
Site Address:	7 School Lane, Emsworth, PO10 7ED		
Proposal:	Two storey side extension.		
Application No:	APP/14/00701	Expiry Date:	29/08/2014
Applicant:	Mr R Treagust	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr D Niven	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	David Niven Designs Ltd		
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 No. 7 School Lane is a semi-detached property on the south side of the road where it narrows to single width before bollards prevent vehicular access to the Mill Pond itself. The site lies within Emsworth Conservation Area and School Lane is noted as having a medieval street pattern - the affected boundary is shown as a 'historic' wall on the appraisal map.
- 1.2 Currently the application site has a lean-to style car port on its west elevation with front door located within this side elevation. The western boundary tapers slightly, such that there is a separation distance of between 2.7m and 3.7m between the side facade and boundary fence. It is noteworthy that the boundary is an old 5' timber fence and not a 'historic' wall. The property has a flat roofed single storey rear addition which includes a balcony at first floor level.
- 1.3 The property to the west, No 6, is orientated such that its front door and main outlook is from its east elevation facing the site across its own 'courtyard' garden, which has a depth of between 5.5m and 7m. The kitchen window faces the application site. No 6 has a detached garage within this garden area, close to the shared boundary with the application site. No. 5 beyond also has its rear garden abutting the application site.
- 1.4 The other half of the pair of semi's, No 8, has a two storey flat roofed side extension and car port.

2 Planning History

15245/1 - Formation of a roof patio on top of existing single storey extension Refused
7 May 1987

Appeal Allowed November 1987

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application proposes a two storey pitched roof side extension with new car port. The extension is set back from the front facade of the original dwelling by 3.5m (at first floor) and has a width of between 3m and 3.3m, tapering to fill the side gap to boundary. The depth of the extension would be 3.9m at ground floor with a lean-to style roof above a ground floor projection, with the main 2 storey depth being 2.8m. The eaves level would match that of the main house at 5m high, with a fully hipped roof having maximum ridge height of 6.2m which is set some 1.5m below the ridge of the main house. The staggering of the first floor element forward of the ground floor

extension provides a recessed covered entrance porch for a new front door facing the street.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

NPPF, particularly Chapter 12 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' paras 126 and 131

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations), adopted July 2014

AL1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Emsworth Conservation Area Character Appraisal, approved March 2010

and Borough Design Guide, 2011

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Emsworth

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer - This property forms one-half of a semi-detached property with slate roof and poorer quality flinton brick facings. The intended extension is of modest proportions, located to the side and set back from the main street frontage. It immediately abuts the boundary with the neighbouring property (no.6 – The Old School House). I am able to confirm there is an error on the townscape appraisal map, since the boundary comprises a fence and the garage associated with no.6. There is therefore no conflict with an historic boundary wall.

From a conservation/design perspective the proposal is acceptable. It will not have any significant impact on the character of the conservation area. In most circumstances I would seek matching materials. The circumstances here are a little different given the quality of the existing face brickwork. I suggest it would be more appropriate to seek a better quality facing brick of complementary tone. I advise if planning permission is granted the submission of sample materials is made conditional with an appropriate informative to guide the applicant.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy - No objection

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: 7

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 11/07/2014

Number of representations received: 3 (from 2 households)

Summary: 2 storey extension will be overbearing and dominant; its bulk and mass will only be 6m from front door; will cause unacceptable harm to amenity as will affect outlook, cause overshadowing; fails HBC Design Guide as no gap to boundary and does not meet daylight rules; will hem in courtyard garden creating prison wall; concerned about builders vans blocking garage and access; builders traffic and tools will cause congestion; existing balcony no longer has opaque side as per Inspectors conditions and is now an invasion of privacy; concern over drains & subsidence; right up to boundary and must be no overhang inc drain pipes & gutters; any gap must be kept clear by applicants in future; road must be kept clean of oil from lorries etc; wish hours of work to be controlled to minimise disturbance; note will not allow works from my side & want boundary fence to be retained; should be no windows in side which would overlook; could wall be softened by painting

Also both **Councillor Galloway** and **Councillor Gibb-Gray** made contact about this application and visited the neighbour at No6. Discussions with them advised them of Officer's view of the proposal, which they understood, whilst sympathising with the concerns of Mrs Morris at No 6. On balance they decided not to Red Card the proposal.

Comment: The issues raised are considered below.

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) Effect on the character and appearance of the area and Conservation Area
- (iii) Impact on residential amenity
- (iv) Other matters

(i) Principle of development

2 The site lies within the built up area of Emsworth where new development is acceptable in principle, subject to policy and detailed development control considerations. The location of the site within Emsworth Conservation Area requires greater care in the consideration of the details to ensure that the statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area is achieved.

(ii) Effect on the character and appearance of the area and Conservation Area

7.3 The site lies close to the Mill Pond within The Old Town and Harbour Sub Area A of the Character Appraisal document where School Lane is noted at Paragraph 3.11 as a small

street that evolved during the 19th century. The urban character of the area with buildings situated at the back edge of the highway contributes to the visual appearance and character of the area. However the application site, No7, and No. 8, comprise an infill pair of semi detached dwellings and are not original Georgian buildings.

