
Site Address:	19 Castle Avenue, Havant, PO9 2RY		
Proposal:	Construction of double garage to front.		
Application No:	APP/14/00103	Expiry Date:	02/04/2014
Applicant:	Dr Wilcockson	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr Allies	Case Officer:	David Eaves
	Allies Associates		
Ward:	St Faiths		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The property is a large detached house set in ample grounds. The proposed garage would be set to the front of the building and close to the southern boundary of the site. The site has a fairly open frontage with railings to Castle Avenue. The southern boundary has a number of shrubs and hedge close to the proposed siting of the garage. There is a large tree to the highway verge.
- 1.2 To the north and south of the site are bungalows with the property to the north including rooms in the roof.

2 Planning History (Relevant)

APP/13/00948 Reduce 1No. Ash (T5) by 3m and remove crossing branches, subject to TPO 0998. Permitted April 2013

10/70226/004 Construction of 2No. bay car port and integrated single garage. Refused April 2010 Appeal Dismissed June 2010

09/70226/003 Construction of a traditional three bay Oak framed garage with ancillary storage/accommodation within the roof space. Refused August 2009

09/70226/002 Construction of a 3No. bay traditional oak framed garage with attached log store and ancillary storage area within the roof space. Withdrawn May 2009

3 Proposal

Construction of double garage to front.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Summary:

Height of garage

Chosen location unsightly - if lower roof-line used by lowering pitch or using flat roof may be more acceptable Street Scene

Questions to be answered regarding its size

Impact on No.15

Roof high and unsightly

Accuracy of plans questioned

Loss of light to north-west room of No.15

No outlook from our room

Total size and height of garage unnecessary

Impact on plants and shrubs

Increased flooding from No.19 towards us

Alternative siting with flat roof design suggested

Concern over boundary fences erected

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 properties
- (iv) Highway/parking issues
- (v) Effect on surrounding trees
- (vi) Effect on Protected Species

- (i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The proposal is for an ancillary domestic garage within the curtilage of an existing dwelling located within the built up area, as such the proposal is considered acceptable in principle subject to other development control criteria.

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

- 7.3 This application follows a series of planning applications and refusals (including at appeal) in relation to providing a substantial garage to the front of the dwelling.
- 7.4 The current proposal is significantly different from the previous planning applications and relates to a double garage set to the southern side of the site with a pyramidal pitched roof design and set at an angle to the site boundary. The previously refused applications were for garages set close to the northern site boundary and 5-6m back from the site frontage. They were also for 3 bay buildings ranging in length from 9.6m to 10.45m. They had a proposed 6m depth.
- 7.5 The current proposal would be sited approximately 3.4m off the southern boundary (at its closest corner point). The building would be set approximately 13.6m back from the site frontage. The garage would be a two bay structure with a length of 6m and a depth of 6m. The highest point of the garage would be approximately 5.8m in height, (which is higher than the refused garages which had a height of 4m and 5m). The bulk of the roof is however considerably reduced by its pyramidal form. The current proposal is considered to be significantly different from the previous proposals and its impact is considered below.
- 7.6 In relation to the impact of the proposal on the street scene, whilst the buildings siting to the front of the house at No.19 would make the building clearly visible in the street scene this is mitigated by the siting 13.6m back from the site frontage. The wider impact is also lessened by the presence of important trees growing along Castle Avenue and the fact that the new building would be seen against the backdrop of the existing 2 storey house. It is also noted that No.19 is set back further on its plot in relation to the road than nearby properties on the west side of Castle Avenue and that the proposed garage whilst sited partly in front of No.15 and 19 would only do so marginally by between 1.5 and 3m with other nearby properties set nearer to the road than the proposed garage. On balance it is considered that the proposed garage building would have a limited and acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.
- 7.7 Previous proposals would have resulted in the loss of significant vegetation close to the northern boundary, further opening up the site to wider views. The current proposals should not prevent the retention of more limited vegetation (bushes and hedge) to the southern boundary. The impact of the current proposals on the wider area is considered to be acceptable.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 With regard to the impact on neighbours, the most significant impact is considered to relate to No's.15 and 21 Castle Avenue and an objection letter has been received from No.15.
- 7.9 No.15 is a bungalow with a window of a room used as a study facing the application site. There is a 1.6m boundary fence and a hedge to part of the boundary of approximately 2.4m in height. The new garage would be set approximately 3.4m off the common boundary and set at an angle. The roof would slope away from No.15.

The siting, angle and roof form all reduce the impact on the building when viewed from the south. As the site is to the north of No.15 there would be no significant impact on sunlight. Whilst it is appreciated that there would be a building with additional mass and bulk when viewed from the south, it is not considered that a refusal of planning permission could be sustained on the basis of the proposal being 'overbearing'.

7.10 The proposed building would be set well off the northern site boundary and No.21 a bungalow beyond which has rooms in the roof. Given the distances involved it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant impact on the residential amenities of this property.

7.11 The development is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring residents.

(iv) Highway/parking issues

7.12 The proposals do not alter to access to the site and provides covered car parking for two cars. There is ample additional car parking on the drive.

(v) Effect on surrounding trees

7.13 The proposal should not impact on trees or other significant vegetation as a result of the proposal.

(vi) Effect on Protected Species

7.14 It is not considered that the proposal would have a significant impact on the species identified by the HBIC in relation to previous applications.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The development is considered acceptable in principle and whilst it would have some impact on the character and appearance of this area, this would be limited and would not warrant a refusal of planning permission. The proposal would also have an acceptable impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring residents. Planning permission can therefore be recommended.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00103 subject to the following conditions

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date on which this planning permission was granted.
Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 The external materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture

those on the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order, no alteration to the roof of the garage hereby approved, including the addition of windows permitted by Part 1, Classes B and C of the 1995 Order (as amended), shall be made without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority..

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenities of adjoining residents having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Design Statement received 31st January 2014
Location and Block Plan Drawing Number 001a
Proposed Elevations Drawing No. 002 Rev A
Proposed Elevations at 45 deg to frontage Drawing No. 004
Site Plan Drawing No. 001
Site Plan Drawing No. 003

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.