
Site Address: 48 Tournerbury Lane, Hayling Island, PO11 9DJ
Proposal: Single storey side and gabled roof extension to east elevation, enlarged front gable, and alterations to allow conversion of existing 3 bed detached dwelling to 2No. 2 bed semi-detached dwellings.
Application No: APP/17/01217 Expiry Date: 24/01/2018
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Wilkinson
Agent: Bernard E Cole & Partner Case Officer: Tina Pickup
Ward: Hayling East

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site relates to a detached bungalow that has dormer additions, located on the south side of Tournerbury Lane on the corner with Beech Grove. The bungalow has a render finish with white cladding in its front gable feature, beneath a red concrete tile roof; dormers red tile hung. The bungalow is set back from Tournerbury Lane by some 11m, vehicular access is in the north western corner with a frontage boundary wall approximately 1m high. This wall increases in height to approximately 1.6m where it runs adjacent the side boundary with Beech Grove and includes a second vehicular access via high gates at the southern end. The applicant runs a business which necessitates the parking of several vehicles and vans - hence both the frontage and rear 'garden' are hardsurfaced and currently used for parking.

The character of the surrounding area is residential of mixed design and densities - directly opposite the site are the high density terraced dwellings in Eastwood Close; Tournerbury Lane in the vicinity of the application site features detached bungalows on small plots, whilst Beech Grove becomes more spacious. Directly to the south of the site No 2 Beech Grove is a detached chalet style dwelling of greater height than the application site. It is set close to the southern boundary of the application site (which comprises a 1m close boarded fence with a 2m high evergreen hedge on No 2's side) and this elevation is a blank gable end. The properties in Beech Grove are generally set back such that the nominal 'building line' is set back behind the side (eastern) elevation of the application site bungalow. No 50 Tournerbury Lane on the opposite corner is also a bungalow and is set off its western boundary by at least 3m. As a result the corner of Beech Grove with Tournerbury Lane is currently relatively spacious.

No 46 Tournerbury Lane to the west is a similar bungalow, but semi-detached, and an original detached double garage located at the end of the gardens straddles the boundary such that each bungalow has half each. The application site has subsequently built an extension from this garage linking to the bungalow ie infilling this side area.

2 Planning History

07/72660/000 - Proposed side extensions to existing bungalow. REF05/02/2008
08/72660/001 - Roof conversion and dormer window extensions to front and rear elevations. Extension to garage and 1.6 metre boundary wall fronting Beech Grove.
PERM 21/07/2008

09/72660/002 - New 1.6m high boundary wall to Beech Grove frontage (part retrospective application). PERM,01/04/2009
APP/15/00734 - Single storey side extension and alterations to allow conversion of existing 3 bed detached dwelling to 2No. 2 bed semi-detached dwellings. PERM 24/08/2015
APP/16/00872 - Single storey side and roof extension to east elevation, enlarged front gable, and alterations to allow conversion of existing 3 bed detached dwelling to 2No. 2 bed semi-detached dwellings. (Revised application). REF 25/10/2016
APP/17/00556 - Single storey side and hipped roof extension to east elevation, enlarged front gable, and alterations to allow conversion of existing 3 bed detached dwelling to 2No. 2 bed semi-detached dwellings. (Revised application). PERM 21/07/2017

3 Proposal

Single storey side and gabled roof extension to east elevation, enlarged front gable, and alterations to allow conversion of existing 3 bed detached dwelling to 2No. 2 bed semi-detached dwellings.

The proposal involves a side and roof extension to the eastern side of the bungalow having a footprint of 3.4m wide by 9.8m deep with pitched roof over with side gable end, and enlarged front gable extension, and a dormer in the rear roof slope. The eaves and ridge line would match the main bungalow. This enlargement would then enable the dwelling to be subdivided into 2 separate 2 bed units. The site layout plan provides 2 car parking spaces for each dwelling in the frontage area, with a landscaped strip between.

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)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Bin storage to be provided for both properties.

