFUSE application APP/14/00148

(A) for the following reason

- 1 The proposed extension would by reason of its proximity to the boundary, depth, height, mass and bulk result an overbearing impact on No.54 Bushy Mead and be harmful to the visual outlook from this property. This impact is further exacerbated by the existing restricted outlook and narrow plot width associated with No.54. This would result in the proposed extension having an unacceptable tunneling effect to the rear of No.54 Bushy Mead to the further harm of the occupants residential amenities. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the guidance contained with the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.