
Site Address: 54 London Road, Widley, Waterloooville, PO7 5AG
Proposal: Replacement single storey extension to rear and loft conversion with dormers to front and rear roof slopes.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00393 Expiry Date: 23/07/2024
Applicant: Mr Adogeri
Agent: Mrs Styles Case Officer: Robert Riley
 Styles Architecture
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in Widley. The application site features a driveway and some hedging to the front of the dwellinghouse and a garden with a tree under a tree protection to the rear. The property features cladding and render to the external walls, with a slate roof in a gable design to form the roof.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that could be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the street featuring generally two-storey semi-detached dwellings with brickwork and pebbledash designed walls in evidence.

2 Planning History

APP/17/00807 - Crown lift to a height of 3m and crown reduce by 2m, reduce lateral branches closest to 1 Oakley gardens to provide a 2m clearance of 1No. Oak, subject to TPO 0855., PERM,22/09/2017

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal to the application site has 5 elements:

- Replacement single-storey extension to rear
- Loft conversion
- Dormers to front roof slope
- Dormer to rear roof slope
- Patio with a maximum height of 0.3 metres

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

Councillor Antonia Harrison

No comments received

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

No comments received

Councillor Paul Tansom

No comments received

Ecologist

Older property. Slate roof appears sound, but not possible to ascertain if gaps around gable ends. Small section of hanging tiles to front looks sound. Probably not enough to justify assessment. Suggest adding bat informative note.

Portsmouth Water

Thank you for your plant location/mapping enquiry.

Please find attached the plan(s) showing the approximate position of water mains at the requested location. Service connections are not shown but it should be assumed that all premises are supplied from the water distribution network. Other connections not related to properties, such as field supplies, may also exist so we would suggest a visual/CAT scan/Ground Radar survey is undertaken prior to any hand or mechanical excavation.

Safe digging practices in accordance with HSE publication HSG47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services" must be used to verify and establish the actual position of the mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used. This documentation is available at <http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/priced/hsg47.pdf>

Copies of guidance notes: Working near distribution apparatus and Guidance for working near or over a Trunk Water Main are enclosed. Please read carefully as the conditions will apply to any work you undertake in the vicinity of Portsmouth Water assets.

It is important to ensure that a copy of the above guidance is provided to those undertaking any work which may affect our apparatus.

Please note Portsmouth water has no responsibility for any underground drainage or sewerage infrastructure. Enquiries regarding these assets should be directed to the relevant authority/company.

SSEN

We have sent you the plans of our network records within the area requested. You will shortly receive responses each of the following; any High Voltage Mains cables and Low Voltage Mains cables.

Attached to this email is the 'Guide to Interpreting' which includes the legends for the plans on pages 7-9.

If a Service Cable is not shown on our maps sent, and you require the Cable to be Traced, please contact the General Enquiries Department on 0800 048 3516 (option 3) or via email, ge@ssen.co.uk.

If you need further information on our network in this area or a quotation for any required works, please contact the Connections & Engineering Department on 0800 048 3516 or via email, connections@sse.com

Hampshire County Council Arboricultural Consultancy

There is a TPO (Ref TPO 0855) tree in the property to the rear:

Aerial imagery shows there are several substantial trees to the rear boundary line:

I raise no objection to the proposal, but if consent is granted please condition that the rear 15m of the garden are a Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) to be enforced with a single line of fencing (see BS5837 for fencing detail, and attached) to restrict contractor movement/storage etc in this area. Photographic evidence that this has been erected should suffice. It is to remain in place until the development is complete and the contractors are quitting site.

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: 14

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
I am not happy with the front dormers, which are completely out of keeping with other adjacent properties, which have deluxe windows instead of dormer. Dormers will also potentially overlook my house Just to advise that there was a typo in my previous submission. My comment wasnt ended to say that dormers on the front pitch of the roof of those house are out of keeping with other properties in this road, but that VELUX windows are an acceptable alternative.	Though it is noted that the streetscene does not feature a character of front dormers, the front dormer was split up in amended plans, and now these front dormers would feature a more traditional pitched design. Regarding overlooking from this dormers this is assessed in section 7 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) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Arboriculture
- (v) Parking
- (vi) Ecology

(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

Character, bulk and the streetscene

7.3 The works would be readily visible upon the streetscene in regards to the proposed front dormers, and at certain vantage points, the proposed rear dormer would be visible upon the streetscene.

7.4 The loft conversion aspect of the works is considered acceptable and would constitute as permitted development as a standalone aspect and cannot be considered under this application.

