

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address: 14 Staunton Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 0EN
Proposal: First floor rear dormer, single storey rear extension and alterations to existing front dormer.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00825 Expiry Date: 17/12/2024
Applicant: Mrs Watts
Agent: Mr Wilson Case Officer: Robert Riley
 SurveyCloud Ltd
Ward: Hayling West

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a chalet bungalow located in Hayling Island. The dwelling features 1No dormer to the front roofplane and 1No rear dormer. To the rear of the application site is the dwelling's rear garden and to the front is space provided for parking and a front garden. To the front and rear of the dwelling are several trees of differing sizes. The property's materials feature white render for the external walls, and brown concrete tiles for the roof in a gable pitch design.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that would be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the street generally featuring single storey bungalows and chalet bungalows featuring brickwork and render designs.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant history.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 First floor rear dormer, single storey rear extension and alteration to the existing front dormer to increase its height by approximately 13cm. The application also proposes the removal of 1No chimney and the installation of 2No ground floor windows on the ground floor, which can be done under permitted development rights.

Officer comment:

- 3.2 The plans and description have been amended during the application process - as amended the application proposes a rear dormer in place of the originally proposed two-storey flat roofed rear extension.

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

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

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

Arboriculturalist, Tree Team

The new proposed dormer height will have no impact on the trees to the front garden and I raise no objection.

Councillor Jonathan Hulls

No comments received

Councillor Paul Gray

No comments received

Councillor Wilf Forrow

No comments received

Ecologist

This looks OK. Relatively minor works to rear elevation and no obvious justification for requesting further details.

HBIC

Within 50m: Notable and Protected Species: "Common Pipistrelle.

Officer comment: *the works would primarily be at ground level, and furthermore, the Council's Ecologist has not provided an objection regarding bat risk. In light of this, unacceptable impacts are considered unlikely.*

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: 10

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment

(Redacted) we fully support this application.

Officer Comment

Support of the proposed works is noted.

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 and disability provision
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (v) Ecology
- (vi) Parking
- (vii) Arboriculture

(i) Principle of development and disability provision

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria. The works would provide additional space for a disabled occupant providing home safety adaptations at ground floor level. The applicant's particular needs are relevant to Policy CS16 (4) in this regard: *'All development should demonstrate that its design...is inclusive by considering the needs of those with disabilities, ensuring safe and convenient access for all...'*

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

7.3 The proposed alteration to the front dormer regarding a proposed height increase would be readily visible on the streetscene. It would be a very modest change and is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character of the dwelling and visual amenities. The application also proposes the removal of 1No chimney and 2No ground floor windows on the ground floor, which can be done under permitted development rights and are considered acceptable.

- 7.4 The proposed rear dormer at first floor level would be larger than the existing rear dormer. Regarding dormers, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states "*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. 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*".
- 7.5 The proposed first-floor flat roof rear dormer would feature an approximate 0.3 metre set up from the eaves line of the host dwelling, and would be set approximately 2.2 metres lower than the ridge height of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the rear dormer would not be readily visible upon the streetscene and is not considered to overly dominate the rear roofslope. With regards to this, the proposed rear dormer is considered acceptable with regards to the character of the dwelling and on visual amenities.
- 7.6 The proposed single-storey rear extension would feature an approximate width of 13 metres, an approximate depth of between 3.4 to 4.8 metres and an approximate maximum height of 2.7 metres. It would not be readily visible on the streetscene, and would be subservient to the existing dwelling regarding its depth and its proposed single storey nature and modest height. In light of this, the proposed single-storey rear extension is considered acceptable.
- 7.7 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011. It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 To the northern, southern and western sides of the application site are properties at Nos 12 and 16 Staunton Avenue and No.95 St Thomas Avenue. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these three properties. Due to the location, nature and scale of the works, properties to the front of the application site are considered to be acceptably impacted. The proposed alterations to the front dormer are considered to have an acceptable neighbourly impact. This application also proposes the removal of 1No chimney and 2No ground floor windows on the ground floor which would face a boundary fence, which can be done under permitted development rights and are considered acceptable.

No.12 Staunton Avenue

- 7.9 The proposed first-floor rear dormer is considered acceptable in consideration of overshadowing and overbearing concerns regarding No.12 Staunton Avenue. Regarding overlooking concerns, the rear dormer would be able to provide oblique views towards No.12's rear garden, however, as these views would only be oblique it is considered acceptable and they would largely emulate views already provided by the existing rear dormer windows.. Regarding these considerations, the proposed first floor rear dormer is considered acceptable. Regarding the proposed single-storey ground floor rear extension, It would feature an approximate 1.4 metre separation distance from the common boundary between Nos 14 and 12 and would be approximately 6.6 metres from No.12's side elevation. The proposed rear extension would be at minimum approximately 3.8 metres from No.12's garage but as this is not a habitable room it is considered to be acceptably impacted. In light of this, this proposal is considered to have a limited and acceptable increase in the sense of enclosure from the rear extension. Regarding overshadowing, in consideration of the proposed modest 2.7 metre height and approximately 1.4 metre separation distance from No.12 Staunton Avenue, it is not considered that this proposal would have an unacceptable increase in overshadowing. Moreover, it is noted that there is substantial hedging around the shared boundary treatment of Nos 14 and 12 near the proposed rear extension which would further lessen the impacts of overshadowing.

