
Site Address: 35 Rosemary Way, Cowplain, Waterloooville, PO8 9DG
Proposal: Rear single storey extension, and loft conversion with dormers and gable build ups.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/23/00761 Expiry Date: 08/12/2023
Applicant: Mr G Benford
Agent: Mr D Treagus Case Officer: Bethany Crowther
 Derek Treagus Associates
Ward: Cowplain

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site occupies a bungalow situated to the north west of Rosemary Way and is set back from the highway. The property comprises cream render with a tiled hipped roof. The site contains a hardstanding area to the front of the property to accommodate onsite parking, and a garage situated to the south west.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character and is mainly dominated by detached and semi detached bungalows.

2 Planning History

09/55197/003 - Fell a Ash (T3) subject to TPO 1035., REF,27/07/2009

3 Proposal

Rear single storey extension, and loft conversion with dormers and gable build ups.

Numerous attempts were made to visit the application site, however the impacts were assessed from neighbouring properties. The agent had been invited on numerous occasions to submit revised plans of the proposal, however with the absence of amended plans, the proposal has been determined on the submitted plans.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Andrew Briggs
No comments received.

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain
No comments received.

Councillor Neil Bowdell - Cowplain
No comments received.

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: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

A summary of the objections received have been listed below:

Comment	Officer Comment
Design:	
Design out of keeping with bungalow.	Please see section 7.
Vertical roof design.	
Rear properties designed to only incorporate velux windows.	Noted.

Privacy: Overlooking to garden, front room and dining room and loss of privacy. Loss of privacy to the 3 properties at the rear due to elevational changes.	Please see section 7.
---	------------------------------

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 design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 The proposed single storey rear extension would replace the existing conservatory, however, would be retreated by approximately 1.2 meters and would be L shape in design. The proposed extension would have a maximum depth of approximately 4 metres, have a maximum height of approximately 2.7 meters. The extension would serve a family room and a kitchen and dining area. There would be a set of rear doors situated along the rear elevation serving the kitchen and dining area, and a window on the rear elevation serving the family room. The external materials would be brick with render and a flat roof. The extension would not be prominent within the street scene and would not lead to a negative effect on the character of the area.

7.4 To the front of the property, two pitched roof front dormers are proposed alongside a hip to gable extension. It is noted that the northern parts of Rosemary Way are characterised by more varied roof forms. Also, a property located further south of the application site features a roof which clearly benefits from hip-to gable extensions. Whilst limited number of front dormer windows can be seen in the southern parts of Rosemary Way, they are not a typical feature nearer the application site. It is considered that the proposed hip to gable extension in itself would be appropriate within its context, however, the addition of the two dormer windows and a window in between would create a top-heavy appearance with the roof slope appearing cluttered. The right-hand side dormer window would also be awkwardly positioned on top of the existing pitched roof over the existing ground floor projection demonstrating that the extent of roof additions proposed onto the enlarged roof slope cannot be satisfactorily accommodated.

- 7.5 The proposed dormer to the rear would facilitate two bedrooms, a bathroom and an ensuite. There would be 2 larger windows and 2 smaller windows situated on the rear elevation of the dormer. The dormer would have an approximate depth of 3.2 metres, height of 2.4 metres and a length of 9.5 metres.

The Council's Design SPD sets out that:

5.47 Dormers are considered an acceptable way of providing light and ventilation to existing buildings. They should be designed to sit back into the roof, back from the front line of the wall below, in from the verge and below the existing ridge line.

5.48 Dormers should not dominate the roof or the existing building. To help avoid this they should be the same size or preferably smaller than the windows below. Generally the dormers should have pitched roofs, with slopes in keeping with the existing roof. The proposed rear dormer in terms of its length and depth is considered to dominate the roof space to the rear, which is contrary to the guidance set out in the Council's Design SPD.