- 7.5 The front dormers, were in superseded plans to be one large reasonably wide width natured flat roof dormer. Regarding the streetscene, there is not an established character of front dormers, and officers considered that the wide width front dormer would have been overbearing and visually intrusive upon the streetscene. Regarding these concerns, the agent amended the plans, with this front dormer changed to be two smaller traditionally pitched roof dormers.
- 7.6 Regarding dormers, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states dormers " *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*". It further states "*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*".
- 7.7 The front dormers were amended to feature traditional pitched roofs, comfortably between the eaves and ridge lines and would not dominate the front roof slope, these front dormers are considered to be in keeping with the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and therefore acceptable.
- 7.8 Regarding the rear dormer, it is considered that it would provide a wide width and monopitched rear roof addition resulting in a dormer that would have a substantial bulk and mass that would dominate the rear roofslope and would be contrary to the guidance contained within the SPD, albeit it would be set up from the eaves line of the host dwelling by approximately 0.25 metres and would be set lower than the ridge height of the host dwelling. However, the dormer would only be readily visible upon the streetscene at limited vantage points. Furthermore, there is a permitted development fallback position under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B. With regards to this, the proposed rear dormer is considered acceptable.
- 7.9 The proposed rear extension would replace the existing rear extension. Though it is noted that it would be a relatively deep and flat roof addition to the rear of the dwelling. It is not considered that it would feature an unduly prominent depth on the dwelling and furthermore it would not be visible upon the streetscene would feature a single storey nature and modest height, with regards to this, this rear extension is considered to be an acceptable addition upon the dwelling.

Materials

- 7.10 This application seeks to use materials that would match those of the existing dwelling, regarding these materials, it is considered acceptable
- 7.11 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

- 7.12 To the southern and northern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 52 and 56 London Road. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these two properties. Nos 51 and 53 London Road to the front of the application site would be acceptably impacted by the rear works and at approximately 43 and 41 metres to the front of the front dormers, are not considered to be unacceptably overlooked by these front dormers. Nos 9 and 10 Oakley Gardens and No.1 Applewood Drive would not be impacted by the front dormers due to their location, and their rear curtilages would be a minimum of approximately 25.5 metres away from the rear extension and a minimum approximate 31 metre separation distance from the rear dormer, at this distance the rear extension would acceptably impact these properties regarding overshadowing overbearing and overlooking concerns and the rear dormer would not be overshadowing or overbearing and would be at a sufficient distance to prevent overlooking of their gardens and rear windows.
- 7.13 The rear patio was amended during the application to be approximately 30cm and would represent permitted development, and cannot be assessed as part of these works and is considered to have an acceptable neighbourly impact. Furthermore, the loft conversion aspect of the works would by itself be permitted development and is therefore considered an acceptable aspect of the works.

No.52 London Road

- 7.14 To the southern side of the application site is No.52 London Road. The front dormers would not overshadow No.52 or be overbearing or be able to overlook No.52 and are considered acceptable. The rear dormer could only overshadow No.52's roof, which features 2No rooflights however at their locations they would not be considered to be impacted. Furthermore, though the rear dormer would add mass and bulk to the rear roofslope of No.54 is not considered to unacceptably increase a sense of overbearing from No.52's rear garden. Regarding overlooking concerns, though it is noted that the dormer may be able to provide oblique views of No.52's rear garden, however, this is considered acceptable. Regarding the rear extension the side fenestration would face No.56 and would not impact No.52. The rear fenestration of the proposed rear extension would face No.54's rear garden which is considered to be acceptable. Regarding its modest height and single storey nature, it is not seen that it would unacceptably increase a sense of overbearing. Regarding the potential for overshadowing and that it would extend approximately 2 metres further than No.52's rear extension which is well fenestrated to the rear, a 45 degree angle test was performed by the officer. With regards to this, officers consider that the proposed rear extension was not considered to fail this test and is therefore considered to be acceptable impact regarding overshadowing concerns.

No.56 London Road

- 7.15 To the northern side of the application site is No.56 London Road. The front dormers aspect of the works would not overshadow No.56 or be overbearing, or be able to overlook No.56, and are considered acceptable. The rear dormer may at its location increase some overshadowing of No.56, however this would impact the pathway to the rear garden and the side elevation which appears to be a flank wall at this level furthermore, there are trees which would provide shielding from these impacts, regarding this the rear dormer would be acceptable regarding overshadowing.

