
Site Address:	55 Hollybank Lane, Emsworth, PO10 7UE		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage; two storey side extension; single storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/19/00544	Expiry Date:	07/08/2019
Applicant:	Mrs Tonkin		
Agent:		Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site relates to a detached dwelling with linked garage, located on the west side of Hollybank Lane, at its northern end close to Long Copse Lane. The site comprises one of 5 identical dwellings set in a row, back some 10m from the highway with a line of mature trees in their frontages. These trees form part of an Area TPO and the tree within the front of the application site is a Scots Pine which is suffering from fungus. The land slopes up slightly such that the dwellings and trees are above road level.

The gable fronted two storey dwelling is constructed of buff brick with red tile hanging at first floor. The side garage is flat roofed and constructed as a double, shared with the neighbour to the north at 57. The separation between the dwellings is good with the gap between 55 and 57 being wider due to the two garages side by side. This provides a relatively spacious character to the area.

None of the other dwellings in this row of 5 have any side extensions. There are no parking restrictions on this part of Hollybank Lane, although it is relatively narrow.

2 Planning History

APP/11/01869 - Fell 1No. Pine tree within Area Order 1 of TPO 0088.,
REF,31/01/2012

3 Proposal

Demolition of existing garage; two storey side extension; single storey rear 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

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

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

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

I have viewed the Pine tree subject to TPO at the front of the property on a number of occasions and noted two different types of basal decay fungi known as *Sparassis crispa* and *Phaeolus schweinitzii*, both of which cause root decay. Whilst the proposal will not impact the tree I strongly urge the applicant to remove this tree as soon as possible without the need for a formal application. I have written to the applicant previously to advise them of this and referred it to Hampshire Highways as should the tree fail this would impact the highway.

Arboriculturalist, Havant Borough Council

I have no objection to the revised proposals, including the removal of the TPO'd Pine. There is a requirement to plant a replacement tree, and details of the replacement could be submitted as part of the application. I would suggest a *Quercus robur* (Oak).

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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Looking at the plans I think that the proposed application results in an over development of the plot and is not in keeping with the neighbouring houses. This is especially relevant to the proposed two story extension on the north side of the property. It takes the building to the extreme limit of the boundary by demolishing one side of a shared single story garage with a two story extension which will extend beyond the limits of the existing garage. A single story extension on this	see section 7

side of the house would be more in keeping. I do also have some major concerns regarding the arrangements for the parking of the building contractors vehicles. Hollybank Lane is 3.5 metres wide at the point directly outside of the house. This means that when the road is clear two vehicle are unable to pass each other without one of the vehicles giving way. There is also blind bend turning into Long Copse Lane. Any building contractor vehicles parked in these areas during construction, including the grass verge opposite, will cause major disruptions and create a dangerous situation on the blind bend. Any parking at these points in the road would be in breach of Highway Regulations. There needs to be a stipulation in any planning decision that all construction vehicles must be parked further down Hollybank Lane where the road is at its widest and this must be strictly adhered to. No vehicles should be parked north of 54 Hollybank Lane.	Householder development does not usually warrant a Construction Management Plan - all vehicles need to comply with Highways Regulations - any issues a Police matter; and any disruption from construction traffic an unfortunate temporary inconvenience; Informatives can be added re hours, bonfires etc Not possible to condition matters beyond application site
While acknowledging our neighbours need for more living space we have concerns about the scale of the proposed extension and wish to make the following comments. 1. It is a large extension which would make it out of character with the rest of the houses in the row. These are 1960's built detached houses, all with a single story extension of some kind at the back but nothing more. The upper storey would halve the distance between the houses. If a future owner of our house extended in the same way they would become semi detached. 2. It is noted that the double storey proposed extension extends further at the front and back than the current single storey garage it is replacing. Number 55 is almost due south of us and the second storey at the back	Noted - see section 7 below See section 7 below

would noticeably restrict the time any sunlight falls to the back of our house during the winter months.	
3. This is a subsidence prone area. Both houses and the garage have had work for subsidence carried out within the last twelve years.	Not a planning matter - but Building Regulations
4. We are very concerned as to the safety of our half of the garage, this being our main storage space. At present the garage belonging to ourselves and number 55 is a double garage built from bricks with a breeze block partition down the middle. From the plan it would seem that the partition would become our outside wall with a trench several feet deep, for foundations, being dug in close proximity. We would certainly want to know what safeguards would be in place for our property and how the roof, which is at present continuous over the full double garage and boundary would be adapted.	Development proposal wholly within application site and hence any impact on shared garage wall a matter for the Party Wall Act. Both neighbour and applicant advised of this

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) Effect on TPO tree
- (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.

7.3 The proposed alterations would result in the demolition of half of the garage, effectively exposing a previously internal wall - although it is noted that the cross section plans show the roof of the neighbours garage linked across and affixed to the wall of the proposed two storey side extension, enclosing it again. Any dispute relating to this party wall would be a matter for the Party Wall Act and the applicants are aware of this requirement.