7.4 The proposed extension is set back by some 3.5m from the front facade and would therefore not be overly visible from the Mill Pond or School Lane itself until directly opposite. Due to the narrowness of the lane the opportunity to view the proposed extension from the public realm would be very minimal. The proposal does fill the width of the plot but this is not uncommon in this urban area. By setting the extension so far back from the front facade with a roof stepped significantly down from the main ridge, the sense of space about the property would not be unduly lost. The proposed design is in keeping with the host dwelling and appropriately subservient as recommended by the Borough Design Guide. It is therefore considered that the proposal would preserve the visual appearance and character of the area and Conservation Area.

7.5 The Conservation Officer has noted the poor bricks of the host dwelling and suggested a condition requiring the submission of materials in an attempt to try to find a better quality brick that might work well against the background of the pale brick of the main house. The neighbour at No 6 has also expressed a desire to see the first floor side elevation include some sort of contrast feature 'diamond' or similar, to add visual interest to her outlook. It is hoped the 2 parties will discuss this possibility and hence the imposition of a materials condition will also enable this to be considered if the applicants are willing to add any feature - the agent has been advised of this request.

(iii) Impact on residential amenity

7.6 The orientation of the property is such that it lies to the east of No 6 and there is unlikely to be any significant increase in overshadowing to the garden area of No 6 from the proposed extension. There are no windows proposed in the side, west, elevation, so there would be no loss of privacy to the occupiers of No 6 and 5 adjacent. However, it would be appropriate to add a condition limiting any further windows in the future both in the side and rear, given the possibility of oblique views to the rear garden of no.5 and to require the bathroom window to be obscure and only the top (above 1.7m) to be openable.

7.7 The extension would be visible from both the courtyard garden and internal rooms of No 6. The primary outlook from this dwelling is towards the proposed extension which would be located on the boundary and hence only be separated from No 6 by between 5.5m and 7m. However, because the proposal is only 2.8m deep at first floor level and with hipped roof set below the main ridge, then it is considered that the bulk of this proposal is very modest and would not result in an overbearing appearance or loss of outlook to the occupiers of No. 6. From no. 5, the oblique angle and distance is also unlikely to lead to overbearing or loss of outlook. As noted above the possibility of including a feature in the side elevation to improve outlook is being discussed between applicant and neighbour.

7.8 The proposed extension is up to the boundary with No 6 but the agent has confirmed that it will be constructed entirely on land within the applicants ownership, including guttering. The agent also confirmed that the soil stack from the bathroom has been designed as an internal stack at first floor and comes out in the corner of the 'porch' overhang at ground floor level, to be able to link to the existing drain - this is shown on the submitted drawings. Therefore there will be no external soil pipe on the side elevation visible from No 6.

(iv) Other matters

7.9 The neighbour has raised concern over builders vehicles blocking the lane, but this would be beyond the red line application site and not conditionable - any blocking of the road would be a police matter. It would also not be appropriate to condition the hours of construction work - the scale of development is so modest that any disturbance during building works will be very short lived and temporary and would not expect it to cause any undue loss of amenity. However should noise result at the time, then it may be that Environmental Health legislation could address any problem.

7.10 The balcony above the existing single storey rear extension was allowed on appeal in 1987. The Inspector did note at the time that the development included opaque perspex infill panels to the balustraded sides of the first floor patio and the application was allowed on this basis, although no specific condition was imposed requiring these opaque panels to be fitted. Until recently (even at the time of my site visit to the neighbour on 22nd July 2014) there was some bamboo cane style screening up that protected the privacy to No 6. This has allegedly recently been removed. Whilst not part of this current application, the open side aspect of the balcony does cause a loss of amenity to No 6 & 5 and an Informative could be added advising the applicants that the opaque screening was fundamental to the balcony being found to be acceptable by the Inspector.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The proposed extension is considered a modest addition to the dwelling which would not cause any harm to neighbouring residential amenity, and meets the Borough Design Guide and policy CS16. It is therefore recommended for planning permission, subject to appropriate conditions.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00701

(A)

(B) subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date on which this planning permission was granted.
Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 Construction of the development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples and details of all external facing and roofing materials shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter only such approved materials and finishes shall be used in carrying out the development.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11.4 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order, no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be constructed within the west (side) and south (rear) elevation of the extension hereby approved at first floor level of above, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 4 The bathroom window at 1st floor level in the south / rear elevation of the extension hereby approved building shall:-

(i) be permanently unopenable up to a height of at least 1.7m above floor level; and

ii) at all times be and remain glazed entirely with obscure glass, the particular type of which glass shall provide a degree of obscuration no less obscure than that which is provided by Pilkington's Texture Glass Obscuration Level 4.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 5 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

1:1250 location plan

1:500 Block Plan

As Built Plans - 14/1001/1

Proposed Plans 14/1001/2

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.