

OFFICER REPORT FOR COMMITTEE

DATE: 18/09/2019

**P/19/0793/FP
MR AND MRS FRONDA**

**STUBBINGTON
AGENT: MR L Rosenthal**

TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH EXTENSION

14 SUMAR CLOSE, FAREHAM PO14 2EH

Report By

Katherine Alger - direct dial 01329 824666

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This application is presented to the planning committee at the request of local ward Member, Councillor Heneghan on the grounds that the design of the extension would not be overbearing.

2.0 Site Description

- 2.1 This application relates to a detached property which is located on the southern side of Sumar Close towards the end of the cul-de-sac. The site is set back from the highway by a front driveway which includes a side garage. The property has a hipped roof appearance with an existing canopy above the entrance. The rear of the site benefits from a large rear garden. The surrounding area is characterised by large detached properties. To the west of the application site is open green space which is designated Countryside.

3.0 Description of Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is for the construction of a two-storey rear extension and a front porch. The extension would accommodate a bedroom, wet room and utility room at ground floor with bedroom and en-suite at first floor.
- 3.2 The front porch would enclose the existing canopy above the front door. It would include the installation of a new front door and side windows and the porch would be constructed of brickwork to match the existing dwelling.

4.0 Policies

- 4.1 The following policies apply to this application:

National Legislation and Guidance

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPF)

Adopted Fareham Borough Core Strategy

Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies

DSP3: Impact on Living Conditions

Other Documents:

Fareham Borough Design Guidance: Supplementary Planning Document
(excluding Welborne) December 2015
Residential Car Parking Standards 2009

5.0 Relevant Planning History

5.1 The following planning history is relevant:

P/19/0308/FP	Two storey rear extension and front porch extension
Approve	5 th July 2019

6.0 Representations

6.1 Two letters have been received raising no objection to the proposal. One letter of objection has been received on the grounds of:

- a) Loss of privacy
- b) Proposed trees will not provide sufficient screening and are likely to overhang boundary
- c) Trees could be removed at any time resulting in further loss of privacy
- d) Extension is too close to boundary
- e) Overbearing

7.0 Consultations

7.1 None

8.0 Planning Considerations

8.1 The following matters represent the key material planning considerations which would need to be assessed to determine the suitability of the development proposal. The key issues comprise:

- a) The design of the proposal and whether it relates appropriately to the host dwelling and the character of the surrounding area
- b) The impact of the proposal on residential amenity
- c) Flood Risk
- d) Parking

a) **Design of the proposal and whether it relates appropriately to the host dwelling and the character of the surrounding area**

- 8.2 The two-storey rear extension would be located on the south west corner of the property. It would have a pitched roof with a height of 6.4 metres and would be set below the ridge height of the existing dwelling. It would have a depth of 7 metres and a width of 7.4 metres. It would include two ground floor windows on the eastern elevation serving a day room and bedroom. The first-floor would include a window on the eastern and western elevations serving an en-suite and a set of bi-folding doors on the eastern elevation opening out onto a Juliette balcony which serves a bedroom.
- 8.3 The extension would include a lean-to roof single storey element on the western side. This would have a depth of 7 metres and a width of 3 metres. It would include two windows at ground floor level serving a wet room and a utility room. The proposed extension would be constructed of brickwork and roof tiles to match the recipient dwelling.
- 8.4 A two-storey extension was granted planning permission in July 2019. The single storey extension had a depth of 7 metres however, the first-floor extension had a depth of 5.4 metres. The revised proposal includes, an increased depth of the first-floor extension to 7 metres. It also includes trees along the western side between the boundary with No 12.
- 8.5 The proposed front extension to create the porch would have an appropriate hipped roof design and would be constructed of materials to match the recipient building which is considered to be an appropriate addition to the property.
- 8.6 The proposed part single part two storey rear extension would be positioned to the south west elevation of the dwelling. It would cover approximately half of the rear elevation and would project sideways towards the neighbouring property No 12.
- 8.7 The existing dwelling has a hipped roof and measures approximately 7.3 metres in depth (including the porch) and approximately 12.2 metres in width. The proposed two storey extension would significantly increase the bulk of the host dwelling by increasing the depth by an additional 7 metres giving a total depth of approximately 14.2 metres and increasing the width by a further 3 metres to give a total width of approximately 15.2 metres. The excessive depth of the two-storey addition is considered to be an unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling which would be out of keeping and scale with the original dwelling.

