DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO/ADDRESS: 11/0117 – 81 Heene Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 26/4

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES):

None.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

This application relates to a semi detached Victorian villa on the east side of Heene Road opposite the junction with Shelley Road. The property has single and two storey extensions set back from the front of the house by 7.5 metres. There is also a rear conservatory. The adjoining semi is in its original state except for a modest rear conservatory on the boundary.

To the south the property adjoins an access for a double garage belonging to 3 Highgrove Gardens, which is a part of an eighties development of 8 houses with garages. Beyond this is a four storey block of flats on a slightly lower ground level with many windows and a communal entrance facing the side of the house. The side of this property is very visible from the street.

The property is situated within the Heene conservation area where the building has been identified as a positive contributor within the Appraisal document.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought to add a further single storey side extension. This application follows refusal for a similar extension last year.

The revised proposal sets the extension slightly further back from the frontage. It is proposed with an overhanging front roof and recessed garage doors. It will create a small garage and provide a small extension to the existing dining room. This side extension measures 6.6 meters in length and an average of 3.2 metres wide. It is shown as being built on the boundary and removes the mono pitched roof on the existing addition. It has an eaves height of 2.5 metres and a ridge height of 4 metres. The land slopes slightly from front to back and is also raised above the level of the ground at Homepier House to the south. A high level fixed and obscurely glazed side window is proposed along the flank elevation. .

In addition a further rear extension is proposed on the south boundary with the neighbour at No. 83. This measures 3 metres in depth, 3.3 metres wide

and has a mono pitched roof and is believed to be proposed with a maximum height of 4 metres and an eaves height of 2.8 metres, though the drawings are not clear in this regard.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

10/0703 – single storey side and rear extension. Refused 1.11.10

04/00766 – Front and rear dormers. Refused 23.8.04

02/00021 – Rear conservatory. Granted 13.2.02

00/00932 – Ground floor side extension. Granted 30.10.00

98/0226 – Single storey extension to ground floor flatlet. Refused 5.5.98. Appeal Dismissed 3.2.99.

86/512 – Retrospective application for use of property as a House in Multiple Occupation. Granted 12.8.96.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

RES9, BE1, H16 and H18 of the saved Local Plan.
BE1, BE6, CC1 and CC6 of the South East Plan
PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS5: Planning and the Historic Environment
Heene Conservation Area Appraisal
Policy 16 Submission Core Strategy

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

One objection received summarised as follows:

i. The extension is too big and if approved and built will be substantially bigger than the original footprint of the house.
ii. The side window will overlook No. 3's driveway.
iii. The side extension now has a sloping roof. A parapeted flat roof, as before, would be preferable.
iv. The plans do not show drainwater pipes etc. They should not encroach over the boundary.

Health: Contamination watch condition required.

Conservation Area Advisory Panel: *'Strong objection. Does not conserve or enhance the Conservation Area. Result would create a strong imbalance to the semi detached pair of dwellings.*

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are

relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if refused, would have some impact on the applicant's Rights. However, it is considered that the harm caused by the development outweighs these and that in the public interest the application should be refused. Accordingly, it is considered that the decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The main issues for consideration are the design of the extensions and their relationship to the house and its semi detached neighbour, the wider streetscene, neighbours and the conservation area.

The existing side extensions are set back from the front of the property by more than 7 metres. Looking at the front of the property and its neighbour the two read as an identical pair. The proposed extension has only set the extension back to be in line with the porch and is still close to the main front wall of the house.

It is considered that the design, position and scale of the extension are unsympathetic to the original design of this villa. Bringing development forward of the existing extensions, as proposed, would unbalance the appearance of the two houses to the detriment of the streetscene. It is also considered that the design of the extension with its double hipped roof would be out of keeping with the property and the overhanging roof and recessed front door would create an anomalous form. The design of the frontage and the proposed roof would be harmful to the appearance of the original building. As both the side and front of this building are clearly visible from the road the extension would be harmful to the appearance of Heene Conservation Area.

& this important building which qualifies as a Heritage Asset under PPS5 and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the.

The applicant did seek advice following the earlier refusal and was advised that an extension set back behind the line of the side hall window with a flat roof with front upstand was more likely to be acceptable. The applicant has chosen not to follow this advice with this proposal.

It is not felt that an extension of this scale would be harmful to any occupier of Homepier House given the degree of separation involved, approximately 8 metres. The proposed side window is indicated as fixed and obscure. The extension is to form the boundary but an encroachment is indicated. This is a matter between private land owners.

The depth of the proposed rear extension is acceptable at 3 metres. The maximum height shown is 4 metres, though the position of ground level is not clearly shown. A rear extension with these dimensions is likely to be permitted development. The adjoining neighbour has a modest conservatory on the boundary approximately 2 metres in depth with high level side windows. These will be obscured by the extension. It has a much shallow pitched roof than proposed. Bearing in mind the reduced height of the extension compared to the previous proposal and the above, this is now acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reason:

The position and scale of the side extension will unbalance this pair of semi detached houses and the design of the pitched and overhanging roof is out of keeping with the original property. As such the proposal will be harmful to the appearance of this building and to the character of the Heene Conservation Area and the proposal is therefore contrary to saved Local Plan Policy BE1, South East Plan Policy BE6 and PPS 5 Planning and the Historic Environment.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal conflicts with the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION? No.

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... [redacted] ...Date..... 13/5/11.....

Authorising Offic sign..... [redacted] ...Date..... 16/5/11.....