

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable

Conservation Area: Not applicable

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist:

Protected tree in adjoining garden to rear of site would not be affected by the proposal. No conditions required.

Development Engineer:

No adverse comments.

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: Not applicable

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable

Number of representations received: 2

Summary:

- a) The plan has been replaced by a completely different, much larger, obtrusive and less sympathetic design.
- b) South facing walls are too close to boundary.
- c) At front will impact on light from living room, restrict outlook and, in summer months, block evening sun.
- d) At rear will block virtually all outlook and light to downstairs bedroom and study. Front extension aligns or overlaps front of number 32 and will make it look crammed in.
- e) Width of front 'double garage' extension doubles width of original house and is hence out of proportion.
- f) Large expanses of flat roofs of both extensions not in keeping with apparent norm in this part of road, nor with style of original Edwardian house. Sedum-covered eco-roofs may well become an eyesore if not correctly maintained in future.
- g) Loss of value to our property.
- h) Design and Access Statement describes photograph of existing conservatory as 'existing garage'.
- i) Site Location Plan omits additional building, whilst it was shown on the previous application where the building work was less obtrusive.
- j) Visual impact of new structure will be obtrusive from neighbouring viewpoint.
- k) Concern that by turning a 3 metre sloping roof into a 6 metre long flat sedum roof, it could be a magnet to birds, especially pigeons, already a noisy, messy nuisance. Birds could be perched two feet from neighbouring open bedroom window on summer mornings. N
- l) Were assured in 2005, by the planning department, that the first extension would not impede access to clean neighbouring conservatory guttering and glass roof on the south side with a ladder. Therefore, did not object to plans. In retrospect, wish we had.

m) Narrow gap (about 18 inches) between the existing kitchen extension and neighbouring conservatory makes it impossible to use a ladder.

Comment:

The Impact of the proposal on local and neighbouring amenities is discussed below.

7 Planning Considerations

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) Impact on the application site and street scene
- (iii) Impact on neighbouring amenities

(i) Principle of development

The principle of providing a single storey extension to the dwelling has been established under APP/12/01276. The current proposal would represent significantly larger additions to the dwelling and it is this that is discussed in more detail below. It is noted that the double garage would not practically provide for two parking spaces at the standard width of 2.4 metres. However, the site has an existing parking area that would not be compromised by the proposals, and the Highway Engineer has not objected to the application.

(ii) Impact on the application site and street scene

The proposed extensions would be of a relatively modest scale, would appear as complementary additions to the main dwelling and would ensure that a good degree of external amenity space is retained at the property. However, as a result of its siting, scale and bulk - exacerbated by the height of parapet required to enclose the proposed flat roofed area - the proposed double garage would appear as an obtrusive addition in views from the public domain, unbalancing the existing pleasant appearance of both the application dwelling and the pair of semi-detached dwellings it forms with that adjoining to the north. The proposed garage would not therefore respond to or respect its local context in that it would not use the characteristics of the locality to help inform its design, with particular regard to height and massing. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy).

(iii) Impact on neighbouring amenities

The proposals would have the potential to impact on the adjoining properties to both the north (36 Horndean Road) and south (32 Horndean Road) of the site. This is particularly so as the areas of the site affected would sit at a higher level than those immediately adjoining. Horndean Road slopes the south and thus number 32 is at a lower overall level, whilst the area to the immediate rear of the dwelling on the application site has been built up in relation to that at number 36. In addition, the alignment of dwellings and the shared front boundary between the application site and number 32 are staggered, such that the proposed double garage would sit forward of the adjoining dwelling.

As a result, and due to its siting, scale and bulk (again exacerbated by the height of

parapet required to enclose the proposed flat roofed areas) the side and rear extension would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the neighbouring property to the north in terms of outlook, shadowing and overbearing effect on the rear garden and conservatory, and on the property to the south in terms of outlook and overbearing effect on the rear garden and internal rooms. Furthermore, due to its siting, scale and bulk (again taking into account the proposed parapet height), the proposed double garage would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the neighbouring property to the south in terms of outlook, shadowing and overbearing effect on internal rooms. Therefore, the proposed extension and garage would not respond to or draw inspiration from or respect its local context, in that it would cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy).

8 **Conclusion**

The proposed single storey extension and double garage would be acceptable in principle. However, due to its siting, scale and bulk, the proposed side and rear extension would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the neighbouring property at 36 Horndean Road in terms of outlook, shadowing and overbearing effect, and on the neighbouring property at 32 Horndean Road in terms of outlook and overbearing effect. Furthermore, due to its siting, scale and bulk, the proposed double garage would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the latter neighbouring property in terms of outlook, shadowing and overbearing effect. The proposed double garage would also appear as an obtrusive addition in views from the public domain, unbalancing the existing pleasant appearance of both the application dwelling and the pair of semi-detached dwellings it forms with that adjoining to the north.

Therefore, the proposed extension and double garage would not respond to or draw inspiration from or respect its local context, in that it would cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours. Furthermore, the proposed garage would not respond to or respect its local context in that it would not use the characteristics of the locality to help inform its design, with particular regard to height and massing. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) and the planning application should be refused.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/13/01138, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 Due to its siting, scale and bulk, the proposed side and rear extension would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the neighbouring property at 36 Horndean Road in terms of outlook, shadowing and overbearing effect, and on the neighbouring property at 32 Horndean Road in terms of outlook and overbearing effect. The proposed extension would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 2 Due to its siting, scale and bulk, the proposed double garage would have an

unacceptable detrimental impact on the neighbouring property at 32 Horndean Road in terms of outlook, shadowing and overbearing effect. The proposed double garage would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 3 Due to its siting, scale and bulk, the proposed double garage would appear as an obtrusive addition to the visual amenity of the street scene. The proposed garage would not therefore respond to or respect its local context, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.