
Site Address:	4 St Helens Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0BT		
Proposal:	First floor extension over existing garage, two storey rear extension and porch along front elevation.		
Application No:	APP/17/00611	Expiry Date:	07/08/2017
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Grows		
Agent:	Mr Davison	Case Officer:	Emma Chisnall
	iDraw Limited		
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site consists of a detached chalet bungalow situated in Hayling Island to the east of St Helens Road. The dwelling house is constructed of a cream render, concrete tiles and tile hanging with a large chimney present to the front. The amenity space to the front of No 4 is hard-surfaced to accommodate multiple cars onsite and an integral garage is in position to the west of the site to accommodate further parking. The curtilage boundary is constructed of timber fencing approximately 1.5m high with the garage to the west forming part of the boundary.
- 1.2 To the rear No 4 has a large amenity space which is laid as lawn and is surrounded by a mixed curtilage boundary including a 1.8m brick wall to the west and 2m timber fencing to the east and north curtilage with varying heights of hedging.

2 Planning History

06/58150/003 - Application to carry out the following works: Scots Pine: cut back branch (growing to SW) overhanging adjacent property; 2No. Sycamores: Crown reduction of 20%, 2No. Poplars: Pollard; 2No. Evergreen Oaks: Crown raise to 5m. All trees within G1 of TPO 0963., PERM, 19/07/2006
APP/13/00766 - Two storey rear extension., PERM, 18/09/2013

3 Proposal

- 3.1 First floor extension over existing garage, change of materials to existing dormer to match new extension, porch over front door and extended living room.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

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)

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

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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Comment	Officer Comment
Concerns raised by No 2 regarding:	
*Forward extension of the lounge and movement of the building line creating additional bulk and a detrimental impact visually.	see section 7
* Errors on the plans including: - Position of No 4 and No 2 on the plans. -Proposed roof does not match elevation plan.	Plans have been amended and alongside a site visit to assess the positions of the dwellinghouses.
* Planning Statement indicates consultation is carried out with neighbours prior to formal submission which wasn't the case.	This is not part of the formal planning process and would be down to the discretion of the applicant to discuss the proposals with neighbours prior to making a decision. The Council notified all impacted neighbours via letter once the application was validated.
* Continued concerns over plan accuracy in relation to: - Identical existing and proposed block plans.	Plans have been amended and the site visited to see the positions of the dwellinghouses.
* We are concerned about any adverse impact the building works may have on	Noted and see section 7

us.	
Concerns raised on behalf of No 6 by Town Planning Consultants Ltd regarding:	Comments shall be addressed under section 7 of the report under 'Planning Considerations'.
* No pre-application advice was sought and no reference was made to adopted policies of the LPA in the proposal.	Pre-application is not a necessary stage in the planning process and it is down to the applicant to decide whether or not they wish to seek this advice prior to submitting a formal application.
* Planning Statement document states that bedroom 4 would be enlarged however this will remain the same with a new bedroom created.	It is noted that the application seeks to maintain 5 bedrooms at No 4 with the conversion of a bedroom into a landing extension.
* Planning Statement document states the existing bedroom size is too small however this is disagreed with.	Noted.
* Works do not comply with the Borough Design Guide in terms of dominance, position to boundary and do not enhance the front elevation of No 4.	see section 7
* Design does not satisfy the requirements of the Core Strategy in terms of neighbour amenity and good design.	see section 7
*It would set the precedent for other types of similar development in the streetscene.	see section 7
* Request that application is refused and sent to committee if approved.	This is a householder application to be determined under delegated powers and as such would not go to a Development Management Committee.
Concerns raised by No 6 St Helens regarding:	
*Development will block northwards view which contributes to aesthetic and spacious character of locality.	see section 7 .
*Water discharge onto the path from ledge along the west side.	see section 7 .
*Why is the side wall not moving in as well.	The impact of the siting and design are assessed in section 7.
*What happens if access onto land is	This is a civil matter to be discussed

|prevented. |between the applicant and neighbours. |

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, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

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

7.3 No 4 St Helens Road is situated in a streetscene where there is evidence of development to the south and west. It is acknowledged that No 4 and No 2 are dwellings of similar style and design but the rest of the dwellings in the road create a varied streetscene where the works proposed to No 4 are considered to not look significantly out of place. Concern has been raised that the works proposed to No 4 would set a precedent for a first floor extension over the garage for No 2 St Helens Road which would be against the Borough's Development Plan. Any such application would have to be considered on its merits. In respect to the current proposal, the dwelling house is within a varied streetscene and is within the built up area where the principle of development is considered acceptable. The development is considered to have an acceptable mass and bulk which is considered to not be dominant, obtrusive or harmful to the character of the area. Therefore the works are considered to comply with the aims of the Borough's Design Guide and Development Plan (Core Strategy) and can be considered to be acceptable.

