
Site Address:	12 Kingfisher Close, Hayling Island, PO11 9NS		
Proposal:	Single storey extension to rear and two storey side extension over existing garage.		
Application No:	APP/16/00344	Expiry Date:	08/07/2016
Applicant:	Mr J Green		
Agent:	Mr J Jervis	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site relates to a semi-detached modern dwelling located on the west side of Kingfisher Close, a cul-de-sac. The area is characterised by high density residential dwellings comprising a mix of two storey semi's and detached bungalows, set in modest plots with open plan frontages. The site is constructed of red brick with cream render at first floor beneath a concrete tiled roof. There is an attached garage to the north side which has a pitched roof and sits behind the front elevation with drive in front. Number 14 to the north is a handed pair such that the 2 garages sit adjacent - the gap between is only 1m. The rear garden is enclosed with 1.8m high close boarded fencing.

2 Planning History

None

3 Proposal

It is proposed to add a single storey rear extension across the whole width of the dwelling, having a depth of 3.5m. This would have a sloping roof having a maximum height of 3.5m. It is also proposed to alter the garage to habitable accommodation by extending forward by 3.3m and then adding a first floor to this extended footprint. This would have a gable end pitched roof to match the main dwelling, set slightly down from the ridge.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

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)

Borough Design Guide SPD, 2011

and Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD 2010

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

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: 0

Summary:

Comment:

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) Impact upon the streetscene
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways and parking

(i) Principle of development

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

(ii) Impact upon the streetscene

There is currently a regular rhythm to this west side of the street scene with the pattern of semi detached dwellings with attached garages - the siting of the pairs varies in that some are staggered but numbers 11,12,14 and 15 are set in a straight line. The proposed extension would visually appear subservient to the main house by virtue of the fact that it is set back from the front elevation by 0.365m and set down from the ridge. This is however quite a small and marginal step back but in its own right would achieve a degree of subserviency as required by paras 5.37 of the Borough Design Guide.

However the Borough Design Guide also requires at para 5.38 that gaps are retained between buildings to protect the spacings and pattern of development and recommends that side extensions should not be closer than 2m from the boundary.

The submitted plans indicate that the existing side garage is built up to the boundary line and that the modest gap between the application site and number 14 in the form of a pedestrian side gate is beyond the application site. The proposed two storey side extension would therefore infill the first floor side gap right up to the boundary. This would result in a loss of space and light at first floor level which would create a terracing effect detrimental to the strong rhythm and pattern of development in this streetscene.

Whilst it is acknowledged that numbers 5 and 15 have similar two storey side extensions, both are considerably smaller in that they have a greater set back from the building line and each are set in a more staggered position relative to adjacent dwellings. Due to the fact that the application site is set in a straight line with number 14, the terracing effect is exacerbated. The proposal is therefore considered harmful to the visual appearance of the street scene and contrary to both policy CS16 clause c) and the Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The proposed single storey rear extension would be 3.5m deep right up to the shared boundary with number 11. This dwelling is a handed version of the application site and has sliding patio doors as the only source of light to the living room. The Borough Design Guide at paras 5.42 to 5.44 also advocates the use of the 45 degree code as a means of assessing the impact on neighbouring amenity. This proposal breaches the 45 degree code. However, the extension is located to the north of number 11 and there is already a 2m high fence on this boundary. The additional loss of light from the 'triangle' of development visible above the fence would be very minimal. Regard must also be had to the fact that under permitted development single storey rear extensions could be up to 3m deep and 4m high (& up to 6m deep with a prior approval) and where within 2m of the boundary can have an eaves height of up to 3m. This proposed extension is only marginally deeper than that permitted under p.d., but lower. As such it is considered that the effect of a pd extension would be very similar to the current proposal in terms of mass and bulk on the boundary and loss of light. Accordingly, on balance, the single storey rear element of the proposal is considered acceptable.

With respect to number 14 to the north, whilst the proposed two storey element would be due south of this property, the projection beyond the existing rear facade is only 1.8m and the shadow line would fall across number 14's garage. It would not breach the 45 degree code in this direction.

(iv) Highways and parking

The proposal results in the loss of the integral garage and the on site parking space and secure cycle storage that this provides. As a proposed 3 bed dwelling, 2 on site spaces and secure cycle storage are required to meet the Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD. The front extension would reduce the length of the drive which would subsequently only accommodate one car. However the front garden area could easily be appropriately hard surfaced to provide the second space. Cycles would have to be stored inside or wheeled through the house to a rear shed. Since adequate parking is possible on the site then it would be inappropriate to also refuse the application for a lack of parking and secure cycle storage.

8 Conclusion

The proposed two storey side extension is considered to have a harmful effect to the street scene and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/16/00344

(A)

(B) for the following reasons

- 1 The proposal would result in development at a 2-storey height across the whole width of the plot, resulting in a loss of space about the building and creating a terracing effect, to the detriment of the visual amenities and spatial characteristics of the streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Borough Design Guide SPD 2011, policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.