
Site Address:	17 North Crescent, Hayling Island, PO11 9LR		
Proposal:	Single storey side extension and front rooflight windows.		
Application No:	APP/21/00514	Expiry Date:	19/07/2021
Applicant:	Mr Ted Munro		
Agent:	Mr Gary Anderson	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 No 17 North Crescent is a small semi-detached dwelling located on the north side of North Crescent - which is a private (un-adopted) cul-de-sac set around a central grassed area that links to Mengham Park in Hayling Island. The cul-de-sac is characterised by either semi detached or detached modest, relatively low profile bungalows or chalets, all featuring red pantile roofs. This gives the cul-de-sac a strong identity. Currently there are no front dormers in the wider cul-de-sac.
- 1.2 The application dwelling, number 17, has white render walls and has a flat roofed rear extension and rear dormer. The front elevation features a bay window, and the main entrance to the property is in the side elevation. The site frontage has a side drive for the parking of several cars. There is a low boundary wall with number 18 to the east.

2 Planning History

APP/16/01216 - Prior notification for single storey development extending 3 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 2.9 metres and a maximum height of 2.9 metres.

, WD,01/12/2016

APP/16/01240 - Single storey rear and side extension., PERM,12/01/2017

3 Proposal

Single storey side extension and front rooflight windows.

As originally submitted the proposal included a front dormer that linked to the bay window below - this was considered visually unacceptable and the application amended to front rooflights. The single storey side extension would measure 1.9m wide by 6.6m long and include an offset shallow pitched roof (to avoid a first floor side gable window).

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

DR1 (Delivery of Sustainable Development)

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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2 on the original proposal for the front dormer.
Re-notification took place on the amended plans and no further letters received.

Comment	Officer Comment
I wish to object to the front dormer as it is out of keeping with the design, appearance and layout of the close which has been preserved for so many years. Of the 40 properties none have a front dormer. The roof lines are largely in their original tiles and breaking these lovely terracotta lines will be out of keeping with the general street scene. Together with the added weight and stresses on an old property with original roof trusses and very shallow foundations.	Noted and agreed - amended plans omit Building Regulations matter

All of the residents try to respect and preserve the external facade while extending their properties to the rear and side. Consequently I have no objection to side or rear extension of the property. However I would ask the council to make regular inspections if the side is granted as to date the rear extension commenced 3 years ago remains unfinished. I would also question the percentage of the land being developed as a result of the earlier extension. I would also ask you to consider the structural impact on the roof of the adjoining property when considering the dormer.	Noted Can't require developments to be 'completed' Garden depth of 8.5m would remain, proposal on side drive area Building Regulations matter
The dormer shown in the plans would be totally unacceptable as it would destroy the roof-line of the whole estate. If it were at the rear of the property it would not be a problem as it would be obscured by the building. Also, it would affect the roof-line of the attached building No.16 and probably the integrity of the weather seal of their shared roof.	Noted and agreed - amended plans omit

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 originally proposed front dormer, which included re-tiling the roof in dark grey roof tiles, was considered a poor design, contrary to the adopted Design Guide SPD that would have been harmful to both the host dwelling and visual character of the cul-de-sac. Following negotiations the plans have been amended to omit the dormer and replace with 2 front rooflights. It has also been confirmed that the roof colour will not change and red tiles will be used to match the existing. The rooflights are permitted development but have been included for clarity, and with the retention of the red tiles, which are a key feature of the cul-de-sac, then the visual appearance of the main roof slope is now considered acceptable.
- 7.4 The proposed side extension is modest in scale, set back from the front facade, with low roof profile and eaves line set below the main dwelling, resulting in an appropriately subservient appearance from the front. The offset roof does not align with the host dwelling but views of this side elevation would be limited between properties. The amended plans have also confirmed that the roof will be red pantiles to match the existing. Overall the appearance of the side extension is considered acceptable and would not be harmful to the character of the cul-de-sac, 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

- 7.5 Number 18 to the east is separated by its side drive and similarly has a side entrance. Whilst the proposal would bring the development and activity closer to number 18, an 800mm separation is retained which is considered sufficient to avoid any overbearing or enclosing effect from this single storey addition to number 18. It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to this aspect of the scheme.
- 7.6 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).

(iv) Parking

- 7.7 It is noted that the side extension would result in a partial loss of the side drive currently used for parking. The remaining drive, about 6m in length, would still accommodate 1 vehicle. As a 2 bedroom dwelling the site needs to provide 2 on site parking spaces to comply with the Parking SPD. There is adequate space to the front of the dwelling to widen the drive to provide a replacement parking space, which can be conditioned.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the amended proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the visual appearance of the cul-de-sac and 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/21/00514 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:

Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number
NC-21/04/001 Rev A

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 Two car parking spaces shall be provided on site to serve the development hereby permitted and shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

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.