
Site Address:	6 Harbour Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0HR		
Proposal:	Single storey side/rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/21/00077	Expiry Date:	22/06/2021
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Drain		
Agent:		Case Officer:	Denise Sheath
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

6 Harbour Road, Hayling Island, is a detached bungalow constructed with brick with white painted brick to the rear and front elevations, the property has a terracota tiled roof. The front of the property is laid to lawn with a hardsurfaced driveway, the front boundary treatment consists of a low brick wall with shrubbery along the boundary. The rear boundary treatment consists of 1.8m close boarded fencing with hedging and shrubbery partially along the side and rear boundaries.

2 Planning History

APP/20/00010/TP1 - , UNK,21/10/2020

3 Proposal

Single storey side/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

CS16 (High Quality Design)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Not required

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

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>Comments received on Application as Submitted</u>	
Objection - Received 08.02.121 Summary: Effect on Outlook Loss of natural habitat Conservation of trees and Hedges Scale of the extension	See Section 7
Further Comments from above objector Received 16/02/21: Objector refers to previous applications within Harbour Road for similar development: Application for an extension to No.5 was amended to a flat roof with a roof lantern which was more suitable. Suggestion for future development of second floors for bedrooms which would eliminate boxed in, over developments north of the building line. Concerns regarding the disturbance of trees and hedgerows and the effect on the wildlife. Concerns regarding the roof line of the development and the loss of dominate the rear amenity area.	See Section 7
Additional Comments from objector above - Received 21/02/21:	Loss of property value is not a planning

Loss of property value	consideration

Objection - Received 22.02.21 I have studied the plans for the proposed extension to No. 6 Harbour Road and would like to make the following comments. On looking at the size and scale of the proposed extension I felt instantly very worried. No. 6 is already extended to the building line on the east side. This application will extend this to the whole plot width and then outwards another 7m. On my boundary the western boundary - this means a 6m extension to the current building line and another 7m over the building line making a new full height wall 1.5m from my boundary a total of 13m long. I work mainly from home and for the last 12 months, 100% from home. My work room is situated at the back of my property on my eastern boundary. I currently enjoy good daylight and sunlight in the back of the property. The extension proposed will add a 13m wall to the current rear wall with a full height roof. This will have a very serious impact in terms of light to the whole of the back of my property - in particular to the room where I spend all my working week. In addition, this 13m new external wall will have 4 windows facing my property where there are currently no windows in the side of either of the properties. The extension would result in a property that is over double the size of the original property This will affect privacy when using the rooms at the rear of the bungalow and when in the garden. The proposed roofline gives no consideration to minimising the effect of loss of sunlight/daylight in my property being full height gable rather than the hip roof or flat roof. This will be an imposing structure that will	See Section 7
---	----------------------

dominate the outlook from the rear of my property and have a poor effect on the trees and shrubs that are growing in the 13m section of my garden. The height and scale of the extension will dominate my property and cause my workroom to become claustrophobic and hemmed in by the size and height. The patio in front of my office will become enclosed causing loss of light. Drainage - My garden is currently easily and frequently waterlogged I am concerned that loss of such a large amount of ground in the adjacent garden may lead to significant issues with waterlogging and drainage in my back garden.	
Further Comments received following receipt of amended Plans Received 07 April 2021:	
Thank you for your letter in respect of the above planning reference and on which I make the following comments, First I will confirm a conversation I had with the applicant recently when the new fence was being erected near to the planned extension. Out of the blue he said, we will be required to have a flat roof and also a number of other changes which were not described. He then moved to the corner of the northeast present building and put his hand up saying that's where the roof will be coming too. This would be only 2.30m high. I thought, cannot be right as inside it would be too low inside for a minimum height unless the floor was being dropped below the present building level. (redacted) The flat roof is good, more sensible and will reduce the domination of a towering sloping roof. Unfortunately the applicant is saying the roof is only going to be 2.2m high is incorrect or he has used the interior measurement. I am saying this as within the revised plans, the architect has put the roof approximately 0.7m higher.	See Section 7

The ' number of other changes' mentioned, as far as I can see, are only relevant to the interior, which again I would have no interest in. My interest is in the Domination of a building that would now be only 1.20m from the boundary wall and our outside patio,(the reduction to 1.20 coming about due to a slight boundary movement), and still extends 7m outside the present building line. With in my opinion, if planning were to be granted, the east/west building line and the northern building line, two precedents would be established. On a personal side, we have to look at the value of our plot, as tested and it would be a reduced value of £50k against the applicant's original plan. Value loss has dropped £25- £30k. Our big problem is the eastern extension wall only being 1.2m from our boundary wall and 7m outside the building line of all the even numbered buildings in Harbour Road. If I could make a request, or probably better to say our food for thought that would reduce our value loss. The extension eastern wall is revised to be 3m from our boundary wall. Thus bringing it more central and more in line with the western side. As to the northern wall, a reduction of 2m would make it only 5m for which a precedent is being set.	Devaluation of property is not a planning consideration.
Further Amended Plans were submitted 19 May 2021	No further objections were received following receipt of the amended plans

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 The application as originally submitted was for an extension with a depth of 10.5m from the roof ridge height to the east and a depth of 16.5m from the roof ridge from the west, a height of 5.7m and a width of 11.3 spanning the width of the property.