No.16 Staunton Avenue

- 7.10 The proposed first-floor rear dormer is considered acceptable in consideration of overshadowing and overbearing concerns regarding No.16 Staunton Avenue. Regarding overlooking concerns, the rear dormer would be able to provide oblique views towards No.16's rear garden, however, as these views would only be oblique it is considered acceptable, and they would largely emulate views already provided by the existing rear dormer windows...
- 7.11 Regarding the proposed single-storey ground floor rear extension, it would go right to the boundary of No.16 Staunton Avenue. The rear extension would extend approximately 3.2 metres beyond No.16's rear elevation. It is furthermore, noted that the rear extension would feature an approximate 1.5 metre separation distance from No.16's side elevation. In light of the proposed protrusion, separation distances and proposed modest height of the rear extension, officers consider that there would not be an unacceptable increase of the sense of enclosure from this proposal. Regarding overshadowing concerns, the part of the side elevation which the rear extension would face is a flank wall, and there is 1No window on this elevation which, is already almost completely overshadowed and no further increases of overshadowing would occur from this proposed rear extension. Officers have performed a light test regarding depth as set out in figure 12 of the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, it showed that the proposed extension would accord with the light test. Officers also note that the extension would be to the north of No.16's curtilage which would lessen the impacts of the works regarding the sunlights orientation, and that furthermore, there is substantial hedging around the shared boundary treatment between Nos 16 and 14 near the proposed rear extension which would further lessen the impacts of overshadowing. In light of these considerations, the works are considered to have an acceptable impact on No.16 Staunton Avenue.

No.95 St Thomas Avenue

7.12 The proposed single-storey rear extension would be at a sufficient distance to prevent unacceptable overshadowing and overbearing concerns. The proposed rear dormer, at its proposed location would be acceptable regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns. Regarding overlooking concerns from the proposed rear dormer, the rear dormer's rear windows would be approximately 22 metres from No.95's rear garden, and approximately 61 metres from No.95's rear elevation, at these proposed distances, overlooking increases would be limited and acceptable.

7.13 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011. It is noted one letter of support was received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

7.14 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

(v) Ecology

7.15 The application site has been located to be within 50m of a Notable and Protected Species; Common Pipistrelle, however, in light of that the works would primarily be at ground level, and that furthermore, the Council's Ecologist has not provided an objection regarding bat risk, officers consider that unacceptable impacts are unlikely. The council's Ecologist regarding bat risk stated "*This looks OK. Relatively minor works to rear elevation and no obvious justification for requesting further details*". In light of this, unacceptable impacts to protected bat species are considered unlikely, and this proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(vi) Parking

7.16 The works would increase the occupancy of the dwellinghouse from 3 to 4 bedrooms. This would require 3 parking spaces to accord with the Havant Parking SPD. This has been shown on the plans and this proposal is considered to accord with the Havant Parking SPD and Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(vii) Arboriculture

7.17 Due to nearby trees to the rear and front of the dwelling, the Council's Arboriculturist was consulted during the application process. In light of this, the Council's Arboriculturist stated "*The new proposed dormer height will have no impact on the trees to the front garden and I raise no objection*". The Council's Arboriculturist furthermore did not raise an objection to the 1No Holly tree. In light of this, this proposal is considered to accord with policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and is considered acceptable in this regard.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and would have a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.
-

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00825 subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing Number: SD24702-E1.0: EXISTING TOPOGRAPHIC PLAN:

Uploaded 10/10/24

Drawing Number: SD24702-E1.1: EXISTING GROUND FLOOR PLAN:

Uploaded 10/10/24

Drawing Number: SD24702-E1.2: EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN: Uploaded 10/10/24

Drawing Number: SD24702-E1.4: EXISTING SECTIONS: Uploaded 10/10/24

Drawing Number: SD24702-E1.3: EXISTING ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 10/10/24

Drawing Number: SD24702-P2.2 A: AMENDED PROPOSED FLOOR/ROOF/ELEVATION PLANS: Uploaded 31/12/24

Drawing Number: SD24702-LP2.0 A: AMENDED PROPOSED SITE AND LOCATION PLAN: Uploaded 31/12/24

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.