

CS16 High Quality Design

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

No comment received

Councillor Narinder Bains - Cowplain

No comment received

Councillor Neil Bowdell - Cowplain

No comment received

Developer Services, Southern Water

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the Applicant or Developer.

To make an application, please visit Southern Water's Get Connected service:

<https://developerservices.southernwater.co.uk/> and please read our New Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link:

<https://www.southernwater.co.uk/help-advice/connection-charging-arrangements>

In situations where surface water is being considered for discharge to our network, we require the following hierarchy - reuse, infiltration, watercourse, storm sewer, combined sewer - for surface water to be followed which is reflect in Part H3 of Building Regulations. Whilst reuse does not strictly form part of this hierarchy, Southern Water would encourage the consideration of reuse for new developments. Guidance on Building Regulations is here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-do>

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX; Tel: 0330 303 0119; Website: southernwater.co.uk; Email: southernwaterplanning@southernwater.co.uk.

Officer comment: *The works have been substantially completed so the above may no longer be relevant. For the avoidance of doubt, an informative has been included*

regarding the need for a formal application for any new connections to the public foul sewer to be made by the Applicant or Developer.

Portsmouth Water Company

Portsmouth Water have reviewed the application and associated documents for APP/22/00816 and have no concerns regarding impacts to groundwater quality. Therefore, we do not recommend any planning conditions to be included on the planning permission.

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: 9

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable

Comment	Officer Comment
Number of comments in objection: 3	
Number of comments in support : 3	
<u>Supports:</u> Impact on natural light less than approved plan. Impact on mental well being from reduced light and damp issue. Increase in electricity use. Additional disruption from construction work with any further changes. Increased construct traffic and associated impacts. Happy with existing structure as built. Feel changes shown in proposed plan satisfactory as no changes to current height if external walls below dormers. Carbon impact from wastage of materials Other properties similar design We are happy with 18 Spring Vale Support this application Well constructed quality extension. Don't want another year of pointless construction activity. Drastic changes at this stage massively costly and no benefit to community.	 Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report in relation to the comments.

Happy with what built and feel it has enhanced the road. Other properties in road had planning approved on extensions as high as this with similar bulk. Also one on Erica Close looks same as currently being built and passed planning. If guttering higher would be out of place with properties in road. Waste of Councils time and money.	
<u>Objections:</u> Building design - mass and bulk Out of character with the surroundings Object as existing dormer already high enough If allowed to stay rather than redo to original approved plan what happens in future when next person does their house? Extension built largely ignoring the plan approved. Plans originally given approval drastically different to what was built. Overall height too high also height of dormers turns from looking like chalet bungalow to a house. House (no longer bungalow) possibly one of biggest eyesores I have ever seen. Not in keeping.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

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) Impact on the Character of the Area & Appropriateness of Design
- (iii) Impact on Neighbouring Properties
- (iv) Parking
- (v) Source Protection Zone (SPZ)
- (vi) Utilities

- (i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area as set out in Policies CS17 and AL2. As such, development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Impact on the Character of the Area & Appropriateness of Design

- 7.3 This application is a retrospective application that has been submitted following unauthorised works to the property that have already taken place. Two planning consents have been granted at this site previously - these are:

APP/20/00868 - Single storey rear extension; raise overall ridge height; demolition of existing dormer; replacement dormer to north elevation; demolition of existing garage; erection of replacement garage and store to the rear and new entrance porch., PERMITTED, 19/11/2020

APP/21/00709 - Revision of previous planning application approved APP/20/00868 for roof configurations with dormer windows to the side and single storey extension to replace conservatory and front porch, including changes to fenestration., PERMITTED, 26/08/2021

