
Site Address:	22 Bedford Close, Havant, PO9 2TP		
Proposal:	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension with loft conversion with rear dormer and new porch.		
Application No:	APP/14/00299	Expiry Date:	15/05/2014
Applicant:	Mrs S Lewis	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr B Bramble-Stewart	Case Officer:	Stephen Andrews
Ward:	St Faiths		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is made up of a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The dwelling is constructed of red brick with tile hanging to the front elevation and pitched brown pantile roof. The dwelling has a flat roofed front porch, detached single garage to the rear, with driveway to the side of the house and access on to Bedford Close. There is a mature hedge along the front boundary, shared with neighbour 21 Bedford Close. The rear is enclosed by close boarded fencing and hedging with mature tree planting beyond the rear boundary.

The area is residential in nature. Bedford Close is largely characterised by similar style and appearance two storey semi-detached dwellings, with uniformed spacing between, created by the driveways for each dwelling being located at the side. There are other varieties of dwelling type in the immediate area including, chalet style dwellings and the two storey detached dwellings in Pook Lane, with their own distinct character.

2 Planning History

None

3 Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension that will match the height and depth of the host dwelling and bring the dwelling some 0.2m to the shared boundary with immediate neighbour 23 Bedford Close. The proposal also includes a single storey rear extension 3.2m in depth, 3.5m in height and 7.1m in width and a rear facing flat roofed dormer that will extend across the existing and extended part of the dwelling. The proposal also shows the removal of the front boundary hedge and provision of three on site parking spaces to the site front.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Development Engineer - None received

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:

Two letters of objection and one petition against the proposal with 10 signatures.

- loss of privacy
- loss of outlook
- out of character
- loss of on street parking
- highway safety
- visually intrusive
- poor design

Comment:

The issues raised in the letters of representation have been fully considered and addressed in section 7 of the report, below.

7 Principal Issues

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact on neighbour amenity
- (iii) Impact on the character and appearance of the area

(i) Principle of development

The site lies in the built up area of Havant where development is normally permitted subject to compliance with the Development Plan and any other material considerations.

(ii) Impact on neighbour amenity

The application proposes a single storey rear extension, insertion of a dormer window in the roof space at the rear of the dwelling and a two storey side extension. There

would also be three high level rooflights in the front elevation of the dwelling.

In respect of the single storey rear extension, the eaves height and ridge height would fall within the limits allowed under permitted development entitlement. However, the depth of 3.2m takes it 0.2m above the accepted limits, without first seeking prior approval from the local planning authority. It is considered that the increase in depth of 0.2m above that allowed under permitted development entitlement would not give rise to unacceptable harm by reason of overbearing effect, overshadowing and loss of light. It is considered that permitted development, in this instance, is a significant material consideration and a valid fall back position. The comparison between what could be built without planning permission and that of the proposal is therefore a sound basis to assess impact on neighbour amenity.

Following the above comparison it is concluded that the single storey rear extension would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbour amenity.

In respect of the rear facing dormer window whilst it is accepted that this part of the development would allow for wider views, this would generally be towards the rear, obliquely looking over neighbouring gardens. It is pertinent to note beyond the rear boundary is the A27.

In respect of neighbours 35 and 37 Pook Lane there would be views towards the rear of these neighbours however there is a separation distance of some 20m from the proposal to the rear of the closest neighbour. In addition there is close boarded fencing along the shared boundaries, various outbuildings in the neighbouring gardens and planting that offer sufficient screening between the development and the neighbours ensuring there is no direct views of these neighbours. Further the section of dormer window in the new roof space (the closest section) would serve a bathroom and as such would be obscure glazed.

It is pertinent to note that a rear facing dormer in the roof space of the original dwelling could be constructed under permitted development entitlement, this would be similar to that of the rear dormer in 20 Bedford Close.

The proposal includes 3 high level roof lights in the front elevation. It is considered that due to the high level position of the windows they would offer limited views over neighbouring properties and not to a degree that would be considered unacceptably harmful.

It is therefore considered that the proposed roof accommodation and associated works would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbour amenity by reason of overlooking and loss of privacy.

The two storey side extension, due to its position would only impact on immediate neighbour 23 Bedford Close. It was noted that 23 had two flank windows (one at ground level and one at first floor level). Whilst it is not certain what rooms are served by these windows it is noted that dwellings along this side of Bedford Close are very similar in scale and appearance. On this basis, it is fair to assume that the dwelling is likely to be a handed view of the application dwelling, with the ground floor window likely to be a secondary lounge window and the first floor window serving the landing area. As such neither window would be a principal window serving a habitable room.

