

Planning Statement for 16 Poplar Grove, Hayling Island, Hampshire. PO11 9DN

INTRODUCTION

This Statement is submitted to support and provide the background and rationale behind the proposed development at 16 Poplar Grove, Hayling Island. PO11 9DN.

The intention is to convert the property from a 3 bedroom (2 Double, 1 Single) into a 4 double bedroom family home. At the same time re-configure the space to create a family friendly Kitchen, dining room, playroom, introduce additional privacy between the neighbouring properties and maximise the outlook onto the garden.

THE SITE

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling with a pitched roof. The area is comprised of a mix of detached and Semi-detached houses although the eastern side of the road is comprised almost exclusively of detached houses. The exterior of the property is constructed of brick and render with a tiled pitched roof. The previous single storey extension to the rear of the property is a felt flat roof construction. The external garage to the rear of the property is 7.5m x 3.5m, with flat roof and sits to the northern side and acts as the party wall to number 14 Poplar grove.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

A previous application, for single storey side extension, two storey rear extension and garage conversion was withdrawn due to some concerns raised by neighbouring property to the north (number 14 Brett & Sandra)

As this will be a long term family home it was always our intention to ensure the neighbours directly affected by this application are comfortable with the proposed development. Prior to application plans were shared with local residents to ensure all feedback could be fully considered ahead of this process.

Prior to our application Brett had mentioned the development looked substantial, he was impressed at the vision mentioning he had considered buying the property himself but was not prepared to live with the turmoil of a development. It was mentioned that they faced planning challenges from #12 when extending to the rear of their house and as a result could only do a single storey which restricts living space upstairs. He advised they would not place a formal objection to the development but would appreciate consideration during the build as they have young children and a large dog.

Once the application was made the local planning officer Tina Pickup visited neighbouring properties. At this point a number of concerns were raised over the development but no formal objections lodged. These concerns were shared by Tina Pickup and as a result we placed the application on hold so that where possible we could address the concerns.

I met with Brett to understand the concerns he & Sandra had over the proposed development, these were described as:

- 1) The roof eaves & rainwater drainage of the single storey side extension over hung the boundary line.
- 2) What would happen to the current party wall during this development as digging for footings could damage the wall, although recognised the wall is already damaged in places and requires repair.
- 3) The building of a single storey side extension right up to the boundary line would feel oppressive and impact the view from the kitchen window by the sink especially with the introduction of a pitched roof on the existing external garage. This window sits c3m back from the boundary line, although he also recognised that this provides much greater & welcomed privacy as currently both of our kitchen windows look out to each other.
- 4) The 2 storey rear extension that was planned to come out further than the existing single storey extension by c1.8m would take away light and a view of the skyline from their kitchen window. Upon discussion this became more about view than light as their Kitchen is dual aspect with 3 windows and Brett recognised the

reality of the single storey side extension would impact the light to a greater degree. Brett advised they would be more comfortable if the 2 storey was kept in line with the existing single storey rear extension.

After hearing these concerns I then met with the architect to explore all potential options so that we could adjust our plans where possible. 4 alternative options were sketched out so that I could share the merits of each with the neighbours.

I then invited Brett over to share with him each of these options to gain his input so that we could progress 1 of them with formal architect designs and amend the planning application. I talked through each option but also shared with Brett the importance to us of ensuring the two storey extension goes further than the existing extension as this is the difference between 4 good sized double bedrooms and 2 good sized doubles with 2 much smaller rooms. Again Brett mentioned that they were not going to formally object to the original application but that they appreciated we are exploring options to ease their concerns. He also recognised that there is little material difference for the additional two storey extension as the single storey side extension will close in the space more.

Regarding point 1, I advised the plans had been drafted using the centre of the wall as the boundary rather than our side of the wall. Once we understood this we agreed that the proposed wall would be brought in sufficiently to ensure the eaves & rainwater drainage would remain inside the boundary. It was mentioned that this in turn would also drop the roof height slightly and push the wall back helping a little with the other points.

Regarding point 2, Brett confirmed he was comfortable with the removal of the current party wall, this would make it easier during the build process and enable access to properly finish the exterior of the wall. It was agreed the removal of this wall also open up the space a little and combined with us bringing in the extension could provide them some additional space. This was on the condition that any builders were respectful to the fact they have young children and a large dog. I will ensure a temporary solution is in place and briefed to the builders to prevent any issues.

Regarding point 3, we agreed that the external finish of the wall would be in keeping with the rest of the house in smooth render in a pure white finish to help reflect as much light as possible into the space. It was also agreed that we would not progress with the proposed conversion of the external garage. This was proposed to sit 7.5m out from the rear of the property and along with a pitched roof would impact light into their kitchen and patio area to the side of the property. This was a very welcome revision to the design as it will increase the level of light into both of these spaces over what is currently there.

Regarding point 4, I re-iterated the importance of getting a well-balanced house with upstairs space being in proportion and reflecting the living space. Brett understood this and with the proposed amendments of point 3 could see no issue with the two storey rear extension coming out c1.8m to be in line with the current external garage.

At the end of the conversation Brett advised that they are considering relocating their patio space to ensure it still receives plenty of sunlight and to position it on the rear of the building rather than the side, on reflection of these plans he mentioned they would evaluate this once complete so that they better understood the impact of removing the existing external garage offset by the introduction of the single storey side and two storey rear extension. If this move is required I have offered some financial support to assist in this move to ensure they are not impacted as a result. It is our intention to move into a rental property during the build process so that all of the building works can be completed as efficiently as possible and minimise the length of time the neighbours will be impacted by the development process. ✓

At the end of this session Brett felt much more comfortable with the planning application and appreciated the consideration given to different options.