- 7.4 The proposals have evolved throughout the different designs and become larger in scale. Under APP/20/00868 an increased eaves height raised from the existing eaves height of approximately 2.3 metres to 3 metres in height. The existing property also had a flat roof dormer to the south elevation and this was replaced with a flat roof dormer to the north elevation. The existing ridge height was 5 metres and this was increased to 6 metres under this application. Following this a subsequent application was submitted under APP/21/00709 whereby the ridge height was proposed at 6 metres, the same as previously approved however the eaves height was increased to 3.3 metres in height. Four dormers were proposed with two either side of the roof slope with dimensions of 3.11 metres width, 1.72 metres height and 3.5 metres depth. It is of note that these dormers were reduced in scale whilst the application was under consideration, due to mass and bulk concerns and the dormers were reduced in scale and lowered down from the ridge line, which was proposed as part of the submission reference APP/21/00709.
- 7.5 Subsequently the applicant had begun construction, however, the resulting design has many differences from that approved under either of the applications outlined above. Following a Planning Enforcement investigation the applicant was advised a revised application would be required. It is noted that the structure as built includes the dormers which have a full gable with a height of 3.4 metres, width of 3.3 metres and 4 metres measured at the dormer ridge. The applicant has been advised these would not be acceptable due to the appearance of mass and bulk. This current application comprises the changes which are described below :
- 7.6 This proposal seeks to raise the ridge by a further 0.5 metres from that approved under the previous application APP/21/00709 to a total of 6.5 metres with an eaves height of 2.6 metres. Four dormers are proposed with two on each side roof slope with dimensions of approximately 3.3 metres width, 2.7 metres height and 3.5 metres depth measured at the dormer ridge. The changes from that built and that are now proposed include a shallow depth roof slope style roof, with a small hip back and with

the ridges now set down from the main roof.

- 7.7 Also proposed / constructed is a garage linked to the rear extension towards the rear of the property which has dimensions of approximately 5.7 metres depth, 3.4 metres width and a height of approximately 3 metres - the porch to the side has also been removed and the rear extension roof would be lowered by approximately 20cms.
- 7.8 The surrounding streetscene comprises bungalows which generally have not been altered at first floor level and are set at a low level in height - either side of the application site are bungalows. The proposal as built is not considered to be acceptable, with the mass and bulk much increased at first floor level creating a top heavy appearance when considered within the context of the streetscene. The ridge of the dormers comes level with the main roof ridge resulting in a dominant appearance within the roof slope. The applicant has been made aware of these concerns and has therefore created the revised roof design for the dormers. Whilst this creates some level of improvement in terms of reduction of bulk at ridge height, it is judged that a flat roof design would create more visible roof space between the dormers and the roof ridge, therefore reducing the top heavy appearance and general mass and bulk within the roof slope. This would bring the dormers down in height and create a more subservient appearance. The applicant has been made aware of this request however does not wish to implement this design.
- 7.9 The applicant draws comparisons of this proposal with that approved at 1 Erica Close. This site is located 150 metres away from the application site, it is not visible from the front of Spring Vale and is located multiple streets away from 18 Spring Vale. Whilst this design incorporates a raised ridge and four dormers, the streetscene is much different, with a much wider mixture in property styles and heights as well as gaps between boundaries. The proposals are not considered to be direct comparisons.
- 7.10 The applicant also draws comparisons between this proposal and 32 Spring Vale which is located broadly within the same streetscene although further down the road. The design the applicant has submitted at No. 32 Spring Vale does include an increase in bulk of roof however this section of extended side roof was set back towards the rear of the property and was therefore deemed to be less dominant, the dormer to the side was more subservient in design and the proposal was less top heavy than that proposed at No. 18.
- 7.11 Policy CS16 of the Havant Local Plan states the following:

Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design (amongst other matters):

- c) Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;*

This proposal is not considered to comply with Policy CS16 as it is not comparable or

in keeping with the surrounding pattern of development. It is directly contrary to the existing characteristics of the streetscene including the existing roofscape and heights within the streetscene, appearing top heavy in an area mainly comprising of bungalows and properties with the living space set at low height.

- 7.12 Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 provides further guidance in relation to design and relevant extracts are provided below:

4.47 It is crucial that the design of new places is undertaken with a sound understanding of the local pattern of development. This understanding should inform the design of a proposal and reflect local character and distinctiveness, whilst allowing innovative design.

In paragraph 4.48 key elements of design are provided and relevant extracts are set out below:

Massing

Massing is the volume (depths and heights) of buildings in relation to other buildings, streets and spaces.