Whilst the side extension would be positioned 0.2m in from the shared boundary a 2.6m gap would separate the proposal from 23. In light of the fact that no habitable or

principle windows would be affected it is contended that this part of the proposal would not result in unacceptable levels of overshadowing, loss of light or overbearing effect. Further the three ground floor flank windows proposed would be high level and obscurely glazed, therefore this part of the development would not result in loss of privacy or overlooking.

For the reasons set out above It is considered that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the residential amenities of any of the adjoining neighbours and would accord with the requirements of policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy Local Development Framework 2011.

(iii) Impact on the character and appearance of the area

The only element of the proposal that would be readily visible from the public domain is the formation of the parking area, the insertion of the three rooflights at the front and the two storey side extension. In respect of the rooflights it is not considered that these would materially alter the appearance of the existing dwelling and as such would maintain the existing character and appearance of the dwelling.

Whilst the formation of the parking area would be undesirable, resulting in the loss of the attractive hedge and garden area to the front of the dwelling, this could be created under permitted development entitlement, provided there was no surface water run off on to the highway. Therefore with regard to this position no formal objection is raised in respect of the parking area on character grounds. Further, due to the fact that access would be created on to an unclassified road no objection would be raised in respect of highway safety. The parking created on-site would offset that lost on street.

The proposed two storey side extension, which has the same depth and height as the host dwelling, would see the dwelling extended at a two storey height across the entire width of the plot, save for the 0.2m set back on the shared boundary with 23. It is considered that this has significant implications to the visual amenity and appearance of the street scene and if replicated could have a damaging affect on the prevailing character of this section of Bedford Close.

The southern side of Bedford Close is characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings of similar scale, appearance and spacing. It is noticeable that for the most part that there is good separation distances between the pairs of semis created by the driveways which provides a clear break in the built form of the street scene and in turn creates good spacing and some form of openness within the street scene. It is therefore considered that any development to the side elevations of dwellings within Bedford Close must have due regard to this important and distinct characteristic.

The development proposes a two storey extension, of a height consistent with that of the host dwelling, that would see the complete loss of the space to the side of the application property. The only space that would be retained would be that of the driveway of 23, however, this is not considered to be a reasonable justification for the proposal and would still undermine the prevailing character and spacing of the streetscene.

It would be normal practice, as set out in the adopted Borough Design Guide, to seek a subservient form of extension as this aids in creating a reduced built form, with clear break between the extension and host dwelling, and in this case some form of meaningful spacing between the two storey development and the side boundary to

prevent a terracing effect. Further such reductions allows for an extension to be created without creating an unbalanced appearance between the pair of semi-detached dwellings.

In this instance the height and depth combine to form an unbalanced form of development close to the shared boundary which would erode the important spacing between dwellings along Bedford Close. The proposal would therefore result in a development that would materially harm the prevailing character and appearance of the area and openness between dwellings. Further the proposal could result in an undesirable precedent, which if replicated, would further harm the character and appearance of Bedford Close by way of a 'terracing effect'.

Having regard to the above information it is considered that the development would conflict with the principles and requirements of policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy Local Development Framework 2011 and that of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012.

8 Conclusion

The development by reason of its height, width and proximity to the shared boundary with 23 Bedford Close would result in the semi-detached dwellings appearing unbalanced with the erosion of space to the side. The result would be a development that creates a loss of space and openness within the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenity and character and appearance of Bedford Close. Further the proposal could lead to an unacceptable precedent, which if replicated would result in a 'terracing effect' of development along Bedford Close which would significantly alter its prevailing character and appearance. 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/14/00299

(A)

(B) for the following reason

- 1 The development by reason of its height, width and proximity to the shared boundary with 23 Bedford Close would result in the semi-detached dwelling appearing unbalanced with the erosion of space to the site. The result would be a development that creates a loss of space and openness within the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenity and character and appearance of Bedford Close. Further the proposal could lead to an unacceptable precedent, which if replicated would result in a 'terracing effect' of development along Bedford Close which would significantly alter its prevailing character and appearance. The development therefore conflicts with the principles and requirements of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011, and the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012.