

---

|                 |                                                  |               |             |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Site Address:   | 2 Bound Lane, Hayling Island, PO11 9HU           |               |             |
| Proposal:       | Proposed loft conversion, porch and summerhouse. |               |             |
| Application No: | APP/21/00446                                     | Expiry Date:  | 02/07/2021  |
| Applicant:      | Mr James Cassidy                                 |               |             |
| Agent:          | Mr I Reed                                        | Case Officer: | Tina Pickup |
|                 | Architectural Planning Ltd                       |               |             |
| Ward:           | Hayling East                                     |               |             |

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

---

## **1 Site Description**

The application site relates to a small bungalow on a small plot located on the west side of Bound Lane. It is constructed with render finish beneath a grey/green pantile roof with eaves overhang feature and a curved opening for an integral car port (currently boarded up). The front door is recessed under this car port. There is an existing in/out block paved drive to the front, sufficient for the parking of at least 3 cars. To the rear there is a brick built flat roofed outbuilding close to the northern boundary and the dwelling has an existing half width conservatory. The garden depth is modest, between 6m and 9m and bounded by a 1.5m high wall along the western boundary.

The area is very tight-knit, with the adjacent bungalows of 2A and 4 being sited close to the respective shared boundaries, and with limited back to back separation with the two storey dwelling to the rear in Mengham Avenue. Additionally the rear of the large two storey properties in Selsmore Road are clearly evident across the intervening small gardens. Overall the existing rear garden feels small and overlooked.

## **2 Planning History**

None

## **3 Proposal**

Proposed loft conversion, porch and summerhouse.

## **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) |
| DM13 | (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)                     |

### Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

|     |                                                    |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------|
| AL1 | (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------|

AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

E22 (Amenity and pollution)  
E1\* (High quality design)  
IN3 (Transport and parking in new development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

**5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

None necessary

**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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: **2**: One on the original plans and one on the amendments

| Comment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Officer Comment                                                                                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>On Original Proposal</u>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                |
| This development in general is welcome !<br>And would have been even more so had some thought been given to the design of the rear dormer.<br>But unfortunately the back bedroom window as planned, takes a retrograde step.<br>Firstly, it considerably reduces privacy for both houses. Which could be avoided with the imaginative use of skylight & roof type windows.<br>Secondly, this proposal will potentially adversely effect the saleability and value, of both houses.<br>Future purchasers will consider both houses to be overlooked.<br>It is worth noting: that normal new | See section 7 re privacy/overlooking<br><br>Effect on value not a valid material consideration |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| buildings are subject to overlooking and privacy considerations.<br>Bound Lane carries a premium which will be more financially damaging than Mengham Ave.<br>Although marginal, still a retrograde step.<br>Would it be possible for there to be a design change? Which might consider the overlooking elements of this proposal? |       |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |       |
| <u>On Amended Proposal:</u>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |       |
| We have noted the changes your client has proposed and whilst they would not be our choice, we find them acceptable.<br>Our thanks to you for your help in this matter                                                                                                                                                             | Noted |

## 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) 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.

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

7.3 Two modest pitched roof dormers with 2 roof lights in between are proposed for the front roof slope which are balanced with ground floor openings and of an appropriate scale and design for the host dwelling. These would also blend visually with the design of number 2A adjacent which also has two pitched roof dormers to the front. In addition a 2m forward extension across a third of the frontage is proposed, making the existing car port an integral garage with a front door in the front elevation. This would be flat roofed with parapet style finish with coping stone and provide better legibility for the front entrance. It is considered that the style and proportions of the existing bungalow have been respected and in street scene terms the proposed development is visually appropriate.

7.4 To the rear a large flat roofed dormer is proposed. It would be set down from the ridge line and due to the eaves overhang, visually there would be some roof slope visible underneath it. Whilst appearing visually bulky this rear dormer does however meets the criteria of Class B of the GPDO and is therefore permitted development.

7.5 It is also proposed to renew the external materials of the finished property with Eternit

slate or equivalent for the roof, and use Hardy lap cladding for the dormers, part front elevation and upper half of side gables, with render to the front extension and remaining elevations. Bound Lane is characterised by a mix of architectural styles and finishes and in this mixed area the proposed finishes are considered acceptable. The replacement summerhouse would be set back behind the front elevation and therefore not visible in street scene terms.

- 7.6 Overall the design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and its surroundings 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 The third party representation relates to cross overlooking and privacy. The rear is very tight-knit with surrounding properties and the introduction of a large rear dormer would add to the perception of being overlooked. Despite the rear dormer being permitted development the applicant has amended the window arrangements in an attempt to minimise that perception, by changing the single large bedroom window to two small windows. This also better balances the windows and reduces the top heavy nature originally proposed.
- 7.8 Given the existing levels of overlooking in this built-up residential area, then the addition of this permitted development dormer would not add any significant material loss of privacy to neighbouring residents.
- 7.9 The proposed replacement summerhouse has a sloping roof with the lower height of 2.5m closest to the shared boundary, rising to 3.1m facing the application garden. A separation of 450mm is proposed with the shared boundary and the existing boundary wall would be retained. The siting is due south of number 2A and there was some concern that the increased height would cause overshadowing to the already small garden of 2A. The agent has demonstrated that the design with 15 degree roof pitch and separation would have no greater an impact than a permitted development outbuilding of 2.5m up to the boundary. On balance it is considered that the replacement outbuilding would have limited impact on the amenity of number 2A and insufficient to warrant a reason for refusal.
- 7.10 In terms of amenity for future occupiers it is noted that part of the existing conservatory is to be demolished which would increase the usable garden area, improving the amenity levels. Additionally the increased height of the summerhouse would act as a screen from the existing overlooking from the north, ie the properties in Selsmore Road, overall improving the level of privacy and amenity for future occupiers.
- 7.11 Overall, it is considered that the rear dormer would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent and to the rear of the application site; and the replacement outbuilding would not result in any material increased overshadowing, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.12 The proposed integral garage meets the internal size dimensions of 3m x 6m set out in the Parking SPD to count as a parking space. As a 4 bedroom dwelling 3 on site

spaces are required. It is noted that the garage extension would reduce the length of the drive in front of the garage such that that area could no longer provide a space in its own right. The other 2 spaces are on the southern part of the drive. Overall the 3 spaces can be provided if the garage is used for the parking of a vehicle and therefore this must be conditioned. On this basis there would be no objection on parking grounds.

## **8 Conclusion**

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and street scene 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/21/00446

(A) 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:

Location and Block Plan Drawing Number A-1302/Rev B  
Proposed Floor Plans Drawing Number A-1305/Rev C  
Proposed Elevations Drawing Number A-1206/Rev C  
Proposed Summer House Drawing Number A-1307/Rev B

**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 garage hereby permitted shall be retained and kept available for the parking of cars at all times and shall not be converted to living accommodation.

**Reason:** To ensure the retention of adequate on-site car parking in accordance with the Parking Supplementary Planning Document 2016 standards adopted in the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and to discourage parking on the adjoining highway in the interests of local amenity and having due regard to

policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.