
Site Address:	The Ranch, Victoria Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0LU		
Proposal:	Sides and rear extension and loft conversion.		
Application No:	APP/21/00227	Expiry Date:	06/05/2021
Applicant:	Mrs Gillian Cole		
Agent:	Mr I Murray	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	I J Murray Associates Ltd		
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site relates to a detached bungalow that is currently vacant, located on the north side of Victoria Road, a cul-de-sac off Havant Road. The road is partly unmade and un-adopted in sections. Opposite, to the south, are fields, currently used for grazing horses.

The existing bungalow is cream rendered beneath a fully hipped concrete tiled roof and is set back between about 7m and 8.5m from the front boundary. It has an attached flat roofed garage that extends up to the eastern boundary; and a detached outbuilding/shed to the rear of the western side. The front boundaries are generally hedges and shrubs; to the eastern side is a wall, about 1.5m high, before hedging enclosing the rear garden.

Victoria Road is characterised by a mix of dwellings of all ages and styles, with uneven and varied siting within plots. The more spacious layouts and ad hoc pattern of development opposite the fields give a sense of a semi-rural lane. To the immediate west is another small bungalow (Bally Moss) set approximately in line, and this bungalow has a large side window serving a dining room/study facing the application site. To the east is a semi-detached dwelling (The Holt) set further forward and having an attached side garage up to the shared boundary; this dwelling has a rear conservatory and outbuildings linked to its rear.

Part of the rear garden lies within flood zone 2.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Sides and rear extension and loft conversion.

During the course of determining the application, amended plans have been received slightly reducing the width of the proposal and extent of glazing to the rear. It is proposed to demolish the side garage, and extend both sides with a rear 5m deep flat roofed extension across the new full width of the property; the enlarged roof would be the same overall height with new front and rear gable projections.

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

N/a

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: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
I object to the west facing windows on west elevation boundary facing my property... the reason for my objection is the following... 1/ The distance from my property boundary which i believe compromises my privacy 2/ The roof height of the proposed development & the distance of the cavity wall from my boundary will definitely have an impact on the light reaching & reflecting my property.... 3/ I believe this is an over development of the existing property... & will have an impact on the infrastructure on the surrounding area	see section 7 below; the side windows are only ground floor site considered large enough to accommodate extensions
I am writing with concern the extension work to the above property I am concerned the closeness of the works to my property 1.238mt also a window that will be very close .	Noted - see section 7
The property to the left of the proposed development is only 18inches away from the boundary line. The plans to not adequately reflect the positioning of the building in relation to my property and the window which will look onto it. It is my belief that the building will be too close to my property, which will therefore negatively impact on the daylight into the room, which is a study.	Noted - see section 7

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
- (v) Flood Risk
- (vi) CIL

(i) Principle of development

7.2 Victoria Road forms the boundary of the defined urban area under policies AL2 and CS17 such that 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 In street scene terms the extended dwelling would include a forward glazed gable, featuring a balcony set under a roof overhang. This would be a striking design but not inappropriate to the mixed street scene. The use of hipped sides would retain the skyline and sense of space about the dwelling, appropriate to this semi-rural lane. The slight forward extension to achieve this front gable feature would stagger the siting between the more forward semi detached two storey dwelling to the east and bungalow to the west. Materials are also proposed as more contemporary, with use of render, grey slate and grey windows and doors.
- 7.4 The proposal includes provision of an integral garage with re-sited drive to the western side of the property. Overall, the extensions and renovations would modernize this bungalow but its scale and siting would remain appropriate to the context of the site. The design and appearance would be visually appropriate to the mixed character of the area, and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy).

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.5 The separation to the side boundaries and resultant impact of proximity of development to both neighbours is the key issue. To the west, the adjacent bungalow Bally Moss, has a large side window within 0.5m of the shared boundary that provides the sole light to this room. Currently there is only sparse vegetation on the shared boundary so the window benefits from a pleasant outlook and light from the application site.
- 7.6 The proposal would infill this frontage area and bring the side elevation to within 1.554m of the shared boundary ie creating a 2m separation of neighbour window to wall. This would block some sunlight and affect outlook to this room. But regard must be had to the fact that a 2m high boundary fence could be erected on this side boundary under permitted development. The agent has provided a cross section plan of this window relative to the boundary and proposed development. Applying the 25 degree daylight check as set out at figure 5.02 of the adopted Residential Design Guide SPD, to this section plan (different to the agents 45 degree lines) it is apparent that in fact the separation would just meet the guidelines to retain acceptable levels of daylight to the affected room. Being only a single storey development with hipped away roof, the daylight opportunity is maximised.
- 7.7 This is recognised as different to sunlight and outlook and being east facing with relatively open aspect the window would currently receive morning sunlight and pleasant outlook. A permitted development fence would largely obscure this and would have a greater impact than the proposed development. Due to this fall-back position it is considered unreasonable to refuse the proposed development based on loss of sunlight or outlook to this window. The agent has indicated that the applicant is willing to omit a fence on this shared boundary to maximise light and benefit to the neighbours amenity, but this will be a matter for neighbours to agree. It is further noted that allegedly a private right to light agreement exists between the 2 properties, but any such private agreement does not constitute a material planning consideration.

