
Site Address:	3 Bacon Lane, Hayling Island, PO11 0DN		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side extension. (Revised Application).		
Application No:	APP/14/00079	Expiry Date:	24/03/2014
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Truick	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Critchley	Case Officer:	Rachael McMurray
	Martin Critchley, Architect		
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is located in Bacon Lane in Hayling Island. The road contains a variety of dwelling types and sizes but most are detached and fairly large in scale. There are several mature trees located along the road which gives the road a certain character.

No. 3 is located towards the entrance of the road, leading off from Manor Road. It comprises a detached, two-storey cottage style property with a pitched roof and barn hip corners. There is a central projecting gable section and two pitched roof dormer windows either side of this. There is a tall chimney on the west elevation. On the rear of the property there is a large dormer window with four glazed sections and a small pitched roof over each section. There is a double width, detached garage located at the side/rear of the west elevation. There is an open area to the front of the property which includes a grassed section and a driveway leading to the garage. The boundary with the highway is marked by a low brick wall and there is a screen of mature planting. The side/front boundaries with either neighbouring property is marked by a 1.8m high wooden fence. The rear garden is mainly laid to lawn and also enclosed by a 1.8m high fence.

2 Planning History

APP/13/01137

Demolition of existing garage and erection of two-storey extension. Withdrawn.

3 Proposal

Demolition of existing garage and erection of two-storey side extension (revised application). The two storey extension would be 5.2m and be attached to the west elevation. It would have a pitched roof which would extend 900mm above the existing ridge. It would project forward of the front building line by 900mm and would extend back to the existing rear building line. It would include a garage at the ground floor and a bedroom, dressing room and bathroom at first floor level.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

NPPF

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

Saved Policies of HBDWLP 1996 - 2011 forming part of HBLDF

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: 5

Number of site notices: 0

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

One objection was received which raised the following points:

- i. The extension would create a dark tunnel alongside No. 5 Bacon Lane and would be overbearing when viewed from the early facing windows in the side elevation of No. 5 and also result in a loss of light to these windows which serve bedrooms, a bathroom and the kitchen.
- ii. The balcony would result in a loss of privacy by allowing overlooking into the side facing windows.
- iii. In the amended scheme, the ridge line has only been lowered by 447mm. It still remains above the ridge line of the original house and therefore has the same impact as the original scheme.
- iv. The extension would result in a loss of spaciousness within the streetscene.

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) Appropriateness of the design and impact on the streetscene
- (iii) Impact on the neighbouring properties

(i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The site is located in a defined urban area whereby development is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to other development control considerations.

(ii) Appropriateness of the design and impact on the streetscene

- 7.3 For side extensions such as the proposal, there is adopted supplementary planning guidance in the form of the Borough Design Guide. This advises that it is important that the extension remains subservient to the main building, so it can be read which part of the building is the original and which is a later addition. Two storey side extensions should be set back behind the main building line. The ridge height of the extension can also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage. The angle of the roof should be the same as or similar to the existing roof.
- 7.4 The proposed extension is not subservient in terms of height as it projects 900mm above the existing ridge line. It also projects forward of the building line by 900mm. Both these factors result in the extension appearing overly dominant in comparison to the existing main dwelling and contrary to the design guidance.
- 7.5 Due to the central gable end which projects forward, the main property is divided up into three sections on the front elevation which gives the sense of vertical emphasis. The extension would include a window at first floor which is wider than the more narrow windows on the existing house and a double width garage door, which achieves a more horizontal emphasis. This contrasts with the character of the existing dwelling and results in a distinct lack of cohesiveness which further emphasises the dominating and contrived form of the extension. Overall, it would have an adverse impact on the visual appearance of the dwelling and its contribution to the visual amenity of the street scene.
- 7.6 The design guide also advises that it is important that gaps are retained between buildings. This helps form the pattern of development in an area, which in turn influences local character. Therefore, side extensions which have a negative effect on the gap between buildings should be resisted. This is particularly important for two storey extensions, which can also cause adverse effects on neighbouring properties, such as overshadowing. In general, the extension should not be closer than two metres from the boundary with neighbouring properties.
- 7.7 At its closest point, which is the one most visible from the streetscene, the extension would be 1m from the boundary. At its furthest it would be 1.5m however, this would not be visible. The proposed extension would therefore infill the existing gap between No. 3 and No. 5. The properties in Bacon Lane vary considerably in terms of the spaciousness in between buildings with some properties have no spacing at all (such as No's 13 and 15). However, these side extensions were built some 25 years ago prior to current and more stringent, planning design policy. There is a degree of spacing between No. 3 and 5 and due to the number of side facing windows in the east elevation of No. 5, the gap appears to be a naturally occurring one. The extension would block the view of the east elevation of No. 5 and due to the inappropriate design, would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene and adversely affect in spatial characteristics.

(iii) Impact on the neighbouring properties

- 7.8 The proposed extension would mainly impact on No. 5 Bacon Lane. It would result in a

7.9m high extension situated very close the shared boundary. Whilst the roof would hip away, there would be flank brick wall of 5m facing onto the east elevation of No.5. No.5 has a number of windows in the east elevation including bedroom and bathroom windows at first floor and also the kitchen window which is not dual aspect as it is located in the centre of the house. The extension would not extend as far back so as to be in line with all the windows on this elevation. Nonetheless, the outlook from the windows towards the streetscene, would be blocked by a flank brick wall as the extension as it would almost adjacent to the shared boundary. Overall it is considered that this would have an adverse effect on the amenity of the neighbouring property as such, is contrary to Policy CS16.

- 7.9 Concern has been raised that the Juliet balcony would result in a loss of privacy by allowing overlooking into the side facing windows. However, the design of the balcony does not provide an external platform and therefore any overlooking would be minimised.

8 **Conclusion**

The proposed extension is considered to be of a design which does not accord with local planning policy in that it would create a dominant, incongruous feature and have an adverse impact on the dwelling and visual amenity of the streetscene . It would also adversely affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties and as such, is recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00079 for the following reason:

- 1 The proposal would result in development at a 2-storey height across virtually the whole width of the plot, resulting in a loss of space about the building to the detriment of the visual amenities and spatial characteristics of the streetscene. By reason of its bulk and height would have an adverse impact on the visual character of the original dwelling and be an incongruous feature within the streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 2 The proposal by reason of its size and location close to the boundary and side windows at No. 5 Bacon Lane, would be in an intrusive and overbearing form of development, detrimental to the outlook 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 National Planning Policy Framework 2012.