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

7.4 The proposal would result in a two storey side extension right up to the shared

boundary and such extensions can erode the space and setting and result in a "terracing effect". However it is noted that in this case the front facade of the two storey side extension would be set back by 3.5m (2.5m to porch canopy) and the ridge line stepped down by 0.8m from the main ridge. The roof slopes away from the shared boundary and the rear element is hipped. It is considered that the design is sympathetic and subservient to the host dwelling and would not be unduly dominant in the street scene. It is noted that as part of the works the existing tile hanging on the dwelling is proposed to be replaced with render, with render also forming the principal external material for the two storey extension. Whilst not a feature of the existing dwelling, it is noted that the adjacent property at No.57 features painted brickwork elevations, and the wider Hollybank Lane/Long Copse Lane street scene also features the use of render. As such, it is not considered that the revised elevational treatment will have a harmful impact on the character of the area.

7.5 On balance the fact that the dwelling is set back by 10m and then the proposed extension has a significant further set back of some 3.5m, overall it is considered that the extension would not be overly intrusive or dominant and would not result in any visual harm to the streetscene. The trees on the frontage also help to soften the appearance of the site. Given that the space between the application site and no 57 is the greatest within this row of 5 dwellings, then the partial erosion of this space is not considered to be overly enclosing or harmful to the visual character of the area. The potential terracing effect would not be so significant as to warrant a refusal in this case.

7.6 It is considered that the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed extension and the resultant private amenity space available commensurate with a 4 bed family sized dwelling and as such the proposal would not represent an overdevelopment of the plot. The design and appearance of the proposal is therefore deemed appropriate in context to the main building and streetscene and is considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). 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

7.7 The site lies due south of No 57 and as such the two storey side extension up to the shared boundary will result in some additional overshadowing over the curtilage of No 57. However it is noted that No 57 has its own flat roofed garage and behind that a wooden summer house style structure. This outbuilding has open sides to the garden but has a roof to provide shade. It is sited immediately behind the garage and up to the shared boundary. The proposed two storey extension is set back to align with the garage and hence it considered that the overshadowing resulting from the proposed development would largely fall across the neighbours garage and outbuilding with limited shadow falling beyond.

7.8 In terms of outlook the proposed extension will be visible from No 57 and it is acknowledged that the occupiers of No 57 will experience a degree of change to their outlook. However it is considered that the change would not be so significant as to be materially harmful. No 57 has a side door leading to a full width conservatory style rear extension - from within this habitable room the view is currently 180 degrees of their own garden with the garage viewable in the corner. The proposed two storey extension would undoubtedly come closer but would not impinge of the majority of the outlook from within No 57. Other side windows in No 57 include over the stairwell and bathroom windows but these are not considered primary habitable rooms. Overall it is

considered that by virtue of the side siting and separating garage then the main outlook over the garden would not be unduly impacted and harmful to the amenity of occupiers of No 57.

- 7.9 There are no first floor side windows proposed and the closest rear first floor window serves an en suite and would be obscure glass, helping to reduce the perception of overlooking. On balance, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overshadowing or overlooking 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).

(iv) Effect on TPO tree

- 7.10 The TPO'd Scots Pine tree at the front of the site is considered by HBC Arboricultural Officers to be in poor health suffering from fungus and is currently a danger. Therefore they have requested the tree be felled and replaced with a Quercus Robur (oak). The applicant is aware of this and willing to provide such a replacement, which can be conditioned.

(v) Parking

- 7.11 The site currently has a side drive and garage, but the garage would be lost as a result of the development which would provide a 4 bedroom dwelling. To meet the current Parking SPD 3 on site spaces are required and an amended plan has been provided showing the provision of the third on the frontage grassed area, under what is the canopy of the TPO'd tree. In light of the fact that this tree is to be removed and a replacement one provided within 1m then the precise planting location of a new young tree can accommodate any ground works and levelling required to provide the additional car parking space. A young tree would be able to grow and mature alongside the new car parking space. Therefore there is no objection to the proposed parking layout which meets the parking SPD and policy DM13.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 On balance, the scale, siting and design of the proposed two storey side extension would have limited and acceptable impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene and neighbours and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00544 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:

Site Location Plan Drawing No PD01 Rev B
Proposed Elevations Drawing No PD06 Rev B
Proposed Floor & Roof Plans Drawing No PD05 Rev E showing 3 car parking spaces
Sections Plan Drawing No PD07 Rev A
Statement regarding tree removal on Council's website dated 18 July 2019

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or 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 The existing Scots Pine TPO tree to be felled shall be replaced with a Quercus Robur (Oak). The replacement oak tree shall be a minimum 1.6 metres tall at the time of planting and shall comply with BS3936:Part 1:1992 and shall be planted in a position as near as practicable to the position of the tree to be felled. The replacement planting shall be carried out within the first planting season (November to February inclusive) following the date of felling of the existing tree.

If within a period of three years the tree planted as a replacement is cut down, felled, uprooted, removed, or dies, or becomes in the opinion of the Council seriously damaged or defective:

- a) the Council shall be notified as soon as is reasonably practicable; and
- b) another tree of the same species and size shall be planted in the same location at a time agreed in writing with the Council unless the Council agrees to dispense with or vary the requirement.

Reason: To conserve and safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and having due regard to policy CS11 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.