
01 Application Number: APP/10/00558

Ward: Hayling East

Site Address: 3 Sunshine Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 9TF

Applicant: Mr Balkwill

Team: 2

Agent: Mr P Walker

Case Officer: Mrs H Lealan

8 Week Date: 20/10/2010

Reason for Committee Consideration: At the request of the applicant

Proposal: First floor front extension. (Revised Application)

EHPBE Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 No. 3 Sunshine Avenue, Hayling Island is a detached two storey property situated on the western side of the cul-de-sac. The streetscene consists of similar such detached and link detached residential properties. The front boundaries of the dwellings are unmarked thus the streetscene has an open nature.
- 1.2 The property has an integral single garage and space for two further cars to be parked on hardstanding to the front of the property.
- 1.3 The design of the dwelling houses vary somewhat, most incorporating a single gable to the front elevation.

2 Planning History

05/65451/000

Single storey rear extension – Permitted.

10/65451/001

First floor extension to front of property - Refused and subsequent appeal dismissed. The Inspectors report is attached as Appendix E.

Reason for refusal:

The proposed first floor extension would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building and character of the streetscene and would therefore have an adverse effect on the visual amenities of the area. As such the development would be contrary to saved Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011, which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework

3 **Proposal**

- 3.1 The proposal is for the erection of a first floor extension to the front of the existing dwelling. This is a revised application following the refusal of application 10/65451/001 and subsequently dismissed appeal. The works would not increase the number of bedrooms but would increase the size of the bedroom towards the southern side elevation to the front of the property. This revised submission includes a hipped roof in place of the gable roof submitted under previous refusal 10/65451/001.

4 **Policy Considerations**

National Policies

PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development)

Saved Policies of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011 forming part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework
D1 (High Quality Design)

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: 9

Number of site notices: None

Statutory advert: N/A

Number of representations received: There have been no neighbour representations sent direct to the Council at the time of writing the report, the consultation period ends on the 7th October and DMC will be updated by addenda of any subsequent representations received within the consultation period.

However, the applicant submitted 14 signed neighbour letters as supporting material as part of the application. These letters are summarised below.

Summary:

- 6.1 We do not believe the proposed extension will have any detrimental effect on number 3 itself; the surrounding streetscene or on us individually and are pleased to confirm support.

Comment: See section 7.

- 6.2 The proposed extension does not seem disproportionate to other work done on the estate.

Comment: See section 7.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 The development plan identifies the main considerations in relation to the proposal as:

- (i) Appropriateness of the Design and the Effect on the Streetscene
- (ii) Effect on the Neighbouring Properties;

(i) Appropriateness of the Design and the Effect on the Streetscene

7.2 This application is a revised scheme for a first floor front extension. The initial application, 10/65451/001, for a first floor extension to the dwelling was refused because it was considered that the development would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building and character of the streetscene and would therefore have an adverse effect on the visual amenities of the area. This application was subject to a subsequent appeal which was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. The Inspector concluded that *"the new gable would be larger than the existing and would add to the mass and bulk to the first floor of the building. Although gables are a feature of houses in this area they are generally well spaced along the street frontage of the buildings. The proposal would result in two large adjoining gables of differing size on one dwelling which itself is close to its neighbours on each side. Having regard to the prominence of the site in the streetscene, and its visibility from both Sunshine Avenue and Old School Drive, I consider that the proposal would be a massive extension that would unbalance the host property and be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area"*. The Inspectors report is attached as Appendix E.

7.3 The revised design does not successfully overcome the Council's nor the Inspector's previous concerns regarding the detrimental impact of the front extension on the character and appearance of the building, the street scene and surrounding area. The proposed first floor extension to the front elevation is still wider than the existing front gable and as such the width and bulk is not much reduced in scale than the previous refusal. Furthermore, the new design has a greater detrimental impact on the character of the property as it introduces a new design element; a hipped roof to the first floor proposal. This additional element, in addition to the bulk and mass proposed, would present a frontage lacking in design cohesion to the visual detriment of the streetscene.

7.4 The applicant ascertains that the Planning Inspector dismissed the appeal purely on the gable roof element of the proposal. It is the Council's opinion that the Inspector supported the full reason for refusal given by the Council in that he had concerns regarding the overall bulk and mass of the extension. It is not considered that the bulk and mass have been reduced to an acceptable scale through the proposed hipping of the roof.

7.5 It is not considered that there are relevant examples of front extensions within the immediate vicinity that set a precedent for the permission of this scheme. Furthermore, PPS 1 clearly states that *"design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted"*. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.

(ii) Effect on the Neighbouring Properties

- 7.6 It is not considered that the proposal will detrimentally impact the amenities of the residents of the adjacent dwelling to the south of the site, No.1, to an unacceptable extent. The proposed first floor extension will extend to a similar depth as the first floor front elevation of this property. The applicant has submitted with the application supporting letters from surrounding neighbouring properties. However, consideration must be had not only to residential amenity but to the impact upon the wider locality. In this regard the submitted revision does not only fail to overcome the previous reason for refusal, but strengthens it due to an increased lack of design cohesion with the main dwelling house.

8 Conclusion:

- 8.1 It is considered that there would be an adverse impact on the appearance of the building and character of the streetscene. The recommendation is to refuse the application.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head – Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/10/00558 for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed first floor extension would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building and character of the streetscene and would therefore have an adverse effect on the visual amenities of the area. As such the development would be contrary to saved Policy D1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011, which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1.

Appendices:

- (A) [Location Plan](#)
 - (B) [Site Plan](#)
 - (C) [Existing Elevations](#)
 - (D) [Proposed Elevations](#)
 - (E) [Copy of Inspectors' Appeal Decision 10/65451/001](#)
 - (F) [Addenda/corrigenda](#) (if appropriate)
-