
Site Address:	Highbank, Northwood Lane, Hayling Island, PO11 0LR		
Proposal:	Two storey side extension; balcony to rear.		
Application No:	APP/16/00430	Expiry Date:	20/06/2016
Applicant:	Mrs Goodfellow		
Agent:		Case Officer:	Bee Crawford
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is an elongated two storey detached property and detached garage, situated on a generous plot. It is currently vacant undergoing renovation, and has a brown tiled pitched roof and elevations of white painted render. The site is level with vehicular access to the front which has an area of gravel and concrete, with hedging to the eastern and western boundaries and 1 metre high gates and shrubs to the south (front). The rear garden is approximately 40 metres deep and is uncultivated with a summerhouse, grass, trees and shrubs. There is a 2 metre high hedge to the western boundary, and fencing ranging in height from 1 metre to 1.8 metres to the northern and eastern boundaries.
- 1.2 A detached chalet bungalow is to the west, a pair of two storey semi-detached properties are to the east and opposite and farm buildings to the rear. The area is of low density with a mixture of two storey detached and semi-detached properties and bungalows of similar and different age, style and design.

2 Planning History

None relevant to this application.

3 Proposal

Two storey side extension; balcony to rear.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

FAO Mr P Marshall, Development Engineer

The Highway Authority have no adverse comment to this application. I would suggest the Planning Authority ask for three parking spaces.

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: 1

One letter of objection was received from one address raising the following concerns:

- 6.1 The extension is disproportionately large and high.
- 6.2 Close to neighbouring boundary.
- 6.3 Unsightly if rendering is not completed.

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 streetscene
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- (i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable in principle subject to the usual development control criteria.

- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the streetscene

- 7.3 The proposed extension would be visible from the public realm, although it is to be situated on the latter half of the property, some 13 metres away from the highway. For extensions such as this, there is adopted supplementary planning guidance in the form of the Borough Design Guide. This advises that it is important that gaps are retained between buildings and recommends 2 storey extensions should be set back from the main building line, with a height lower than the ridge and at least 2 metres

from the boundary to prevent neighbouring properties and the streetscene being adversely affected.

- 7.4 Following Officer concerns regarding the potential impact on the neighbouring property to the west, amended plans were submitted reducing the width of the extension by 1 metre and hipping the roof to lessen the impact on this neighbour. Although the proposal would result in a generous increase to the original volume of the property, it can be comfortably accommodated within the extent of the site. It is considered the addition would be more conspicuous if the height of the proposal were to be lower than the existing ridge. Whilst the extension is wider than the existing property, which is narrow in design and situated on the eastern side of the site, it is judged to be subservient to the main dwelling by virtue of its position, length and roof design.
- 7.5 The balcony to the rear has a depth of approximately 0.5 metres and it is considered any resulting degree of overlooking to the neighbours would be no greater than that of a Juliet balcony which could be constructed within the realms of permitted development.
- 7.6 Although there is no increase in the number of bedrooms at the property, which is currently four, there is sufficient space for future parking on the site. Due to the limited on road parking and current vacant status of the site, a condition is recommended to provide three off road parking spaces.
- 7.7 The design and appearance of the extension 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 deemed that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality which is diverse in nature.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.8 Following the submission of amended plans the proposal would be 3 metres from the western boundary with the neighbouring property a further 4.2 metres away. Although the western elevation of the property is relatively deep at 8.6 metres, there are no side windows and the width has been reduced and the roof hipped away from the boundary to lessen the impact. The extension would not extend beyond the rear wall of the dwellinghouse and there would be a decrease in the number of windows which currently face the neighbouring property both at ground and first floor, reducing the existing extent of overlooking.

7.9 A letter of objection was received from the neighbours to the west raising concerns with respect to the size of the proposal and the proximity to the boundary. The amended plans received on 30 May reduced the width of the scheme by 1 metre, hipped the roof back and changed the front fenestration to match the existing windows. The resulting distance between the western elevation of the extension and the eastern elevation of the neighbouring property would be approximately 7 metres which is considered to be acceptable.

7.10 Subsequent to the case officer visiting the neighbouring property to the west, whilst it is acknowledged there could be the perception of the scheme being overbearing to this property, the existing dwelling is narrow in relation to the plot size and sited more to the east, approximately 9 metres from the western boundary. There would still be a sufficient gap of 7 metres retained between the neighbouring

properties and the resulting building would be more centrally located on the site.

7.11 There was also concern with respect to the appearance of the development subject to the scheme being completed. Although there are no time constraints with respect to the completion of the proposal following implementation, planning permission would include a condition to ensure external materials of the extension match, in type, colour and texture, to those of the existing building which is white painted render.

7.12 The properties to the east, rear and opposite the site are deemed to be a sufficient distance away for any impact to be negligible.

7.13 It is therefore considered that the amended plans have addressed concerns raised and that the degree of impact is not considered so great as to constitute a defensible reason for refusal. It is deemed the proposal is unlikely to result in an unacceptable level of overbearing and not cause any degree of additional overlooking. It is judged the scheme would have a negligible impact on the properties to the east, opposite or to the rear of the application site, meeting the requirements of policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

8 Conclusion

8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/16/00430 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 Compulsary 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 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 2012.

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans received 31 May 2016:

Drg No 1	Location and block plan, illustrative elevations
Drg No 2	Existing floor and roof plan
Drg no 3	Existing elevations plan
Drg no 4	Proposed floor and roof plan
Drg No 5	Proposed elevatons plan
Drg No 6	Foundation and roof details
Drg no 7	Floor framing and cross-section details
Drg no 8	Roof framing and cross-section details

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.