Community Infrastructure

Confirmed sub-division with less than 100sq m floorspace not CIL liable

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

None received

Developer Services, Southern Water

Public foul sewer within site and exact position must be determined by applicant. No new tree planting within 3m either side of sewer and infrastructure protected during construction works; no new soakaway within 5m.

May be possible to divert sewer at applicants expense; request condition re measures to divert; if any sewer found crossing site during construction investigation will be necessary; applicant should contact SW

Formal application to connect to foul sewer required and Informative requested; Surface water disposal to be in accordance with BRegs and prioritise in order of: soakaway; water course; sewer

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

The entrance to the parking for both properties will be from the existing dropped kerb which is close to the junction of Tournurbury Lane and Beech Road. It therefore important that cars using the parking space can turn on site and enter the highway in a forward gear. The Highway Authority needs turning overlays showing that is possible from every space (when the other spaces are occupied) to turn onsite.

It should be noted that area behind the parking spaces will need to be used jointly by both properties

Public Spaces

None received

Waste Services Manager

No concerns

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
This application appears to be the sixth; the previous applications having been declined. The plot does not appear to be large enough to support two separate dwellings. The Highways Authority state that all cars need to be able to turn within the property so that they can exit in a forward gear - there	see considerations below, but 2 other schemes have been permitted and one refused

appears to be insufficient space to allow this to occur. The property is located on a tight corner which is already extremely busy and dangerous particularly because of the cars and vans parking at the junction with Beech Grove which effectively makes entrance and exit into and out of Beech Grove via a single carriageway. The garden space would be tiny and insufficient for two properties. The development is not suitable in terms of residential amenity; it would create an overbearing structure on the neighbouring properties. There would not appear to be any net benefit if the proposal was permitted and would compromise the character and appearance of the area. Should surface water not be discharged into a soakaway?	Yes - to be in accordance with Building Regs
---	--

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) Impact upon the character of area and streetscene
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways and parking
- (v) Developer Contributions

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further sustainable development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

The planning history is relevant and it is noted that a modest side extension allowing for the subdivision into two was first allowed under APP/15/00734. A larger design with gable end facing Beech Grove was then refused under APP/16/00872 as the side extension was considered over bulky and dominant on the users of the adjacent highway, detrimental to the spacious setting of the corner. A compromise between the two was then reached under APP/17/00556 with the same larger footprint but the use of a hipped roof to minimise the bulk and respect the spacious setting of the corner.

This current application reverts to the larger gable sided scheme that was previously refused under APP/16/00872 - the submitted plans are identical to those under APP/16/00872. Since circumstances have not changed in the area and there have been no policy changes, then the same considerations apply to this current application.

(ii) Impact upon the character of area and streetscene

The submitted 1:200 site layout plan shows the proposed side extension as being within 400mm of the boundary wall. The proposed east elevation would be a full height gable end and it is considered the height and mass of this profile wall so close to the back edge of the pavement will have an overbearing and dominant effect on users of the highway. Furthermore the proposed enlarged front gable would be full height from the ridge level and would also add bulk to this east elevation, exacerbating the presence and dominance of the extension. This proximity to the eastern boundary would also result in a loss of the current spacious setting to the corner and the extension would encroach past the nominal 'building line' of the properties in Beech Grove. This would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the street scene and harm the spacious setting of the existing corner of Tournerbury Lane with Beech Grove.

As noted above the planning history has resulted in a compromise scheme of the same footprint being permitted under APP/17/00556 but with a fully hipped roof. The introduction of the hipped roof resulted in a significant reduction in bulk and mass on this eastern elevation, such that on balance it was considered less overbearing and acceptable. However this scheme reverts to the full gable end which would re-introduce the 'triangle' of roof bulk in very close proximity to the back edge of the pavement. The visual impact and overbearing nature of that additional bulk is considered unacceptable in street scene terms and at variance with the spatial setting of the corner.

Accordingly, in terms of the extension proposed, the design and proximity to the eastern boundary and corner, is considered an overly bulky and dominant extension that would be detrimental to the spacious character of the area and contrary to Policy CS16.

