
Site Address:	17 Garden Close, Hayling Island, PO11 9AD		
Proposal:	Erection of a rear tiled roof extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00543	Expiry Date:	16/09/2024
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Phillips		
Agent:	Mr Nahid	Case Officer:	Robert Riley
	Crofton HIC		
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a two-storey detached dwellinghouse located on Hayling Island. The application site features a front and rear garden with ample parking provided by a driveway to the front and side of the dwellinghouse. The property's materials feature brickwork and tilework for the external walls and brown concrete tiles in a gable pitch design for the roof.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that would be considered urban and residential with other properties on the road having similar appearances.

2 Planning History

APP/23/00995 - Certificate of lawfulness relating to proposed construction of rear dormer., PERM,11/01/2024

3 Proposal

- 3.1 This application seeks the erection of a rear tiled mono-pitched roof extension with 2No rooflights to serve a dining room with a proposed width of approximately 7.2 metres, a proposed depth of approximately 4.5 metres and a proposed ridge height of approximately 3.9 metres and a proposed eaves height of approximately 2.4 metres. The application also seeks the installation of window at ground floor level on side elevation.

Officer Note

- 3.2 The proposed floor plans have omitted the room usage of the proposed rear extension, however in an email uploaded on 17/9/24 the agent has confirmed it would be used as a dining room.

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)

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

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 Jonathan Hulls

No comments received

Councillor Paul Gray

No comments received

Councillor Wilf Forrow

No comments received

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre

Within 50 metres: Notable and Protected species: Long-eared Bat Roost

Within 50 metres: Notable and Protected species: Stag Beetle

Officer note:

The works would be of a modest scale and at ground floor level, regarding this, the works are considered unlikely to have an unacceptable impact on these notable and protected species.

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: 19

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Comments received relate to proximity	This proposal has been subsequently

of proposed build to neighbouring property (points 1-7) 8. Other properties in very close proximity that have had rear extensions have all considered any effect on neighbouring properties. As such all have retained the existing one metre gap between the existing building side line and boundary fence. None of them have been built up to the boundary line.	amended and would no longer be built up to the building line, and has been amended to be in line with the existing dwelling.
[redacted] I am greatly concerned over a worrying precedent which may be set by permitting the construction at No. 17 of a rear, pitched roof extension, built up to and including the boundary fence [redacted]. My objections are as follows: Points 1-5 relate to impact of build so close to boundary (summarised) 6) All detached properties in Garden Close were originally built with a minimum 1 metre space between house and boundary fence. All previous extensions have honoured this metre and have been constructed with minimal interference or encroachment onto neighbours land. 7) The owners of the property at No. 17 are well able to build an extension on their own land, retaining the one metre space up to the boundary fence [redacted] 8) I would have no objections to this proposal if the outer wall of the extension was built in line with the existing house.	See comment above.

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) Ecology

- (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

Character, bulk and the streetscene

- 7.3 The rear extension would only be visible at certain vantage points on the streetscene and is therefore considered to be acceptable regarding visual amenities. It would furthermore, feature a modest height and width and would have a modest increase of depth on the existing dwelling. It is considered that regarding this, it would be appear to be a modest, in keeping and subservient addition upon the dwelling and therefore acceptable. The proposal for a side window at ground floor level is also considered acceptable with regards to visual amenities and impacts of character on the dwelling.

Materials

- 7.4 The proposal would use materials to match the existing dwellinghouse, which is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.5 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

- 7.6 To the north are properties fronting onto St Mary's Road. Due to the scale of the proposed extension and a separation distance, the extension is not considered to create any demonstrable harm to these properties, in terms of a loss of light, outlook or privacy. To the northwestern and southeastern sides of the dwellinghouse are Nos 18 and 16 Garden Close. Due to the location, nature and scale of the works, properties to the front and rear of this property are considered to be acceptably impacted.

No.18 Garden Close

- 7.7 The proposal for a new side window at ground floor level would face No.18 Garden Close's side wall, however this appears to be a flank wall and furthermore, the window would be at ground floor level, regarding this, it is considered to have an acceptable impact. The rear extension would not feature any fenestration facing No.18 and is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns with any rear fenestration facing the rear garden. The rear extension would feature an approximate 1.5 metre separation distance from No.18's curtilage, however, in consideration of its proposed modest height and scale, and that it would not face any windows at No.18's side elevation, officers have considered that it would not be unacceptable regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns.

No.16 Garden Close

- 7.8 The proposal for a new side window at ground floor level would face No.18 Garden Close and would not impact No.16 Garden Close. The rear extension would feature fenestration facing No.16, however, it would only be able to provide views of outbuildings, No.17's rear garden and No.17's shared boundary treatment and is considered acceptable with regard to its side fenestration. Furthermore, its rear

fenestration would face the rear garden and boundary treatment which is considered acceptable. Regarding overbearing and overshadowing concerns, the rear extension would feature a separation distance from No.16's curtilage of approximately 4.5 metres at this distance and in consideration of the proposed modest height of the rear extension it is not considered that the rear extension would have an unacceptable impact.

- 7.9 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and 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 2 letters of objection were received with respect to the superseded plans.

(iv) Ecology

- 7.10 The application site has been found to be within 50 metres of notable and protected species; Long-eared Bat Roost and Stag Beetle. However in consideration of the modest scale of the works and that it is at ground floor level, officers consider that harm to these protected species would be unlikely. In consideration of this, officers consider that this proposal would accord with Policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

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 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/24/00543

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:

AMENDED BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 20/8/24
AMENDED EXISTING FRONT AND REAR ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 20/8/24
AMENDED EXISTING GROUND FLOOR PLAN: Uploaded 20/8/24
AMENDED EXISTING SIDE ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 20/8/24
AMENDED LOCATION PLAN: Uploaded 20/8/24
AMENDED PROPOSED FRONT AND REAR ELEVATIONS: Uploaded

20/8/24

AMENDED PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN: Uploaded 20/8/24

AMENDED PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 20/8/24

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.