
Site Address:	18 St Thomas Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 0EX		
Proposal:	Porch to front of the property (Revised Application).		
Application No:	APP/15/00940	Expiry Date:	19/10/2015
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs McCullagh	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Widdows	Case Officer:	Rachael McMurray
	Anglian Group		
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

St Thomas Avenue comprises a circular avenue characterised by mainly chalet style detached dwellings set in modest plots. The dwellings vary in architectural style with predominantly open plan frontages or have very low walls, although the presence of mature vegetation and gardens has provided some front screening. There is a strong building line with the dwellings all set back from the highway by approximately 7 to 8m.

No 18 is a gable fronted chalet bungalow located on the eastern side of the road, representing the end (southern-most) dwelling set in a linear fashion. It is the first dwelling after the corner and No 16 to the south is set at right angles such that its rear garden forms the southern side boundary with the application site. No 16 is set such that its western side elevation is approximately in line with the front building line of the bungalows to the north ie the spacious setting is maintained on the corner.

The application site has a conservatory on its southern, side, elevation, which has in effect blocked access to the detached garage that sits behind the dwelling. Parking is provided for at least 2 cars in front of the conservatory. The front boundary has a low wall with some evergreen shrubs that do currently partly screen the site. No 20 to the north is a similar chalet bungalow having its drive alongside its southern elevation providing a separation distance of between 5m and 7m. No 20 also has a small 'infill' conservatory on its southern elevation facing the application site - but this does not project forward of the front elevation. The boundary between the two properties comprises a post and wire fence with shrubs.

2 Planning History

APP/15/00144 - Conservatory to front of property Refused 18/3/15

This proposed a fully glazed conservatory located outside the front kitchen window, measuring 3m wide x 2.5m deep x 3.3m high

3 Proposal

This is a reduced revised proposal and now proposes a substantially brick built with glazed roof extension located centrally on the front elevation having dimensions of 2.2m wide x 2m deep x 2.8m high. Supporting information indicates that the development would provide disabled access for a mobility scooter.

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
AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

and The Borough Design Guide SPD, Dec 2011

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Summary: application states a conservatory not porch; porch guidelines set at 3 sq m; could become conservatory in future so should be determined as conservatory; don't understand how front access provides better disabled access than a ramp to existing side entrance; access should be from side; No 20 twin of application site with 1.3m central corridor which is adequate for wheelchair access; existing conservatory to south could be modified; slope within capabilities of a motorised scooter; proposed front entrance will necessitate a ramp and rails across front lawn exposed to all weathers; unnecessary forward extension would set precedent; building should not be between front elevation and roadway;

Comment: These issues will be considered below but the needs and necessity of the proposal are not for deliberation - the proposal must be determined as submitted and other options are not relevant.

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

(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. Whether the proposed development is called a conservatory or a porch is an arbitrary argument - it is a proposed extension and its particular size, design and location must be considered on its merits, having regard to the adopted policies and relevant material considerations.

(ii) Impact upon the streetscene

St Thomas Avenue is characterised by a relatively strong building line with a uniformity to the siting and set back of the dwellings. Front boundaries were originally all low and would have been quite 'open plan'. Over time, gardens have matured and the presence of shrubs and trees have provided some screening to some front gardens. The application site benefits from some evergreen shrubs on the roadside which would help to screen the proposed conservatory. However, there would be no control over the removal of these domestic shrubs and therefore the application must be determined on the basis that these bushes may not remain in perpetuity.

The revised scheme has substantially reduced the size of the front extension from 7.5 sqm to 4.4 sqm. and would now be sited more centrally between the two front windows. The design incorporates brick elevations with Georgian windows of an appropriate size and proportion to reflect the front elevation. The eaves line would align with the top of the front windows and therefore not dominate the host dwelling. The structure would have a hipped glazed roof to minimise bulk. Overall the visual appearance and design of the front extension proposed is considered appropriately subservient, balanced and proportionate the host dwelling.

The question of whether the principle of this front extension encroaching into the frontage area would harm the overall streetscene is a balanced judgement. Regard must be had to the fact that under permitted development rights a Class D porch could be erected outside any external door that measures 3 sqm. Such a porch could be added to the principal elevation of any dwelling in St Thomas Avenue which would therefore encroach into front garden areas. The proposed front extension is only marginally larger - it would project 2m. The front garden has a depth of some 8.5m and hence the extension would still be set back by 6.5m.

It is considered that this set back would maintain a sense of space about both the extension and existing dwelling and the overall character of the frontage area would not be unduly harmed. Guidance of front extensions is contained within the adopted Borough Design Guide, which at para 5.36 is notes that *Front extensions are therefore most appropriate where the building is set well back from the street.* The retained 6.5m set back is considered sufficient to avoid the proposed extension being overly dominant and prominent in street scene terms.

It is acknowledged that by providing disabled access there will likely be associated ramps and rails leading to the entrance door, but the harsurfacing and provision of such ramps incidental to the dwellinghouse does not require permission in its own right unless it exceeds 5 sqm and is either porous or provision is made for direct run-off water to a permeable or porous area within the curtilage.

On balance it is considered that the 2m deep, modest brick built extension that relates well to the host dwelling would be acceptable in streetscene terms and would not be visually intrusive. It is therefore considered to comply with both adopted Design Guide SPD and Policy CS16, clause 1c and e).

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The property directly to the north, No 20, has a small side conservatory which has an outlook towards the side elevation of the application site. Currently this outlook is towards the northern wall of the application site which is aligned. The proposed development is set more centrally on the front elevation and therefore some distance from No 20. Considering a 2m high boundary fence or wall could be erected as permitted development on this boundary which would screen the two sites then the likely impact of the proposed development would be very minimal. Therefore the effect on the amenity of neighbours is not considered sufficient to warrant a reason for refusal on amenity grounds.

8 Conclusion

It is considered that the revised reduced design of the proposed front extension would have no adverse impact on the visual appearance of the street scene or neighbouring amenity. Therefore it is recommended for permission.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/15/00940 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 The external materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture those on the existing building.
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 2012.

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

1:1250 Location Plan

1:500 Block Plan

Existing Plan and Elevations Contract No 099/84070 B page 1 of 2

Proposed Plan and Elevations Contract No 099/84070 B page 2 of 2

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

