

PLANNING APPLICATION FOR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT AND INTRODUCTION OF FIRST FLOOR BALCONY AT MULBERRY, MILL LANE, LANGSTONE, PO9 1RX

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT & SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

CONTENTS

1. Introduction.
2. Site and Area Appraisal
3. Policy Framework and Justification
4. Pre-Application Advice.
5. Design Statement.
6. Access Statement
7. Ecological and Arboricultural Report
8. Refuse Collection

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Statement is submitted in support of an application for the construction of a single storey extension to the front of Mulberry, Mill Lane, Langstone, PO9 1RX
- 1.2 This Statement will describe the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings, describe the proposed development and relate these to policy framework and previous site planning history. Design principles will be described to demonstrate that the proposed development is in accordance with the standard requirements for residential dwellings.

2.0 SITE AND AREA APPRAISAL

- 2.1 The application site lies within the original grounds of Flint House to the north of Mill Lane. The plots have been divided into those facing Mill Lane and those to the rear of these bounded by farmland to the north. Mulberry is one of these northerly plots sharing access with The Orchard. It is not visible from Mill Lane being set approximately 40 metres up a single lane driveway.
- 2.2 The site is 1470m² (0.147 Hectare) with a footprint of the existing house including ancillary buildings of approximately 200m². There is sufficient space around the dwelling for this extension to not cause concerns with maximisation of the site.
- 2.3 The existing house is traditional brick cavity construction with a peg tile roof. We understand that this dwelling and Orchard House were constructed by the family then owning Driftway House as dwellings for their children. The design of Mulberry is two storey chalet style from the

front with roof dormers set in a large pitched roof down to a single storey but with a more traditional two storey and roof to the rear and the previous extension.

- 2.4 The proposal is to provide additional floor area to the kitchen and utility room as a single storey extension and to roof this with a shallower pitched roof springing off the existing just below the pitched dormers.

- 2.5 Planning History for this site

APP/18/00083 – Fell 1No. Apple tree (T1); Fell 2No. Elder trees (T2 & T3); Fell 1No. Goat Willow Tree (T4),
APP/17/00062 – Single storey extension to front and side elevations. Pitched roofs and tile hanging to the existing dormers

APP/16/00866 – Cut back lower laterals (garden side) by 2.5m 1No. Ash; reduce height by 3m

APP/13/01161 – Reduce height of the hedgerow (Northern Boundary) by 3-4m and reduce laterals by 3m on southern side

APP/11/00902 – Fell 1No. Apple tree and reduce height (crown reduction) by 4m, 3No. Bay trees and 1No. Goat Willow

09/59527/005 – Fell 1No. Conifer tree and crown raise to 2.5m to 1No. Conifer

07/59527/004 – Fell Leylandii (only) and replant within the curtilage of Mulberry,

01/59527/003 – Crown raise up to 3m, removal of 2 lowest lateral limbs and deadwood a Mulberry tree (T1)

00/59527/002 – Two storey rear extension with attached conservatory, porch canopy to east elevation

99/63816/001 – Height reduction of a holly tree within Group 1 subject to TPO 1661

97/59527/001 – Two storey rear extension with attached conservatory (west elevation) and single storey rear extension

Only three of the above applications are for building development of which APP/17/00062 is the most relevant as it is for approval of a similar single storey extension to the front elevation.

- 2.6 The site is within Mill Lane Conservation Area but the building is not of any Special Architectural or Historic Interest, nor is it deserving of a special mention.
- 2.7 The mulberry tree in the garden of the application site (from which the site gains its name) has a Tree Preservation Order on it but it is not effected in anyway by these proposals.
- 2.8 The site is not prone to flooding (Flood Zone 1)

3.0 POLICY FRAMEWORK AND JUSTIFICATION

- 3.1 The proposals will be judged against the National Planning Policy Framework along with the following Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) policies

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)

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

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20 (Historic Assets)

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

- 3.2 The application site is situated within an established urban area and as such the development should be considered acceptable in principle
- 3.3 The site lies within Mill Lane Conservation Area and is subject to consideration under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. We believe that the proposals adhere to the policy of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the

Conservation Area.