Regarding its location and scale it is not considered that it would be overbearing and is acceptable in this regard. Regarding overlooking concerns, the rear dormer would feature fenestration which at most it would provide oblique views of No.56 London Road which is considered acceptable. Regarding the replacement rear extension, it would be of a single-storey nature and would not be seen to unacceptably increase a sense of overbearing. Regarding overshadowing concerns, with consideration of its 3.2 metre height and that it would feature a 3 metre separation distance to Nos 54 and 56's boundary treatment and 5.5 metres to the side elevation, this is at a distance where it would not unacceptably increase overshadowing. Regarding overlooking concerns of the proposed rear extension, the rear fenestration of the extension would face onto No.54's garden and would have an acceptable impact upon No.56. The rear extension also proposes 2 new windows for the utility room, these were considered to potentially increase overlooking of No.56 and its rear amenity space and the agent amended plans to make these windows obscure. In light of this, these windows will be conditioned to be obscure if permission is forthcoming, and the rear extension is not considered to unacceptably overlook No.56. With consideration of these concerns, No.56 is considered to be acceptably impacted by this proposal.

- 7.16 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 2 letters of objection from the same third party were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Arboriculture

- 7.17 Due to a tree under the protection of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and several substantial trees towards the rear of the curtilage, the Arboricultural team was consulted during the application process. They stated " *There is a TPO (Ref TPO 0855) tree in the property to the rear, Aerial imagery shows there are several substantial trees to the rear boundary line*" They further stated " *no objection to the proposal, but if consent is granted please condition that the rear 15m of the garden are a Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) to be enforced with a single line of fencing (see BS5837 for fencing detail, and attached) to restrict contractor movement/storage etc in this area. Photographic evidence that this has been erected should suffice. It is to remain in place until the development is complete and the contractors are quitting site*". If permission is forthcoming, this will be conditioned as a prior commencement condition, in an email uploaded on 30/7/24 this condition was agreed by the agent.

(v) Parking

- 7.18 This proposal would increase the number of bedrooms at the application site from a 3 bedroom dwelling to a 4 bedroom dwelling. This would require 3 parking spaces to accord with the Havant Parking SPD. This has been shown in the plans, and is considered to accord with the Havant Parking SPD and Policy DM:13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(vi) Ecology

- 7.19 The application site has been found to be within 50 metres of a notable and protected species; Stag Beetle, however in light of the nature and scale of the works it is considered acceptable. Furthermore, due to works to the roof of the dwelling, the Council's Ecologist was consulted during the application process. The Council's Ecologist stated " *Older property. Slate roof appears sound, but not possible to ascertain if gaps around gable ends. Small section of hanging tiles to front looks sound. Probably not enough to justify assessment. Suggest adding bat informative note*". In light of this, if permission is forthcoming, an informative will be added alerting the applicants to this risk. In light of these ecological considerations, this proposal is considered to be acceptable regarding ecology and to accord with Policy DM:8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

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/24/00393 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: A1025 215 REV:C :AMENDED PARKING PROVISION
EXISTING VS PROPOSED: Uploaded 25/7/24

Drawing Number: A1025 310 REV:D :AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS:
Uploaded 25/7/24

Drawing Number: A1025 210 REV:C :AMENDED PROPOSED FLOOR
PLANS: Uploaded 30/7/24

Drawing Number: A1025 311 REV:C :AMENDED PROPOSED SECTION
PLANS: Uploaded 25/7/24

Drawing Number: A1025 101 REV:C: AMENDED PROPOSED SITE PLAN:
Uploaded 25/7/24

LOCATION PLAN: Uploaded 22/5/24

Drawing Number: A1025 200 A: FLOOR PLANS AS EXISTING: Uploaded
22/5/24

Drawing Number: A1025 300 A: ELEVATIONS AS EXISTING: Uploaded
22/5/24

Drawing Number: A1025 301 A: SECTIONS AS EXISTING: Uploaded 22/5/24
Drawing Number: A1025 100 A: SITE PLAN AS EXISTING: Uploaded 22/5/24
Drawing Number: A1025 315 A: AMENDED PROPOSED AND EXISTING
SOUTHERN ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 30/7/24

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used 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.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, hereby permitted the 2 windows serving a utility room on the ground floor side elevation on the plans hereby approved shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

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

- 5 Prior to commencement of development, suitable tree protective barriers compliant with the recommendations found in Figure 3a of BS5837:2012, must be placed 15 metres from the rear garden's rear fence. These 15 metres shall be a Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ), enforced with a single line of fencing. No construction-related access shall take place within the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) of the tree. No materials storage, welfare facilities, or construction activities including cement mixing etc. are to occur near the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the tree, or where there is any risk of spillage or run-off towards the trees and their Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ).

Reason: This prior commencement condition is to ensure that trees to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period in the interests of amenity and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.