- 7.8 It is further noted that the rear garden outlook from Bally Moss would benefit from the removal of the outbuildings that are sited up to the shared boundary and currently perceived as quite enclosing. Their removal would open up the rear aspect to the benefit of the amenity of the occupiers of Bally Moss.
- 7.9 With respect to impact on The Holt to the east, the separation to this shared boundary would be 1.259m. Due to the orientation, the likely impact on The Holt would be overshadowing and loss of outlook. This property has a single storey rear infill extension with glazed end and lantern light, stepped off the boundary with other linked outbuildings beyond. The outdoor area adjacent the shared boundary currently has an open aspect by virtue of the relatively low boundary wall.
- 7.10 The presence of the extension and flat roofed rear addition will undoubtedly be visible and add to a sense of enclosure. The representation notes the proposed side windows and potential loss of privacy. However, these windows are only at ground floor level and would serve a bathroom (obscure glazed) and bedroom. Again regard must be had to the fact that 2m high fencing could be erected which would prevent any direct overlooking and reduce the dominance of the extension. The proposed rear extension would only be about 2.5 to underside of eaves; 2.7m to top of roof, some 1.2m away. The majority of the main hipped roof would remain as currently aligned ie set forward and at the same height; the additional bulk from the rear central gable projection would be sufficiently separated to minimise any additional overshadowing. Overall, whilst the extensions will have an impact, the harm they would cause is considered to be marginal. It is because of the historic low boundaries that the proposal will appear to have a greater impact; but with a standard fence ie the fall-back position, the impact would be much less.
- 7.11 The originally proposed large centralised rear gable window would have added a perception of overlooking to the rear gardens from its scale and dominance. Amended plans have reduced the scale of the glazing by dividing it up which will lessen its impact. Since it serves a second bedroom, the likely occurrence of overlooking would be limited in this residential area. It is however noted that this rear gable could provide access to the flat roof in the future - its use as a balcony area would be intrusive and result in direct overlooking, so it is recommended to condition that the flat roof area is not used as a balcony. On this basis, overall there would be limited additional overlooking from the proposed development.
- 7.12 Overall, on balance, it is considered that the amended plans that have provided greater side separation and reduced rear glazing, would have an acceptable impact on the light available to, outlook from and overshadowing effect on immediate neighbours amenity. The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of the Borough Design Guide SPD, 2011 and Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.13 The proposed development would result in a 4 bedroom property which requires 3 on site parking spaces to meet the Parking SPD. An integral double garage is proposed together with driveway of about 10m providing sufficient on site parking to comply with the Parking SPD, 2016 and policy DM13 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(v) Flood Risk

- 7.14 Only parts of the rear garden are within flood zone 2. The accompanying flood risk assessment indicates that flood proofing measures will be incorporated into the design. Due to the low level of risk to future occupiers, there is no objection on flooding grounds.

(vi) CIL

- 7.15 The proposed additional floor space has been assessed, and due to the credit for the areas to be demolished, the net gain in floor area only amounts to about 88sqm. Therefore it has been concluded that the proposal is not CIL Liable.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the amended proposal with increased separation and reduced glazing, would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours 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/21/00227 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:

Design & Access Statement
Flood Risk assessment
Existing Site and Location Plan Drawing Number A101
Proposed Site and Location Plan Drawing Number A111 V3
Proposed Site and Location with Boundary Distances Plan Drawing Number A111 V3
Proposed Floor Plans Drawing Number A112 V3
Proposed North & South Elevations Drawing Number A113 V3
Proposed East & West Elevations Drawing Number A114 V3
Proposed Site Views Drawing Number A115 V3
Proposed Site Sections Drawing Number A117 V3

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 hereby approved flat roofed element to the rear shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings, having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.