
Site Address:	7 Frogmore Lane, Waterloooville, PO8 9QN		
Proposal:	Single storey side and rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/13/00932	Expiry Date:	11/11/2013
Applicant:	Mr J Malone	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr C Allchurch	Case Officer:	Jenna Shore
Ward:	Hart Plain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site consists of a detached two storey dwelling with a pitched roof. To the rear is a single storey extension with a mono pitch roof. To the south is a detached two storey dwelling of similar design this dwelling is however slightly longer in length than that of No.7. A driveway width provides some separation between the two dwellings and a 1.5-1.8m hedge forms the boundary.
- 1.2 To the north is a detached chalet bungalow with dormers to the front. A 1.8m fence forms the boundary.

2 Planning History

No planning history

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks to erect a single storey side and rear extension.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework

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

Saved Policies of HBDWLP 1996 - 2011 forming part of HBLDF

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 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.

Three letters of objection have been received from one address outlining the following concerns (one letter addressed to Havant Borough Council, two letters addressed to the applicant):

- 1) Why are no measurements shown on the plans
- 2) The proposal is in close proximity to the boundary. Why is the proposal on the boundary and not to the statutory 1m separation
- 3) The side elevation is shown to be parallel when there is a foot difference between the original building and the boundary fence.
- 4) The proposal will result in a loss of light and is unlikely to be rectified by the velux windows. Electricity bills will increase
- 5) The walls are greater in height than the boundary treatment
- 6) The proposal will create a wind tunnel affect
- 7) Noise levels will increase
- 8) There is likely to be flooding if the guttering is not cleared regularly. How will access to maintenance be made
- 9) Concerns relating to construction, hours of work, access requirements to neighbouring land
- 10) Outlook of the dining room will be affected
- 11) The close proximity will effect privacy
- 12) The design and appearance is out of keeping

6 Planning Considerations

6.1 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) Effect on neighbours
- (iii) Effect on the character of the existing dwelling and the streetscene

(i) Principle of development

6.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, consequently development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development control criteria.

(ii) Effect on neighbours .

6.3 The proposed rear element of this application is noted to be long in length but is however within the threshold of the recent changes (August 2013) to the General Permitted Development Order 2008 (the rear section in isolation) allowing up to 8m rear extensions to the rear of dwellings. The rear section of this application is 7m. Typically such an extension may not have been viewed favourably however weight can be given to what could be achieved without the benefit of planning permission and in this case the length falls short of this.

6.4 A 45 degree test from the rear elevation of No.5 Frogmore Lane indicates that the

proposal is unlikely to result in so serious an impact to the outlook and light available to the rear windows of No.5 as to form a reason for refusal. The design shows the ridge at its highest point is located 4m north of the boundary with the extension at its lowest is being sited adjacent to the shared boundary with No.5. The design is therefore considered to reduce the perception of mass sloping bulk away from the boundary. The length of the garden at both No.5 and 7 is considered to accommodate an extension of this length whilst still leaving a large expanse of garden without development adjacent.

- 6.5 The number of windows to the roofslope facing No.5 Frogmore Lane is considered to be significant however the siting and height of the bottom sill above head height limits the potential for overlooking to the south and is consistent with current Permitted Development rules such that a sustainable reason for refusal could not be made.
- 6.6 To the north the extension does have the potential to cast a shadow over the rear patio area of No.9 Frogmore Lane. However, the height of the 2.9m is within the Permitted Development threshold. It is possible that the extent of the shadow cast would be marginally greater than that created by the 1.8m fence which forms the shared boundary. It is unlikely that the proposal would lead to an adverse impact. Much of the proposal at length is likely to be screened by a garage located to the south/rear of No.9. Due to this garage it is unlikely that the proposal would appear overbearing or visually intrusive. This is again supported by the 45 degree test which would indicate that the extension would not result in a loss of outlook to the rear garden of No.9.
- 6.7 The proposed side extension is located in close proximity to shared boundary with No.5. However this element of the proposal is considered to fall within the threshold of Permitted Development. The impact that is created would be similar to that of a development which has not benefited from the requirement for planning permission.
- 6.8 In response to questions stated within objection letter:
- Measurements are not required to be annotated on the plans, they are however drawn to a scale as highlighted on the plan.
 - In planning terms a dwelling can be extended up to and on the boundary. The logistics of such a close build may be highlighted as part of a building control application.
 - The site was not noted to taper significantly down the length of the garden so much so that the extension to the rear would encroach over the boundary
 - Light - the application site is north of the neighbouring property. The north facing elevation of the neighbouring property does not receive direct sunlight, light availability is consequently unlikely to be made significantly worse.
 -

(iii) Effect on the character of the existing dwelling and the streetscene .

- 6.8 The streetscene of Frogmore Lane consists of houses with a variation in design, size and use of materials. There is very little consistency or thread of design which runs throughout the streetscene. The application site and No.5 Frogmore Lane are very similar in design and size but are the only pair of dwellings of this type in the streetscene.
- 6.9 The side extension is the only element to be clearly seen from the streetscene. The extension is set back from the original front wall of the dwelling causing it to appear

subservient to the original dwellinghouse. With this extent of set back it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to result in an adverse impact to the character of the streetscene

- 6.10 The proposal does add an extensive amount of bulk to the rear of the property, however the design is considered to be appropriate with the ridge line and roof slope matching that of the original dwelling. The proposal is therefore unlikely to result in an adverse impact to the character of the original dwelling.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 The scale, siting and design is unlikely to result in an adverse impact to neighbouring dwellings or the character of the streetscene.

8 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/13/00932 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:

Location and block plan drawing number PL.00 received by the Council 16th September 2013
Existing elevations and floor plan drawing number 01 received by the Council 16th September 2013
Proposed elevations and floor plan drawing number 02 received by the Council 16th September 2013

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.