
Site Address:	17 Tanners Ridge, Waterlooville, PO7 5RF		
Proposal:	Single storey front and side extension.		
Application No:	APP/14/01153	Expiry Date:	25/12/2014
Applicant:	Mr R Garfoot	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr M Moyse	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Martin Moyse		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

No 17 is a detached low profile bungalow with buff brick elevations having decorative block panels, beneath a shallow pitched concrete tile roof. It is set within an area of uniformity with the other bungalows on the west side of Tanners Ridge being identical. However, opposite, on the east side, the properties are terraced two storey dwellings. The application site is located on the south-west corner of Tanners Ridge with Sovereign Lane in an open and prominent location. It has an approximate 'L' shaped footprint. The land slopes down to the west such that Tanners Ridge is, as the name suggests, the highest point.

The area is characterised by open plan frontages with a strong building line. To the rear, west, of the site the bungalows in Sovereign Lane are similar and also have a strong building line set well back from the road such that No 20 sits back behind the side elevation of the application site with a 1.8m high close boarded fence enclosing the rear garden of the application site.

2 Planning History

None

3 Proposal

The proposal involves two extensions to this property: one would be to the front, east elevation, being a full width 2.2m deep extension; the other would be to the side, north, elevation and would be 5m deep. Both extensions continue the existing eaves and ridge line and propose matching materials.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

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)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Development Engineer - Highways - no adverse comment

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: 11

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary: Notes large plan boundary line between properties inaccurate; gap between my bungalow and front extension is less than 3m so Party Wall surveyor would be needed to ensure excavations do not damage adjacent bungalow

Comment: Amended plans were received on 21/11/14 correcting the boundary line; Party Wall Act a private matter between neighbours.

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.

(ii) Impact upon the streetscene

Front/east extension: currently the front elevation of the application site is stepped back slightly from No 15 immediately to the south, to take account of the curve of the corner and the sloping land (the road level is higher with a grass bank down to the bungalow level). The proposed 2.2m addition on this front elevation would align the front elevation with that of the adjacent bungalow. Visually this is acceptable as it would maintain the strong building line within the street scene.

Side/north extension: The existing side elevation already sits beyond the building line of the properties on the south side of Sovereign Lane. The proposed 5m extension would encroach into the existing open plan grassed area that provides the setting to this bungalow and the character for this area. This open plan character is repeated on the opposite corner - No 25 on the northern corner is in effect a 'handed' version of the application site, similarly set back with an open plan frontage - together they provide an important visual pairing and setting for the junction and wider area. The proposed 5m extension would result in a significant loss of this open space and character and be overly dominant and imposing to the street scene. A gap of between just 1m and 2.8m would remain from the end elevation and back edge of the highway - this reduced set back is considered too minimal and out of keeping with the more spacious open plan character of the area as a whole, contrary to Policy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The proposed front extension would align with the adjacent bungalow - there are no side windows in this front part of the adjacent bungalow so the extension would have no affect on the amenity of the occupiers. The side extension would also have no detrimental effect on any adjacent occupiers as it is too remote to affect light or outlook.

8 **Conclusion**

The application site is on an open plan corner where the land slopes such that the northern extension proposed would be overly dominant, considerably forward of the surrounding building lines, harmful to the visual character of the area. As such it is considered contrary to Policy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide and is recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/01153 for the following reasons:

- 1 Due to the site's prominent corner location in an area characterised by open plan frontages, the proposed side extension to the north elevation, at 5m wide, would erode the existing open space and character of the area, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene. The side extension would be overly dominant, harmful to the visual setting and character of this corner site. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the adopted Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011.