
Site Address:	40 Newbarn Road, Havant, PO9 3PX		
Proposal:	Part two storey, part single storey rear and side extension.		
Application No:	APP/14/00281	Expiry Date:	28/05/2014
Applicant:	Mr N Freeman	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr M Wright	Case Officer:	David Eaves
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site lies to the east of Newbarn Road within the built up area of Bedhampton. The property is a semi detached house in an area of semi-detached and terraced properties. the house is brick (painted white to first floor) and with concrete tile roof. The attached neighbouring property No.42 has had a two storey extension added although the width of this extension is modest compared to that of the proposed extension to No.40.

2 Planning History

None.

3 Proposal

Part two storey, part single storey rear and side extension.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)

CS19 (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)

DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011

Residential Parking and Cycle Provision Supplementary Planning Document 2010

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Southern Water

Plan showing approximate position of public surface water sewer crossing the site. Exact position must be determined by on site by the applicant before layout is finalised.

It might be possible to divert the public surface water sewer so long as this would result in no unacceptable loss in hydraulic capacity, and the work carried out at the developers expense to the satisfaction of Southern Water under the relevant provisions.

Sewer protection requirements provided.

Condition recommended and other advice provided.

Development Engineer

No adverse comment providing provision of three parking spaces and provision of cycle facilities.

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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) Effect on the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring property
- (iv) Impact on sewers
- (v) Highway implications
- (vi) Use of the extended building

- (i) Principle of development

7.2 The site lies within the built up area where extensions to residential properties are considered to be acceptable in principle. In this case the extension is of a scale which would compete visually with the main dwelling and incorporates what appears to be a self contained unit at ground floor level. The proposal therefore raises significant issues beyond those associated with an extension of more usual form and use and these issues are considered below alongside other development control criteria.

- (ii) Effect on the character and appearance of the area

7.3 The property is located in an area of dwellings of similar designs and other terraced properties. A number of properties have been extended with two storey side extensions. Some have followed the line of the front wall of the host dwelling whilst others have been set back from the front elevation. The closest examples are at No.

42 and No.34, both are much less wide than the host dwelling and can be viewed as incremental, subservient additions and are relatively modest, in line with the guidance set out in the Borough Design Guide SPD (paragraphs 5.34 - 5.44 refer). The current proposal is to add a set back side extension with a width of 5.5m compared to the width of the original dwelling which is 6.5m. Although set back the proposal would have the appearance of an additional dwelling in terms of its bulk and width and floorspace created (approximately 88sqm internal floorspace).

- 7.4 An extension of this scale would look incongruous on the host dwelling, competing in scale with No.40, and would be harmful to the established pattern of development in the area which is partly a function of the gaps between buildings and the pattern of houses some of which have modest and subservient extensions. It would result in a cramped form of development.
- 7.5 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD provides design advice in relation to side extensions (paragraph 5.37) stating 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."* In this case, the proposed extension whilst set back would, due to its width, fail to read as a subservient extension to the host property.
- 7.6 The SPD continues (paragraph 5.38): *"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."* As stated above the proposal would be harmful to the character of the road by further reducing the gaps between buildings particularly at first floor level.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring property

- 7.7 The main impacts from the proposed development are considered to be to No.38 and 42 Newbarn Road (to the sides) and to 47 and 47a Hulbert Road (to the rear).
- 7.8 No.38 is a two storey house set off the boundary to the south; thus the proposed extension is to the north of No.38 reducing any impact on light. There are no first floor windows proposed to face No.38 and only two small side windows face the application site. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable relationship with the neighbouring property to the south.
- 7.9 In terms of the relationship with No.42 to the north, a single storey rear extension would be set closest to the boundary. This would project approximately 2.5m from the existing rear wall and would be splayed in line with the boundary. The main two storey element would be set approximately 6.2m from the nearest part of the building forming No. 42. This would then drop down to single storey height. Whilst there would be some impact on No.42 in terms of the mass and bulk of the addition and limited loss of light (the extension being to the south of No.42), this impact is relatively limited and would not have a sufficient impact to warrant a reason for refusal of the planning application.

7.10 The properties in Hulbert Road are set beyond long rear gardens and it is not considered that the extension would result in any significant overlooking given the distances involved.

(iv) Impact on sewers

7.11 On the basis of the information provided by Southern Water it would appear that a public sewer crosses the site. Whilst it may be possible to divert the route of the sewer this would appear to result in the need to divert the route onto properties in other parties' ownership whilst maintaining the appropriate easement. Therefore at the current time there is no guarantee that an acceptable diversion would be possible, and a planning condition involving third party land is not considered appropriate. In order to safeguard important public sewer infrastructure it is therefore considered appropriate to impose a reason for refusal based on the lack of evidence that important infrastructure will be maintained.

(v) Highway implications

7.12 The proposal would result in the provision of 6 bedrooms. The Havant Borough Residential Parking and Cycle Provision Standards SPD would require the provision of 3 car parking spaces (if a single house were created). As discussed below, however, the size of the unit coupled with the independent living arrangements for the annex could be considered to require 3 spaces for the main house and 1 for the 1 bed annex dwelling. There appears to be space for 2 cars on the existing drive and plans indicate that a third space could be provided on the existing front garden. On balance, and given the Development Engineer's requirement for only 3 spaces to serve the overall development it is considered that adequate parking to serve the development could be provided.

(vi) Use of the extended building

7.13 The applicant has indicated that the ground floor area would accommodate members of his immediate family. In this regard, the plans show a fully self contained unit with separate side and rear door, kitchen, lounge, shower and WC together with a bedroom. There would be no staircase to the first floor which would provide 2 bedrooms (possibly for use by foster children in future). The first floor could only be accessed through the main house.

7.14 Whilst the extension is large and partially self contained there would be a family link between its occupants and the occupants of the main house. On this basis it is considered that the resulting development at 40 Newbarn Road would continue to function satisfactorily as a single planning unit, and would not result in the formation of a separate dwelling house.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The proposed development would result in an unacceptable form of development competing in scale with the host dwelling and harming the character and appearance of the area. In addition the site is crossed by a public sewer and there is no indication that this matter can be satisfactorily addressed. A refusal of planning permission is therefore recommended.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00281 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed extension would by reason of its width, mass, bulk, design and proximity to the site boundary lead to a cramped and incongruous form of development which competes in scale with the host dwelling and conflicts with the established pattern of development in the locality. The development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with 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.
- 2 The proposed development fails to take account of a public sewer which crosses the site and does not demonstrate how the protection of this important public infrastructure would be achieved. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS19 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.