- 8.8 The proposed extension is set down from the main ridge height and matches the existing eaves however, due to the significant bulk of the proposal, it fails to create a subservient addition to the property and instead results in an incongruous and over dominant feature.
- 8.9 The applicants propose to plant 6 metre high Field Maple trees along the western boundary between the single storey element of the extension and the boundary fencing with No 12 in order to screen the extension. This landscaping would not be sufficient to screen the proposal from the neighbouring occupiers nor would it help to reduce the significant bulk of the extension. It is also considered that Field Maple Trees would not be an appropriate species of tree within this location due to the size of the trees and the close proximity to the neighbour's boundary.
- 8.10 It is acknowledged that Sumar Close is varied in character with a number of properties having been altered and extended. However, there are no examples of extensions similar to that proposed.
- 8.11 The recently approved scheme (Ref P/19/0308/FP) was granted planning permission following negotiations to reduce the 7 metres depth of the two-storey extension. Officer's raised concerns that a 7 metres deep extension would be excessive and would result in an adverse impact on the neighbours. The scheme was therefore reduced in depth at first level by approximately 1.5 metres which helped to reduce the bulk of the extension when viewed from the western and southern elevations. The scale was considered to be acceptable.
- 8.12 The revised proposal by reason of scale and mass fails to relate appropriately to the host dwelling by creating an out of scale, over-dominant and visually obtrusive form of development.

b) The impact of the proposal on residential amenity

- 8.13 The proposed extension would be set away from the boundary with No 12 Sumar Close. There would be a separation distance of between 3.5 metres between the corner of the proposed wet room and the boundary fencing and 1 metre between the corner of the utility room and the boundary fencing.
- 8.14 There are two side windows at No 12 which would face onto the proposal. One serves the kitchen and the other serves the dining room. The windows are positioned so that half of the kitchen window faces onto No 14. It is noted that there is already a degree of impact on the outlook from these windows due to the position of the flank elevation of the application property, however,

with the addition of a 7 metre two storey extension, this would be exacerbated further.

- 8.15 Despite the extension being set away from the boundary with the neighbouring property, it is considered that the presence of a two-storey extension of the depth proposed would also have a substantial effect on the neighbour's outlook when viewed from their rear garden which would result in an increased feeling of visual containment and dominant impact.
- 8.16 In terms of the impact of loss of privacy, all of the side windows facing onto No 12 would be obscure glazed as they would serve a wet room, utility room at ground floor and a bathroom at first floor. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would result in loss of privacy to the occupiers at No 12.
- 8.17 There is a separation distance of at least 11 metres between the application site and the neighbouring occupiers to the rear at 25 Stroud Green Lane which complies with the Design Guidance. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would result in overshadowing, loss of light or loss of privacy to the occupiers to the rear.
- 8.18 The extension would be located on the south-western elevation. Therefore, due to the large separation distance and orientation, it would not have any impact on neighbouring occupiers to the north east at No 16.

c) Flood Risk

- 8.19 The application site is located within Flood Zone 2. The applicant has provided a Flood Risk Assessment, in which they indicate that the floor levels within the proposed development will be set no lower than the existing level. Therefore, the Flood Risk Assessment satisfactorily addressed the flood risk and the proposed extension would not have an impact on flooding.

d) Parking

- 8.20 The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 4 to 5 bedrooms. The on-plot parking requirement for a 5-bedroom dwelling is the same as a 4-bedroom dwelling. Therefore, the proposal would not increase the demand for parking.

9.0 Recommendation

9.1 REFUSE

- 9.2 The proposal is contrary to Policy CS17 of the adopted Fareham Borough Council Strategy and Policy DSP3 of the adopted Fareham Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies and the Fareham Borough Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document in that it would be of an inappropriate scale and mass in relation to the host property and would have an

overbearing harmful impact on the outlook of the neighbouring occupiers, No 12 Sumar Close.

10.0 *Background Papers*

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL



14 Sumar Close
Scale: 1:1,250



This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Licence 100019110. 2016