
Site Address:	51A Serpentine Road, Widley, Waterlooville, PO7 5EE		
Proposal:	Two story side extension and single story rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/20/01040	Expiry Date:	14/01/2021
Applicant:	Mr Wingate		
Agent:	Mr Fletcher	Case Officer:	Jane Burton
	Emerge Architecture		
Ward:	Purbrook		
Site Visit Date:			

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

51A Serpentine Road is a two-storey detached dwelling on a corner position of Serpentine Road and Lone Valley. The dwelling is recently built, having gained planning permission under ref. APP/17/01182. The site was previously part of the garden/plot of no.51 Serpentine Road, the semi-detached dwelling to the west. The building is of a scale and design that fits in with the surrounding post war architectural style on Serpentine Road, with a hipped roof, and is constructed of brick to the ground floor with render to the first floor. The dwelling has block paving for parking to the front, and a rear garden with shed/outbuilding to the rear. The site has timber fencing to the side and rear boundaries, and timber gates providing access to the side. There is a gap of approximately 4m -3m between the side elevation of the house and the highway (varying due to the tapering of the site to the rear).

The surrounding area is residential, of medium density, and other than the application property there are several newer dwellings in the vicinity at no. 55 Serpentine Road, and land adjacent to no.78 Serpentine Road. On the opposite side of the corner is no.49 Serpentine Road which has been extended to the side, but still has a good gap between the 2 storey element and the highway boundary. Land rises to the south such that the properties in Lone Valley are higher, these are a mix of some bungalows and chalet style dwellings.

2 Planning History

APP/17/01182 - Erection of 1No, 3 bed detached dwelling (Approved 11.01.18), Request to discharge conditions 3, 4, 5 and 6 discharged on 25.05.18 (Including approved landscaping plan ref. 1037-5300, agreed boundary treatment, refuse and cycle store)

3 Proposal

The proposal is a part two-storey, part single-storey side extension incorporating a single garage, and single storey rear extension. The two storey element would be approximately 5.7m in depth, 7m in height, and would be set back from the front elevation by approximately 1.8m, and set down from the roof ridge by approximately 0.6m. The single storey side and rear extension would be approximately 3.3m in depth, with a height of 3.5m at the ridge, and 2.5m to the eaves. The extensions would be in positioned in close proximity to the side boundary, and would be almost full width at the rear, and extending 3m to the side of the existing house (9m in total). The rear of the two storey extension would be inline with the existing roof and rear building line.

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

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036
E1* (High quality design)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Gary Hughes
No comments received

Councillor Husky Patel
No comments received

Councillor Ms C Howard - Purbrook Ward
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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

No representations were received.

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

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area where residential development is acceptable in principle subject to compliance with the other policies of

the development plan and unless other material circumstances dictate otherwise.

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

- 7.3 Policy CS16 of the HBLP states that development should demonstrate that it its design responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and, amongst other requirements, a) Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic, or local character, and c) uses the characteristics of the locality to inform the development such as heights, massing and existing building lines.

No.51 is a new dwelling within an area of established character and on a site with a highly visible corner position. The site was formerly a garden/green area. The retention of a sense of space on the corner given the established character of the area was an important consideration in the assessment of the proposal for a new dwelling under planning ref. APP/17/01182. Pre-application advice obtained prior to the submission of APP/17/01182 advised that the spacious setting of the corner would be respected by maximising the gap to the highway in the design solution.

In the officer assessment under APP/17/01182 it was noted that the position of the new dwelling would be kept close to no.51, and as a result the separation to Lone Valley would be similar to the extension at no.46 on the opposite corner and would not encroach unreasonably beyond the building line within Lone Valley. It was concluded that the space on the corner was sufficiently respected not to cause any harm to the visual amenity or character of the area.

Pre-application advice prior to the submission of APP/17/01182 also advised that the visual impact of the extent of hardstanding for parking should be carefully considered and landscaping, boundary treatment, and refuse/cycle store details were approved by condition under APP/17/01182. The approved details included some greenery to the front and 2 x proposed trees on the site, as well as hedging inside a side boundary of 1.5m high timber fencing with trellis above.

The latest Street view imagery at the time of the report shows the whole of the front area to be block paved, with little vegetation to soften and the fence to the side has no trellis above.

Greenery would have benefited the streetscape, however despite the hard landscaped appearance from the public realm the site does still retain the sense of space to the corner, important to the character of the immediate area and street scene. The current side building line provides some balance with that of no.49 Lone Valley and would not extend excessively beyond the front building line on Lone Valley.

The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2014 provides further guidance stating *New developments should follow a common building line i.e. that defined by immediate neighbours and ensure there is an appropriate degree of enclosure that makes a street feel welcoming.* Further, the site has two frontages being a corner plot and guidance in relation to front extensions states; *Front extensions should not protrude too far forward from the main building, or be prominent in the street and should respect the common building line. Front extensions are therefore most appropriate where the building is set well back from the street, where there is a staggered building line, or in isolated countryside locations. Two storey front extensions will only be acceptable where the building is set well back from the street.*

Whilst it is considered that the single storey extension to the rear of the existing building would have an acceptable impact, the proposed development for a side extension would infill the space to the side, would be part two-storey height, and would extend to be in

close proximity of the side boundary (including at two storey height) in a prominent and highly visible position. The proposal would be overly prominent and would not retain the sense of space to the corner considered to be important to the character of the area and street scene.

Development at the site has already been carried out within an area of established character, and the acceptability of the layout/position of built form and its impact on the streetscape was set out in the previous planning assessment of the site.

Overall, due to its siting to the side, size, height, proximity to the side boundary, and position on a prominent corner, the proposed side extension under this application is not considered to respond positively to the local context and spatial characteristics/setting of the streetscape. The proposal is considered to be harmful to the character and visual amenity of the locality contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP, and it is recommended that the application is refused for this reason.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.4 No.51 Serpentine Road is the adjacent property to the west. The rear building line of no.51A is approximately in line with the main rear building line of no.51. Given that the proposed rear extension of no.51A would be single storey and set in slightly from the side building line, and not excessive in depth (3.3m) it is not considered that an unacceptable impact on the amenities of no.51 would result.

No.57 Lone Valley is to the rear of the site. No.57 has side facing windows, however due to the relationship of the extensions to this property it is not considered that unacceptable neighbour impacts would result. In addition, the proposals are at a sufficient distance from other (opposite) properties that no unacceptable neighbour impacts are considered to result.

- 7.5 Overall, it is considered that the proposal 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) in this respect.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and area contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP Core Strategy. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused for this reason.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/20/01040 for the following reasons

- 1 Due to its siting to the side, size, height, proximity to the side boundary, and prominent corner position, the proposed extension would fail to respond positively to the local context and spatial characteristics of the area, and would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and area contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.