- 7.6 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would result in an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.7 To the rear of the property is No. 14 Thistledown. This property is sited at an elevation which is higher than that of the application site. There is a high-level boundary fence between the two properties. During a site visit it was observed that to the rear of the property is a living room with patio doors which lead out to a raised decking area with outdoor seating and a table. When looking from the patio area, the proposed dormer would be sited just above the boundary fence. The proposed flat roof dormer extension would bring the roof of the application site closer to the rear neighbouring property. It is considered that although the proposed windows in the rear dormer of the application site meet the distance requirement set out in the Design SPD, due to the elevational differences, the proposed dormer would cause an unacceptable harm to the neighbour amenity. The proposed rear dormer would have a direct overt presence when viewed from 14 Thistledown, due to its scale, size and extent of windows proposed. It is considered that the dormer would lead to a harmful outlook to the property at the rear and would lead to a sense of being overlooked to the habitable rooms of this property. It is therefore considered that the rear dormer in addition to the hip to gable enlargement would cause unacceptable adverse harm to the occupiers of no. 14 Thistledown.
- 7.8 To the south of the application site is no. 33 Rosemary Way. The proposed front dormers are considered to not lead to a loss of light, privacy or outlook to the neighbouring property. There is a high level fence along the rear boundary of the two properties. At the neighbouring property there is a patio area with a table and chair sited next to the boundary fence. The proposed extension would offset the boundary by approximately 2.7 metres. It is considered that the proposed extension would not lead to an unacceptable loss of light, outlook or privacy to the neighbouring property. The rear dormer is considered to not lead to any demonstrable harm to the neighbouring property due to the position in which the dormer sits in relation to the neighbouring property. It is considered that there would not be harmful impacts in terms of loss of privacy to the garden at this property. The rear dormer is considered to not cause a loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring property.

- 7.9 To the north of the application site is no. 37 Rosemary Way. The proposed front dormers are considered to not lead to a loss of light, privacy or outlook to the neighbouring property. The proposed extension would be similar in height to the existing conservatory, however would retreat approximately 1.2 metres from the existing position. It is therefore considered that the impacts of the proposed extension to the neighbouring property would be similar to that of the existing conservatory and is considered acceptable. The rear dormer is considered to not lead to any demonstrable harm to the neighbouring property due to the position in which the dormer sits in relation to the neighbouring property. It is considered that there would not be harmful impacts in terms of loss of privacy to the garden at this property. The rear dormer is considered to not cause a loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring property.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would lead to a loss of outlook and would have unacceptable adverse impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the property to the rear, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iv) Parking

- 7.11 The proposed works would see the addition of one bedroom to the property, totalling 4 bedrooms. The Council's Parking SPD sets out that a minimum of 3 car parking spaces are to be provided for a property with 4 bedrooms. The site plan demonstrates that 3 parking spaces meeting the space requirements can be achieved to the front of the property, therefore meeting the provision as set out in the Parking SPD.
- 7.12 Had the Local Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission, a planning condition would have been imposed to secure the provision and maintenance of the required 3 car parking spaces within the frontage of the site.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed rear dormer by reason of its design, size, scale and elevational position would cause unacceptable harm to the neighbour amenity to no. 14 Thistledown. The design of the rear dormer is contrary to the guidance set out in the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD as it dominates the roof space. The rear dormer would result in the sense of being overlooked and would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 8.2 The proposed front dormers combined with the hip to gable roof extensions by reason of its design would lead to a top-heavy appearance within the roof slope, with the proposed right dormer not being satisfactorily accommodated within the existing pitched roof. This is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 8.3 For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposed development is inappropriate and recommended for refusal.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00761 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed rear dormer by reason of its design, size, scale and elevational position would result in an inappropriate form of development that would cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the neighbouring property at no. 14 Thistledown by creating a sense of overlooking, and would be contrary to the guidance set out in the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD as it would dominate the roof slope and create overly top-heavy appearance of the dwelling. The rear dormer would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed front dormers combined with the hip to gable roof extensions and additional fenestration would clutter the roof slope and would result in a top-heavy appearance of the host dwelling, with the proposed right dormer being awkwardly accommodated within the existing roof form, to the detriment of the appearance of the dwelling and visual amenities of the nearby streetscene, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.