In terms of the proposed subdivision of the site into 2 dwellings, it is acknowledged that the site lies within a relatively high density area, particularly when taking into account Eastwood Close opposite. The subdivision of the dwelling to create two small dwellings would not be out of character with the surrounding area. The subdivision can technically achieve sufficient parking and amenity space per dwelling, commensurate with the area.

The submitted plans indicate that the existing second vehicular access off Beech Grove would be sealed off by extending the boundary wall, creating private rear gardens for both units. This would potentially improve the highway amenity and parking issues on the corner for local residents. Vehicular access and parking would be via the existing access point off Tournerbury Lane. This frontage area is currently hardsurfaced with block paving and gravel and is devoid of any softening landscape features; the proposed plans would provide a visual enhancement to the frontage area through the provision of landscaped areas between the parking spaces.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

No 46 to the west would be buffered from the more intensive use of the site by the existing garage and link building that are to remain. (The issue of whether this link building has encroached No 46's ownership is a private matter). The plans keep the parking to the frontage area so noise and disturbance from car doors banging etc is contained in the more public frontage area and not adjacent neighbours rooms. No 2 Beech Grove sits adjacent the rear garden which is currently used for the parking of

vans - to remove this vehicular access point and return this area to private gardens, albeit 2, would nevertheless likely result in an improvement to both noise and disturbance and outlook experienced by the occupiers of No 2. The dormer proposed in the rear roof slope would increase the potential for overlooking, but because it would align with the more public frontage area of No 2, then there is likely to be no significant material loss of privacy as a result.

In terms of future occupiers each unit would have a rear garden depth of 9m which is as existing and commensurate to others in Tournurbury Lane. Whilst the garden of unit 1 is narrow, it is considered sufficient to provide adequate private sitting out area for future occupiers. Should permission be granted then permitted development rights should be withdrawn to prevent further site coverage and reduce the amount of useable amenity areas.

(iv) Highways and parking

The submitted plans show identical parking layout to the approved plans under both APP/15/00734 and APP/17/00556 and the Highway Engineer did not object to that layout at that time. Those permissions conditioned the provision of the parking spaces and retention of the turning space to enable vehicles to enter and leave in a forward gear. The Highway Engineers current request for provision of turning overlays is not considered necessary considering the extant permissions. The plans do provide adequate on site parking for both units and unit 1 has suitable area for secure cycle storage in the existing utility/store. Unit 2 would need secure cycle storage in order to comply with the recently adopted Parking SPD 2016, and this, together with bin storage could be conditioned if permission were recommended.

(v) Developer Contributions

The proposed new floorspace amounts to about 62 sqm which is less than 100 sqm threshold for CIL and therefore the proposal is not considered CIL liable.

However the proposal does result in a net gain of 1 dwelling within the 5.6km zone identified as significant in potentially increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. Natural England's advice in regard all new housing development within this zone is that it is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA. Policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan which was adopted on 30 June 2014, covers this issue and allows for a financial contribution to be made towards mitigation measures. This is currently set at £181 per dwelling to the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project. For the proposed additional dwelling, plus admin and monitoring fee, the appropriate payment would be £210.

This payment has been made in the past under a combination of APP/15/00734 and APP/17/00556 and the monies can be transferred to this application in the event that this application is allowed on appeal and implemented. Accordingly a new Deed with the current reference numbers and application details has been generated and signed by the applicant to conclude the paperwork associated with this policy requirement.

8 Conclusion

Whilst the subdivision of the site to 2 dwellings is considered appropriate in principle, the proposed enlarged side extension, by virtue of its proximity to the eastern boundary and design, is considered overly bulky and detrimental to the spacious

setting of the corner site. The proposal is therefore considered to harm the visual appearance of the street scene and be contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011. Accordingly the proposal is recommended for refusal on this design ground. However the required SDMP contribution and Deed has been received and the proposal is therefore compliant with policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan, 2013.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/17/01217 for the following reason

- 1 By virtue of the proximity to the eastern boundary, the proposed gable end side extension would be overly bulky and dominant to users of the adjacent highway and would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the street scene and the spacious character and setting of the corner site. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.