P/16/1278/FP SARISBURY

MR & MRS WHITTINGTON AGENT: THORNS YOUNG LTD

TWO STOREY EXTENSION

17 LIPIZZANER FIELDS WHITELEY FAREHAM HAMPSHIRE PO15 7BH

## Report By

Arleta Miszewska 01329 824 666

#### **Amendments**

The original proposal has been revised to include:

- An obscure glazed balustrade serving a Juliet balcony in a front elevation;
- A traditional design window serving the proposed lounge instead of bi-fold doors;
- A hip end roof instead of a gable end roof.

# Site Description

The application relates to a two storey, 4-bed detached house located at the end of a culde-sac in Lipizzaner Fields. The house is served by a double detached garage located to the north of the house. The access to the property is via a shared drive with no. 15 Lipizzaner Fields located to the east.

## **Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a two storey infill extension located between the front projection of the house and the detached garage. The extension would accommodate a lounge on the ground floor and a bedroom on the first floor. The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms in the house.

#### **Policies**

The following policies apply to this application:

# **Approved Fareham Borough Core Strategy**

CS17 - High Quality Design

# **Development Sites and Policies**

DSP3 - Impact on living conditions

#### Representations

Two letters from two different households have been received objecting to the original proposal and five letters from four households have been received objecting to the revised proposal. The following concerns have been raised:

- External materials out of keeping with the area,
- Loss of light in garden and conservatory, loss of privacy in first floor bedroom at no. 19,
- Loss of outlook, privacy and light, and overshadowing of no. 15,
- Intensification of business run from home, increase in noise level and demand for car parking.
- Will set a precedent,
- A protected tree is not shown on the submitted plans,
- Noise during construction.

#### **Consultations**

INTERNAL

Trees -

There are no arboricultural grounds for refusal, therefore no objection to the proposed two storey extension.

An informative is suggested clarifying with the applicant that no activity during the construction phase is to take place in the garden to the west side of the plot. This would avoid the need to condition a tree protection plan.

## Planning Considerations - Key Issues

Design and impact on the street scene

The extension would infill the area between the front projection of the main house and the detached garage. Although the ridge height of the proposed extension would match the height of the ridge of the main house, this is considered acceptable in this case as lowering the ridge height would create an overly complicated appearance.

Concerns have been raised over the choice of external materials. However, as the property is located at the end of a T-shaped cul-de-sac and not prominent from the street, the proposed extension would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the area and the visual amenities enjoyed by the members of the public.

Impact on the living conditions of adjacent neighbours

Concerns have been raised over loss of light in the rear garden and conservatory at no. 19 Lipizzaner Fields. The separation distance between the proposed extension and this neighbouring property boundary would be between 5.5 and 6 metres. Moreover, given the hipped roof design, the location of the extension, south of the garden, and the movement of the sun, it is clear that the extension would not cause overshadowing during summer months, when the garden area would be expected to be used most frequently. As such, it is concluded that the proposed extension would not cause such detrimental overshadowing of the property at no. 19 to justify planning refusal.

Further concerns have been raised over loss of privacy in the bedroom window at no. 19 from the proposed first floor, full-height window with a "Juliet" balcony serving a bedroom. The Council's adopted Design SPD states that:

""Oblique" views across into neighbouring gardens are typical where houses are close by but these are not considered harmful to privacy."

Finally, the Council's Design SPD states that:

"A "Juliet" balcony has no decked area to stand out on. There are no potentially harmful sideways views."

The views afforded from the front windows towards nos. 15 and 19. would be sideways and therefore, in accordance with the Council's design standards, not considered harmful to the privacy of the adjacent neighbours.

Turning to the concerns raised over the loss of light, sunlight and overshadowing of the front bay window at no. 15 Lipizzaner Fields. The extension would be located to the north-west and some 8 metres away from the bay window. The Council's Design SPD requires two storey side extensions which can affect a sole window in a neighbouring property to be located 6 metres away. Therefore, this spatial relationship complies with the Council's guidance for domestic extensions and is not considered harmful to the living conditions of these neighbours, in terms of loss of light, sunlight, outlook and overshadowing.

Standards related to distance requirements (BRE) have been quoted by the neighbours from no. 15 Lipizzaner Fields. However, these standards are not adopted by the Council. The proposed extension follows the guidance set out in the Council's adopted Design SPD.

Concerns regarding loss of privacy from the windows inserted in the frontage of the proposed extension have also been raised by the neighbours from no. 15 Lipizzaner Fields. In this case the views would not be across rear gardens, where greater level of privacy would be expected, but across the frontages, which can be easily overlooked by the street users. Moreover, the window would be screened, to some extent, by a one metre high obscure glazed balustrade. Therefore, the front windows in the proposed extension are not considered detrimental in planning terms.

### Impact on protected trees

The Council's Principal Tree Officer raises no objection to the proposal subject to no works being carried out in the garden to the west side of the plot. The applicant has confirmed that, as requested, no activity during the construction phase will take place in the garden to the west side of the plot and that the build and connecting utilities will take place from the frontage of the property.

#### Other matters

Concerns have been raised over a business being run from the application site and the potential for the proposed development to intensify the use. The applicant has confirmed that the proposed extension is to be used for domestic purposes only and not with running of the home business. Therefore, the proposed extension would not result in an increase in noise level and demand for car parking.

Setting a precedent has also been raised as a concern. However, each planning proposal is assessed on its own merits and granting of planning permission for a development does not guarantee that a similar development will be approved elsewhere.

Whilst noise during construction of an extension is inevitable, it will be of a temporary nature and therefore does not justify refusing a planning application. As the proposal is an extension to a domestic property, rather than a large scale development, imposing a condition requiring detailed construction method statement would not be, in planning terms, necessary and reasonable.

#### Recommendation

Permission, subject to conditions:

1. The development shall begin within 3 years of the date of the decision notice. REASON: To allow a reasonable time period for work to start, to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and to enable the Council to review the position if

a fresh application is made after that time.

- 2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents:
- a) Proposed floor plans and elevations, drawing number PG 1087 16 2 Rev C;
- b) Proposed sections, drawing number PG 1087 16 3 Rev C;
- c) Proposed block plan, 1:500.

REASON: To avoid any doubt over what has been permitted.

# **FAREHAM**

BOROUGH COUNCIL





