
Site Address:	18 St Thomas Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 0EX		
Proposal:	Conservatory to front of property.		
Application No:	APP/15/00144	Expiry Date:	03/04/2015
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs McCullagh	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Widdows	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Anglian Group		
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **REFUSE 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 and frontages are generally open plan 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

None

3 Proposal

The addition of a conservatory measuring 3m wide by 2.5m deep with pitched glazed roof, in mock Victorian style having an overall eaves height of 2.135m and to ridge of 3.33m (dimensions appear to be above damp course). It would be positioned at the northern end of the front gable facade, projecting into the front garden. The northern elevation would be constructed of brick with the south and west being fully glazed above a damp course of bricks.

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

None

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: 9

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

Summary: Not in keeping with its environment; error in drawings - front annotated as rear; no other conservatories on principle elevations in St Thomas Avenue; outlook from No 20 would face another 2.7m of brick wall; height would shade sun lounge and imprison; would set precedent for construction beyond building line; affect character of area; would devalue other properties; actual ground level mis-represented, buildings are higher; brick elevation could be extended round conservatory making it a proper extension; planning rules exist to prevent altering the front appearance of properties; will restrict water run-off; conservatory a temporary structure not in keeping with area; an affront to the building line; contravenes regulations building forward of principal elevation; existing kitchen door on north elevation has already been bricked up.

Comment: Most of these issues will be considered below, but: affect on value of properties is not a material planning consideration; bricking up of existing kitchen door is not development that requires planning permission so cannot be controlled.

7 Planning Considerations

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. The development requires permission because it breaches the permitted development control criteria in that it is sited forward of the principal elevation and it is the effect of this that 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 proposed conservatory, at 2.5m deep, would project significantly into the front garden area. This would represent an incongruous feature and be out of keeping with the otherwise open nature of the front gardens in the street.

The adopted Borough Design Guide states, at paragraph 5.36:

Front Extensions

Front extensions should not protrude too far forward from the main building, or be prominent in the street and should respect the common building line. Front extensions are therefore most appropriate where the building is set well back from the street, where there is a staggered building line, or in isolated countryside locations. Two storey front extensions will only be acceptable where the building is set well back from the street.

In this instance the application site is not staggered and the proposed conservatory does not respect the strong building line - It would be an overly prominent formal structure detrimental to the visual appearance and amenity of the street scene, which would be contrary to both this clause of the adopted Design Guide SPD and Policy CS16, clause 1c).

Regard must also be had to what could be done under permitted development rights - under Class D a 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 - but the current proposal is 7.5 sqm and accordingly significantly larger and would have a greater impact. This is not considered sufficient justification to make the proposal acceptable.

(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 would result in an additional 2.5m brick wall of height 2.13m with glass roof above. It is accepted that due to the current relative open nature of the shared boundary this wall would be visible from within No 20's side conservatory and affect the views to the south across the neighbours garden; but regard must be had to the fact that a 2m high boundary fence or wall could be erected as permitted development on this boundary which would screen the two sites. Therefore the effect on the amenity of neighbours is not considered sufficient to warrant a reason for refusal on amenity grounds.

8 Conclusion

The proposed conservatory, in a forward position within a street with a strong building line, would represent a prominent and incongruous structure detrimental to the visual appearance and amenity of the street scene, contrary to policy. Therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/15/00144, for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed conservatory, by virtue of its forward position, is considered to represent a prominent and incongruous feature within the streetscene out of character with the strong building line and visual character of the area, and would therefore be detrimental to the visual appearance and amenity of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 (1c) of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Supplementary Planning Document: Havant Borough Design Guide 2011 (paragraph 5.36 'Front Extensions') and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.