

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE: APP/25/00526

APPLICATION TYPE: Full Planning Permission

PROPOSAL: First floor side extension.

SITE ADDRESS: 90 Stockheath Way, Havant, PO9 2DT

AGENT DETAILS: Miss Travers-Ayre
Thorns Young

APPLICANT DETAILS: Mr Durrell

CASE OFFICER: Robert Riley

TARGET DATE FOR DECISION: 27/08/2025

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a semi-detached two-storey dwelling located in Havant. The application site features a rear garden, and parking is provided to the front. To the side of the dwelling is a garage. The dwelling features brickwork for the external walls and concrete tiles in a gable design to the west side of the building.
- 1.2 The application site is in an urban and residential area, with the character of the street featuring similar properties, with little variation in external finishes.

2 Planning History

02/67118/001 - Single storey attached garage incorporating a porch entrance to existing front door., PERM,07/01/2003
02/67118/000 - Construction of single storey side/front extension forming garage and porch., PERM,24/06/2002

3 Proposal

- 3.1 First floor side extension.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020
N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Jason Horton

No comments received

Councillor Munazza Faiz

No comments received

Councillor Sharon Collings

No comments received

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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

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 design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (v) Parking

- (i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 The works would be readily visible in the streetscene.

7.4 Regarding the first-floor side extension it is noted that this would create a reasonable

increase of mass and bulk upon the dwelling, with the first floor addition being proposed to feature an approximate 3.4 metre width, an approximate 6.6 metre depth (approximately 7 metres with roof overhangs) and an approximate maximum 5 metre height to eaves with hipped roof above.

- 7.5 The potential for a terracing impact is considered to be important to assess due to the reduced separation at first floor level that would result between Nos 90 and 88 Stockheath Way's first floor side elevations. Whilst the works would abut the shared boundary, with the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD specifying two storey extensions should feature a 2 metre distance from the boundary, the existing side extension would not accord with the guidance from the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD which seeks a 1 metre separation from the boundary. Although the first floor element would not accord with the guidance, officers note that there is a significant separation distance at present between the side elevations of the dwellings of between approximately 3.4 metres to a maximum of approximately 5 metres. With consideration of this, although it would potentially increase a terracing impact, officers are not of the opinion that this separation would create a cramped and contrived appearance on the streetscene, and on balance do not consider it to harm the wider visual amenities of the area.
- 7.6 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD with regards to subserviency of side extensions, states "*It is important that the extension remains subservient to the main building, so it can be read which part of the building is the original and which is a later addition. Two storey side extensions should be set back behind the main building line. The ridge height of the extension can also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage. The angle of the roof should be the same as or similar to the existing roof. Flat-roofed extensions are not normally acceptable, particularly at two storey height*".
- 7.7 It is noted that the proposed first floor side extension together would feature a pitched hipped roof to attach to the gable roofed property, however it would not feature a reduced ridge line compared to the existing dwelling or be set back. In consideration of this, whilst it is noted it does not accord fully with the guidance from the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, the hipped design and relatively modest width of the extension (compared to the host dwelling) would promote subservience to the existing property and lessen the visual bulk upon the streetscene. Overall it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact upon the existing dwelling.
- 7.8 Regarding the streetscene, it is generally noted that most dwellings nearby do not feature side extensions, and on the officers site visit it was noted that there are no hipped roofs at first floor level in proximity to the application site. Notwithstanding this, officers note that the location of the proposal, where Stockheath Way angles towards Petersfield Road, would lessen visual impacts of the works, in effect making the visual elements of the works have a more localised impact. With regards to this, and the separation distance between Nos 90 and 88 Stockheath Way, it is on balance not considered to be so out of keeping and prominent to warrant the refusal of this planning application.

Materials

- 7.9 The proposal would feature matching materials to the existing dwellinghouse which is considered acceptable
- 7.10 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011. It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.11 The works are considered to acceptably impact properties to the front of the application site. No.92 Stockheath Way to the east of the application site is considered to be acceptably impacted by the works owing to the works occurring to the western elevation of No.90. Regarding properties to the rear, overshadowing and overbearing impacts are considered to be acceptable. The planning agent has agreed by condition for the rear window of the first floor side extension to be fixed shut and obscure glazed regarding overlooking issues. In light of this, properties to the rear are considered to be acceptably impacted regarding overlooking concerns and are considered to be acceptably impacted by the proposal.
- 7.12 It has been considered important to assess the impact upon No.88 Stockheath Way to the west of the application site, owing to the proximity of the proposal.
- 7.13 Regarding overlooking concerns, the front window to the proposed first floor side extension would face the public realm and is considered to acceptably impact No.88. The rear window owing to the angle of the property, would feature direct views into No.88's Stockheath Way's rear garden. Owing to these overlooking concerns that would warrant the refusal of this planning application, the planning agent has agreed for a condition for the rear window to be both obscure and fixed shut which will be conditioned if permission is forthcoming for this planning application. Subject to this the proposal is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, the proposal would not extend beyond No.88's rear elevation, regarding this, officers consider the rear and front of the property to be acceptably impacted. It has been considered important to assess the impact of the works upon No.88's side elevation and side access to the rear garden. Officers note that the side access to the garden would be impacted by the works, however, owing to that the proposal would not extend beyond No.88's rear elevation, and impact the rear primary amenity space, on balance officers do not consider this to be so unacceptable to warrant the refusal of this planning application. Regarding side fenestration of No.88 Stockheath Way, there is 1No. small side window at first floor level that would be impacted by the works, as it appears obscure, officers do not consider the impact upon this window to be unacceptable. There is 1No. door on the ground floor side elevation. It serves a hallway to No.88 Stockheath Way. The door would be substantially overshadowed by the proposal's bulk at first floor level, however, as this is not for a habitable room, officers do not consider this unacceptable. Regarding these considerations, on balance, No.88 Stockheath Way is considered to be acceptably impacted by the works.
- 7.14 Consequently, on balance, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and on balance would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011. It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.15 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

(v) Parking

- 7.16 The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 2 to 3. The Havant Borough Parking SPD requires two parking spaces with no increase required as a result of this development. It is noted that the garage and frontage parking would be retained.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and on balance would have a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/25/00526

Subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

LOCATION PLAN
Drawing number: 9128-25-0: BLOCK PLAN with parking plan
Drawing number: 9128.25.0: BLOCK PLAN
Drawing Number: 9128.25.1: Rev B EXISTING & PROPOSED FLOOR & ELEVATIONS

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 The external materials used shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.
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.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the rear first floor bedroom window shall be fitted with textured glass which features an obscuration level of no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall be fixed shut and retained as such thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.