New developments should follow the typical pattern of existing properties, looking to immediate neighbours first. The mass of a new building or extensions should not be allowed to dominate the street.

Height

New developments should follow the typical pattern of existing properties, looking to immediate neighbours first. The height of a new building or extensions should not be allowed to dominate the street.

Overall, the proposal is not considered to meet policy and SPD guidance and results in a top heavy design with an unacceptable mass and bulk which is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the streetscene and the locality.

(iii) Impact upon neighbouring properties

- 7.13 To the north east of the application site is No. 20 Spring Vale. No. 20 is a bungalow and is sited within close proximity of No. 18. It is noted that the proposal previously approved with the raised eaves height at approximately 3.4 metres height would have had some increased impact on the side elevation windows at this property. It is understood that there are four windows on this side elevation of No. 20, the first is a dual aspect window serving a bedroom, followed by two bathroom windows and another dual aspect window serving an open plan living room. This proposal would have an eaves line approximately half a metre lowered than that previously proposed. Despite this, this proposal is considered to have an increased impact on the side elevation windows of No. 20 as the dormers are set close down to the eaves line and are larger than that previously proposed in both height and width. The total height of the dormers would be higher than that previously proposed resulting in greater building bulk set close to the boundary. The overall roof bulk and building bulk of the side elevation proposed is considered to have an oppressive and overbearing impact upon the side elevation of No. 20.

- 7.14 To the south west of the application site is No. 16 Spring Vale. There is a larger separation distance between these properties and therefore the proposed alterations are not considered to have such an impact on this property. It is noted there was an original dormer in this siting prior to works taking place which already had windows offering some level of overlooking and therefore it was not considered appropriate in following planning applications to add planning conditions for obscure glazing to these dormer windows. The garage / side extension would be located adjacent to the garage at No. 16 and is not deemed to result in any harm to the amenity of No. 16.
- 7.15 To the rear (south east) of the application site are the rear gardens of No's 63-65 Hazleton Way. There would be approximately 50 metres separation distance back to back between No. 18 and the rear elevations of these properties which exceeds the minimum separation distance of 20 metres in Havant Borough Design Guide SPD - for this reason the rear first floor bedroom window is not considered to result in harmful overlooking.

(iv) Parking .

- 7.16 The Havant Borough Parking SPD states that the minimum vehicular and cycle parking requirements for a dwellinghouse of 4 no. bedrooms or more is 3 no. vehicular and 2no. bicycle parking spaces respectively. The proposed garage and existing hardstanding in the front curtilage of the property provide sufficient space to accommodate the above parking requirements.

(v) Source Protection Zone (SPZ)

- 7.17 The site is within Source Protection Zones (SPZ) 1c and 4 in the Portsmouth Water Ground Catchment. The Portsmouth Water Catchment Management Team has reviewed the retrospective proposal and has confirmed that it has no concerns regarding impacts to groundwater quality. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the Source Protection Zone (SPZ).

(vi) Utilities .

- 7.18 There is a Southern Water Foul Sewer Pipe running under the public highway in proximity to the existing bungalow. A planning informative has been included on the Decision Notice (DN) to remind the Applicant and / or Developer that an application to Southern Water is required for any new connection from the retrospective proposal to the public foul sewer. As for Southern Water's comments about the possibility that a public sewer may be crossing the development site, as the proposal is substantially completed, it is not considered justified to include a planning condition in this instance.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The general design of this proposal with the raised ridge and side dormers in combination would result in an overdeveloped and top heavy roof slope, which is considered to have a harmful impact upon the character of the property, street scene and the visual amenity of the immediate locality. It is not considered to be appropriate within the context of the existing property and surrounding streetscene. The build up of the building line from the dormers is also considered to have an increased oppressive impact on the side elevation of No. 20 adjacent. As such, the application is contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011 and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00816

For the following reasons

- 1 The design of this proposal would result in an overdeveloped and top heavy roof with an unacceptable mass and bulk. This is considered to be out of keeping with the surrounding pattern of development and would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the property, the street scene and the visual amenity of the immediate locality. The side dormers are judged to result in an oppressive, overbearing impact to the adjacent property No.20 Spring Vale. As such the application is considered to be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.