Amended plans were submitted 07 April 2021 following concerns of the extent of the proposed works and the impact upon the neighbouring properties, the proposal was amended to have a depth of 6.4m from the roof ridge height to the east and a depth of 12.5m from the roof ridge from the west, with a height of 5.7m and a width of 11.3 spanning the width of the property. The proposal included a flat roof extension which would have a depth of 4m and a height of 3m this element would also extend the width of the property.

- 7.4 Following a site visit to the property and to the neighbouring property to the east it was considered that the amendments would still have an unacceptable impact especially to the neighbouring property to the east and therefore a further reduction to the extension to the roof ridge depth would be required to limit the impact, therefore further amended plans were submitted on 19 May 2021 to address these concerns. The depth of the roof ridge extension was amended to 5.5m from the east and 11.5m to the west of the roof ridge extension would create a double gable to the rear, the proposal would maintain the 5.7m height and would span the width of the property, with a flat roof extension attached with a depth of 4.7m and a height of 3m.
- 7.5 Although the proposal is large in scale this can be comfortably accommodated within the plot of No.6 due to its large rear garden and will still allow the property to have ample amenity space. The proposal would have a limited impact on its locality due to its single storey nature and location to the rear/ side of the property. Notwithstanding this the materials to be used in the construction will match the existing which should ensure the development does not look out of place and is in keeping to No 6 therefore protecting the visual amenity of the locality.
- 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 The proposal is has a distance of approximately 40m from the neighbouring property to the rear and is separated by a footpath adjacent to the rear boundary, therefore any impact upon this neighbouring property would be considered acceptable.
- 7.8 The proposed extension will have a separation gap of 2.7m to the shared boundary with No.8. There are to be windows inserted along the western elevation, these windows can be carried out under permitted development and would therefore not be a justifiable reason for refusal. The proposed roof ridge extension has a greater depth along this facing elevation together with the flat roof extension which could create a limited loss of morning light. The boundary treatment along the western elevation

consists of 1.8m close boarded fencing, there are trees and shrubbery over 2m in height partially along this boundary within the boundary of No.8. Therefore with the limited loss of light and the separation gap between the extension and the boundary the proposal would be considered to have a limited and acceptable impact upon this neighbouring property.

- 7.9 Concerns were raised with regard to the height and depth of the proposed extension and the impact upon the western neighbouring property, amended plans were submitted reducing the depth of the extension to the roof ridge from a 16.5m depth to a 11.5m depth along this elevation, the amendments included a single storey extension with a depth of 4m and a height of 3m, this would help reduce the impact and help alleviate the concerns raised.
- 7.10 The proposed extension will have a separation gap of 1.3m to the shared boundary with No.4 and a 2m distance from the rear facing elevation, there are to be windows inserted along the eastern elevation, these windows can be carried out under permitted development and would therefore not be a justifiable reason for refusal. The boundary treatment along the eastern elevation consists of 1.8m close boarded fencing, there are trees and shrubbery over 2m in height partially along this boundary within the boundary of No.4. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would have a limited and acceptable impact upon this neighbouring property.
- 7.11 Concerns were raised with regard to the height and depth of the proposed extension and the dominance upon the neighbouring property to the eastern elevation, amended plans were submitted reducing the depth of the extension to the roof ridge from a 10.5m depth to a 5.5m depth along this elevation, the amendments included a single storey extension with a depth of 4m and a height of 3m, this would help reduce the impact and help alleviate the concerns raised.
- 7.12 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not 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). It is noted following submission of amended plans received 19 May 2021 no further letters of objection were received.

(iv) Parking

- 7.13 This property will be increasing from 3 to 4 bedrooms; therefore 3 vehicle spaces are required. There are the relevant number of parking space to the front of the property. A condition has been added to the decision to ensure the relevant parking spaces are provided and retained.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and the locality and the relevant parking would be provided. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00077 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:

Application Form - Received 25 January 2021

Location Plan - Received

Block Plan - Received

Roof Plan - Drawing No. 5519/200 - Received 19 May 2021

Existing Elevations - Drawing No.5519/2 - Received 25 January 2021

Existing Floor Plan - Drawing No. 5519/1 - Received 25 January 2021

Proposed Floor Plan - Drawing No. 5519/3 Rev D - Received 07 April 2021

Proposed Elevations - Drawing No. 5519/4 Rev D - Received 19 May 2021

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 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.

- 4 The development shall not be brought into use until a minimum of 3 parking spaces have been provided within the curtilage of the site and thereafter all of those spaces kept available for such purposes.

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.