
Site Address:	26 Castlemans Lane, Hayling Island, PO11 0PZ		
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension with velux windows, and single storey brick built conservatory with changes to ground floor roof at front.		
Application No:	APP/14/00287	Expiry Date:	12/05/2014
Applicant:	Mrs Campbell	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr Bramble-Stewart	Case Officer:	Daniel
	GBS Designs		Gender-Sherry
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 Castlemans Lane is a rural lane, lined only on the eastern side with residential dwellings. These are mainly semi-detached pairs, separated by the occasional detached dwelling. The dwellings are set in a slightly staggered diagonal line, running north to south. All are two storey and enjoy expansive views across the open field to the west of the road.
- 1.2 To the rear of all dwellings on this road is a large open field, providing views of a very rural nature, and creating a spacious setting for the dwellings. All dwellings enjoy large rear gardens that generally benefit from uninterrupted light from the east, partly from the south and entirely from the west.
- 1.3 No.26 is the northern dwelling of a semi detached, two storey pair sitting forward of the building line of the next pair to the north, Nos.28-30. No.26 currently has a single storey, half width conservatory to the rear, and a detached single storey shed to the rear alongside the northern boundary, which partly sits adjacent to the similar sized shed of the northern neighbour, No.28. To the front and side is a flat roofed garage and porch.
- 1.6 The neighbour to the south, No.24 has an existing single storey rear extension running the full width of the dwelling.

2 Planning History

None applicable

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application proposes the demolition of the existing conservatory and the erection of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension. The two storey element of the proposal will project from the north eastern corner of the host dwelling and have dimensions of approximately 3.55m deep by 4.75m wide by 6.1m high; its pitched roof will tie in to the ridge height of the host dwelling and feature a gable end design. The single storey element is to comprise an attached conservatory with dimensions of 3.55m deep by 3.5m wide by 3.15m (max) high.
- 3.2 Also proposed within the application is the addition of a pitched roof at the front and side of the dwelling to replace the existing flat roofs over the porch and garage.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS16 (High Quality Design)

CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (December 2011)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Southern Water

The exact position of the surface water sewers must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

Please be advised of the following;

-No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 metres either side of the centreline of the surface water sewer.

-No new soakaways should be located within 5m of a surface water sewer.

-All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

Furthermore, due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water, Southern House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk.

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the foul and surface water sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

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: 2

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary:

- 6.1 Neighbour to the north expresses concern over loss of natural light to their kitchen, and both windows serving the downstairs and upstairs landing area. Concerns are expressed of a potential overbearing and intrusive appearance upon their dwelling and reduced lunar light to the aforementioned windows. There will be a loss of outlook from the currently expansive open views as a result of the two storey brick extension.

Comment: A site visit was conducted from the neighbours property and the points raised are considered below in the 'Planning Considerations' section.

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 of the design on the character and appearance of the immediate area
- (iii) Impact on neighbour amenity
- (iv) Permitted Development Fall Back

- (i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The site lies in the non-urban area. The proposals represent extensions to an existing dwelling and are considered acceptable in principle, albeit that consideration needs to be given to the impact of the development on its rural, countryside setting.

- (ii) Impact of the design on the character and appearance of the immediate area

- 7.3 The prevailing policy and design guidance set out in Section 4 above regarding extensions to existing residential properties requires that new development should look to the existing building as the main reference point for massing and design, and respect the local context. In this regard, the level of impact posed by the front and side roof additions would be minimal, especially when considering that part of the ground floor front elevation already has a pitched roof, and the application simply seeks to continue this pitch across the entire porch area and side garage as a replacement of the existing flat roof. Therefore it is considered that this element would be appropriate in design and have a minimal impact on the character and appearance of the area and if anything enhance the appearance of the dwelling in its wider setting.

- 7.4 To the rear, the single storey rear extension would not be visible from the public realm, and would be largely screened from the southern neighbouring property by their own conservatory. The two storey rear extension would be partially seen from the highway, however matching materials would be used and its close visual relationship to the existing dwelling and the neighbouring property to the north is such that its design, in isolation, is appropriate to the host dwelling and would have a limited and acceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the wider area.