- 3.3 The proposed front extension is smaller in footprint to that approved under APP/17/00062 so should not be seen as detrimental to the Conservation Area. In our opinion the introduction of a pitched roof over this extension back to the original roof is a far better solution to that approved previously and provides a more sympathetic aesthetic, making the extension look to be part of the original construction. We therefore believe that these proposals are appropriate to the host dwelling and meets the requirements of Policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan.
- 3.4 Materials used will match that of the existing dwelling in materials and colour. Matching bricks will be in Flemish Bond with verge detailing to match the existing. The new pitch roof is shallower than traditional for peg tiles, so a specialist membrane will be incorporated to ensure a watertight finish.
- 3.5 These proposals also include for a porch over the front door. Again, this is smaller than that approved under APP/17/00062, so we would assume that this too would not be detrimental to the character of the existing dwelling or the Conservation Area
- 3.6 An alteration to the first-floor front elevation is included in these proposals. The existing first floor bedroom window is to be replaced with full height opening doors giving access onto a new timber and glass balcony. This mix of traditional and modern is a well-accepted aesthetic within Conservation Areas and brings a balance to that corner of the property.
- 3.7 The previously approved proposals under APP/17/00062 included the conversion of the loft to habitable accommodation including roof windows gaining views of Langstone Harbour. This would also enable views across to The Orchard, however this was not to be an issue on that application as the separation distances and mature planting around the site were considered sufficient to avoid any significant loss of privacy. The introduction of the balcony on this proposal would also enable views into The Orchard however from a lower elevation this is greatly reduced from that above gutter level so should by inference also not be an issue.

4.0 PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

- 4.1 Pre-Application advice has been sought from Tina Pickup who was the Officer dealing with the previous application. Our request was for advice if these new proposals could be a Non-Material change or whether a new application had to be submitted

Her response by email to Chris Tomes on 27th June 2018 was:

I am of the opinion that yes, you will need a fresh application for the revisions – they are not non-material. With respect to the proposed balcony I recall that the site is quite private and well screened with sufficient separation to the boundaries – so the introduction of the first floor balcony is not out of the question. Provided there is no direct overlooking to any private garden area of any neighbour then the proposed balcony may be acceptable. I cannot guarantee the outcome of any such application which would be subject to a further site visit to assess the boundary screening and neighbour notification – but it is probably worth submitting.

With respect to the roof though I have quickly discussed this with our conservation officer who would object to the loss of the traditional peg tile roof which adds character to the conservation area. He has suggested as follows:

there is the Klobber Permo Extreme breathable membrane which enables the use of roof tiles down to pitches as low as 12.5 degrees (depending on the roof tiles being laid). This is a popular

option where an exact match to the existing roof tiles on the main roof is essential (such as clay handmade tiles) where the minimum roof pitch that the tiles can be installed at, being 35 degrees typically, precludes their use normally at such low pitches.

Perhaps you could investigate whether this would enable the use of peg tiles?

5.0 DESIGN STATEMENT

- 5.1 The proposal is for the construction of a single storey extension to the front elevation including a shallow pitched roof incorporating roof windows. This is smaller than that proposed and approved under application APP/17/00062 but alters the roof construction from a parapet roof around a central flat roof to a single pitched roof. We believe this to be a better solution to that previously approved.
- 5.2 Also included is a porch over the entrance door which is more modest than that previously approved and a first-floor bedroom balcony to the master bedroom with an alteration of the existing window to full height glass doors.
- 5.3 There is sufficient parking on site for this dwelling and is not compromised by these proposals
- 5.4 Materials and detailing for proposed walls and roof will match those of the existing building with the hope that this provides an extension that fits well into the existing dwelling.

6.0 ACCESS STATEMENT

- 6.1 The site is accessed off a shared drive with The Orchard and will not be altered by these proposals
- 6.2 Access to the dwelling is also not compromised by these proposals

7.0 ECOLOGICAL AND ARBORICULTURAL STATEMENT

- 7.1 These proposals do not affect any mature trees or those with preservation orders.
- 7.2 The modest extension to the property should have no impact on the ecology of the area.
- 7.3 The larger proposals previously approved were not deemed contrary to any local ecology or natural habitat.

8.0 REFUSE COLLECTION

- 8.1 No alterations required to existing facilities