7.4 The developments design has caused significant concern from neighbouring dwellings in relation to the loss of the visual gap between No 4 and No 6 St Helens Road. Although it is acknowledged that this gap shall be reduced it is considered that an acceptable space with views through shall be retained due to the works design with a lowered first floor eaves level, and that the roof shall be hipped increasing the gap between No 4's eaves and ridge line. Concern has been raised that the ground floor development would not be set in from the shared boundary to the west to increase this gap but this is not proposed as part of the application and therefore cannot be considered further. Following the concerns raised the first floor development has been amended to be set back from the front elevation, the works are set in from the side elevation and down from the ridge height. These measures would ensure that a terracing effect is not created as a result of the development and that an acceptable gap between No 4 and No 6 is retained. The works are also considered to achieve a subservient appearance on No 4 which complies with the Borough Design Guide and would therefore not warrant a refusal of the planning permission and are considered to be acceptable.

7.5 The materials proposed to be used shall match that of the existing dwelling which would ensure the works look in keeping to No 5 and not out of place.

7.6 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the

main building and is therefore 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 Concern has been raised by No 2 St Helens Road regarding the forward projection of No 4. The plans have since been amended and no forward projection is proposed which is considered to address this concern. The works proposed to No 4 would be set away from the neighbouring dwelling to the east and would be set down and hidden in the majority from No 2 by the rest of the dwelling house creating a limited and acceptable impact. The proposed roof pitch at ground floor level to the front is considered to be modest in size which would not result in a significant adverse impact to No 2 and can be considered acceptable.
- 7.8 Concern has been raised on behalf of No 6 that the development does not comply with the Borough's Development Plan (Core Strategy) in terms of amenity. The application has been critically assessed in this regard. No 6 St Helens Road has one window on the ground floor east side elevation that looks onto the garage that forms the boundary at No 6. Although it is acknowledged that the increased height of the development could have a potential impact on this window and appear obtrusive to the outlook it is considered that this would not be significantly altered as a result of the development due to the first floor extension being set in from the side elevation and hipped away from No 6 to the side, front and rear. It is noted that the ground floor window on No 6 is not used as a main habitable room and serves a small area to the rear of the garage and as such the works are considered to not impact a main habitable room reducing the impact further. It is therefore felt that on balance although the works would have an impact that the level of harm caused as a result would not be sufficient to refuse the planning application. The works are to the east of No 6 and therefore have the potential to impact light levels. This has been assessed and due to the works being in line with the rear elevation and being set down from the existing ridge height the development is considered to maintain light levels reaching No 6 and not significantly impact them. Therefore the development is considered to not result in significant harm to the neighbouring amenity of No 6 and can be considered acceptable.
- 7.9 Concern has been raised by No 6 in regards to the works creating additional water discharge onto the side path of No 6. Confirmation has been received by the agent confirming that all rainwater to the new roof on the west side will be collected by a new gutter on the roof slope which shall be retained within the curtilage of No 4. This can be seen on the plans submitted. The existing rainwater to the flat roof shall be collected by an arris rail on the western boundary, and via the flat roof sloping back towards the rear garden where the water will be collected. This is considered to sufficiently address this aspect.
- 7.10 The dwellings to the north and south of No 4 and are considered to be set sufficiently away from the dwelling house to ensure privacy levels are maintained and no over-looking is caused as a result of the new first floor windows proposed to the dwelling house creating a limited and acceptable impact.
- 7.11 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to appear overbearing or lead to 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).

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and the character of the area 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/17/00611 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 external materials used 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.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Proposed Block, Floor and Elevation Plan: Drawing No 16.210.101 Rev D

Received 05.08.2017

Drainage Details: Received via email 12.09.2017

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.