- (iii) Impact on neighbour amenity

7.5 When considering the policy context for the impact of development on neighbouring amenity, Policy CS16 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) builds on the guidance in the NPPF regarding the relationship of new development to neighbouring buildings and requires that new development should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through, amongst other criteria, loss of outlook. In addition the design guidance in the Borough Design Guide SPD sets out:

Rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building. They also need to have particular regard to neighbouring properties and should not cause an adverse affect, such as overshadowing. (paragraph 5.41)

Rear extensions should be a maximum of 3 metres from the rear wall of the existing house, providing that this does not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties. Outside of Chichester Harbour AONB exceptions to this may be considered, providing there is no adverse effect on neighbouring properties. In general, a single storey extension should be no closer than 1 metre to neighbouring properties and 2 metres for two storey extensions. (paragraph 5.42) *The design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours. Obstruction of light and outlook from an existing window can be mitigated against if the extension does not result in the centre of the existing windows being within a combined plan and section 45 degree overshadowing zone.* (paragraph 5.43)

7.6 With regard to the extensions proposed it is clear that there are only two neighbouring properties to consider in this case - No. 24 to the south and No. 28 to the north. In the case of No.24, the roof alterations to the front and side lie well away from this property and consequently are not considered to have any detrimental impact. With regard to the rear extensions, the design of the proposal sites the main building bulk of the two storey addition approximately 3.75m off the common boundary, such that only the replacement conservatory will lie adjacent to No.24's own conservatory. No objections have been received from this adjacent occupier, and the siting and scale of development adjacent to No.24's northern boundary is not considered to result in undue detriment to the light or outlook available to this property.

7.7 With regard to No.28, this property lies in a recessed position relative to No.26, with its front and rear building lines significantly further to the east than those of Nos 24-26. Whilst the property features a conventional front door access, to the southern side of the property an access gate leads to a glazed side door that provides the entrance to the rear part of the house and in particular the kitchen. The kitchen itself benefits from a window in the south elevation, which is the principal source of light to the room and enjoys an open outlook and a high level of uninterrupted sunlight and daylight to the south across the presently undeveloped area of Nos 24-26.

7.8 The two storey extension proposed, in projecting the main body of the dwelling house 3.55m beyond the original rear building line of No.26, and lying within 1.63m of the common boundary at its nearest point will have a significant impact upon the level of amenity currently enjoyed from the side access and kitchen at No.26, and in this respect a letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of this property. This impact has been assessed from both outside and inside of No.28, specifically from the side access and door adjacent to the site (which is used as the primary entrance to the dwelling by the occupiers), and from within the kitchen.

7.9 Having regard to the advice regarding extensions to dwelling houses contained within the Borough Design Guide, whilst the design of the proposal is sympathetic to the host dwelling, it is clear that its depth exceeds that recommended in paragraph 5.42, whilst its proximity to the boundary also does not accord with the guidance

in that paragraph. Its positioning relative to the side access glazed door and kitchen window clearly fall well within the 46 degree overshadowing zone, as the extension will overlap the whole of the door and part of the window, and thus loss of light can be expected.

7.10 Given the degree to which the open outlook to the south contributes to the amenity of No.28, it is considered that the loss of outlook and light that would be experienced by this property would be significant and harmful to that property. Furthermore, the increased bulk of the resulting dwelling and subsequent loss of natural light upon the area immediately to the south of No.28, which is currently used as the primary entrance to the rear of the dwelling, and as mentioned above, contains a door and window serving the kitchen, would result in the development appearing overbearing and harmful to the amenities of this property. In both respects the development would not meet the requirements of Policy CS16 of the adopted Local Plan (Core Strategy), nor the guidance set out in the Borough Design Guide.

7.11 The roof alterations proposed to the front and side of No.26, whilst in part directly adjacent to the common boundary with No.28, are relatively modest in scale, and have not elicited any objections from the adjacent neighbour.

(iv) Permitted Development Fall Back

7.12 Having been advised of concerns regarding the impact of the development as proposed on the amenity of No.28, the applicant's agents have drawn attention to the permitted development rights available to No.26, which represent a 'fall back' position should permission not be forthcoming for the current scheme. In this regard it is recognised that No.26 still has its permitted development rights intact, and therefore there is scope for the erection of a two-storey rear extension to be constructed; however the maximum that could be constructed under such rights would be a 3m deep extension lying a minimum of 2m from the boundary with No.28. It is acknowledged that even a permitted development compliant two-storey extension would have some degree of impact upon the neighbour to the north, however such an extension's impact would be reduced from that proposed by lying further from the boundary and less deep in the plot, and therefore affording more of the existing open light and outlook to remain to the kitchen/access door in the south elevation of No.28. By comparison, it is considered that the extension this application seeks permission for will cause extra, undue harm to the outlook and amenity of the occupiers of No.28. The existence of a 'fall back' position is therefore not considered to justify approval in this case

8 Conclusion

8.1 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its design in relation to the host property, its impact upon the wider rural landscape, and its impact upon No.24 to the south. However, the impact of the proposed two-storey rear extension is such that it will be overbearing and cause a significant loss of light and outlook to No.28 Castlemans Lane, to such an extent that the development would not meet relevant Local Plan policy and adopted design guidance. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00287 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed development would result in an excessive building bulk adjacent to an existing residential property, detrimental to the visual outlook, light available to, and amenities of the occupier of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the guidance contained in the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.