
Site Address:	12 Manor Close, Havant, PO9 1BD		
Proposal:	Part two storey, part single storey side and rear extensions following demolition of existing conservatory and store.		
Application No:	APP/13/01275	Expiry Date:	04/03/2014
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Southwell	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Critchley	Case Officer:	Rachael McMurray
	Martin Critchley, Architect		
Ward:	St Faiths		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located in Manor Close in the centre of the St Faiths Conservation Area. Manor Close is unusual in that the frontages of the dwellings face onto a pedestrian footpath and the rear of the properties are accessed on adjacent roads (Prince George Street and Fairfield Road). Manor Close is characterised by mainly detached, two-storey 1930's style properties which vary in design. The nature of the layout is such that the rear elevations of the properties, particularly at first floor and roofscape, are readily evident in views from the public domain.
- 1.2 No. 12 Manor Close is a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling of brick and tile construction. There is a conservatory attached to the rear elevation. There is a detached garage in the rear garden which is accessed from Fairfield Road, from which the rear elevation of the property can clearly be seen. There is also an outhouse in the garden which is attached to the neighbouring outhouse at No. 11. There are two dormer windows located on the south side facing roof slope.

2 Planning History

09/72404/002

Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the rear wall - Permitted - 30/7/09

APP/13/00796

Single storey rear extension and replacement garage following demolition of existing conservatory, store and garage. Permitted - 10/10/13

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is to remove the existing conservatory and replace it with a single storey extension, as has already been approved under APP/13/00796. However, above part of the single storey extension would be a first floor extension in the form of an extension to the depth of the existing dormer on the south facing roof slope and an extension of the rear facing roof slope to form a small hipped end.
- 3.2 There is an existing planning permission (APP/13/00796) that has already approved the single storey extension. The originally submitted plans for that previous application included a proposal for a two-storey extension however, due to its unacceptability, it was removed from the application. The current application is a revised version of the originally submitted application.

- 3.3 In terms of dimensions, the dormer window would be extended by 3.640m with the flat roof continued. Alongside this, the extension to the rear roof slope would also be 3.640m with a small pitched roof and hipped end of 1.7m in width. Taken together, these additions would facilitate a fourth bedroom at first floor.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Practice Guide to PPS5

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: St Faiths.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer:

This is a rehash of an application that originally came forward under ref APP/13/00796 to which I objected.

My previous comments are set out below:-

“Properties in Manor Close date from the 1930’s. Various alterations and additions have been made, including, by their random nature and form, side dormers. These are oversized but have a functional purpose in enabling the necessary headroom to provide extra accommodation. The dormers tend to be of a common size but vary in design - flat roofed dormers as on the application property or with hipped tiled roofs which serve to help soften the impact. There are a few “horrors” notably at nos. 4, 27 and 30 which are likely to have been constructed under “permitted development” when controls on roof alterations were more lax.

Rear extensions in the immediate vicinity are restricted to ground floor lean-to and conservatory additions. The rear of the properties are readily visible from Fairfield Road and due to the spacing of the dwellings the flank elevations likewise.

The design solution proposed is extremely poor in form and detail. It is constrained by the need to safeguard the amenities of the neighbour (other half of semi-detached property) and the limitations of the existing roof profile. This had led to an unsatisfactory compromise with an awkward poorly related extension and an ugly dormer extension. It fails to meet the test of “preserve or enhance” set out in the 1990 Act. I have looked to see if there is an alternative to provide a similar level of accommodation within a more fluid design. The cleanest approach would be to extend the rear elevation as a piece but this fails on amenity grounds. I have to conclude, given the site constraints the proposals are over ambitious. I can envisage how the ground floor accommodation could be remodelled but can not see an opportunity to provide the increase in first floor accommodation sought. I therefore

have to recommend refusal”

REFUSAL:-

The proposed extension relates poorly to the existing building and general townscape and would be a discordant element in the conservation area. As such the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, in relation to the quality of design & protection of the historic environment; it also runs counter to extant guidance set out in The Practice Guide to PPS.5 and Local Plan Policy CS11.

Development Engineer:

No objections

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: 1

Statutory advertisement: 17/01/2014

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) Appropriateness of the design and effect on the streetscene / conservation area
- (iii) Effect on the neighbouring properties

(i) Principle of development

7.1 The site is located in an urban area whereby development is normally considered to be acceptable subject to other development management considerations. However, the site also lies within the St Faiths Conservation Area, and here there is a duty on local authorities, through exercising their decision-making powers, to ensure that the character of the Conservation Area is preserved or enhanced by new development proposals.

(ii) Appropriateness of the design and effect on the streetscene / conservation area

7.2 In isolation, the two elements of the extension could be argued to be a continuation of the existing roof forms - the existing dormer on the south elevation and the hipped roof rear elevation. However, when considered in context and together, they are not

cohesive as a design, would dominate the side and rear elevations on which they would be located, and would result in a contrived juxtaposition of roof forms which when viewed both from the south elevation and also the public domain of Fairfield Road, would be particularly incongruous. The adopted Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 (Section 5.3) describes how extensions to existing properties should look to the original building for reference as to scale, detailing and design - in this case the excessive size of the side dormer and incongruous combination of an uncharacteristically narrow rear hipped feature with that dormer, projecting well beyond the original first floor rear elevation, will appear at odds with the established design character of the main dwelling, as well as other properties in Manor Close.

- 7.3 The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted and has advised that the design solution is poor and fails to meet the test to 'preserve or enhance' within the Conservation Area. It is therefore considered that the application should be refused on design grounds as not only would it have an adverse impact on the character of the dwelling in itself, it would also be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the St Faiths Conservation Area, in particular as viewed from Fairfield Road, from which the new work would be clearly visible. The proposal in this respect would be contrary to the Havant Borough Core Strategy (Local Plan) policies CS11 and CS16 (the former of which seeks to protect the special heritage of the Borough; the latter requiring new development to achieve high standards of design quality), as well as running counter to the objectives of the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011.

(iii) Effect on the neighbouring properties

- 7.4 The key considerations here relate to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of Nos. 11 and 13 Manor Close, which directly adjoin the application site.
- 7.5 The first floor extension has been set in from the shared boundary with No. 13 by 3m to minimise the impact on outlook from the first floor windows of this property. Having regard to the criteria set out in Section 5.3 of the Borough Design Guide SPD 2011, a satisfactory relationship is considered to have been achieved as the extension would lie outside of a 45 degree line of sight.
- 7.6 With regard to the impact on No. 11 and applying the same test, the extension would again lie outside of the 45 degree line. With no objections having been received from either neighbouring property, it is considered that the direct impact of the proposed development on the neighbouring properties is acceptable; although this does not outweigh the more general harm caused to the character of the area which is described at paragraphs 7.2 and 7.3 above.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposal is considered to be of a poor design which would have an adverse impact on the character of the main property and the visual amenity of the St Faiths Conservation Area. For these reasons the application is considered to be unacceptable and is recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/13/01275 for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed extension by reason of its size, design and prominent location would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and character of the general townscape, and would be a discordant element in the St Faiths Conservation Area. As such the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, in relation to the quality of design and protection of the historic environment; it also runs counter to extant guidance set out in The Practice Guide to PPS5 and is contrary to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the objectives of the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011.