
Site Address: 130 Silverdale Drive, Waterlooville, PO7 6DX
Proposal: Rear gable build up with increased dormers to both sides.
Application No: APP/23/00438 Expiry Date: 13/09/2023
Applicant: Mr L Ford
Agent: Mr Adam Jones Case Officer: Ikrame Essalih
Ward: Hart Plain
Site Visit Date:

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 130 Silverdale Drive, Waterlooville is a bungalow with accommodation in the roof space, located on the west side of Silverdale Drive. The dwelling is constructed in bricks, painted brick and rendered elevations in white/cream colour and a pitched roof with a hipped rear side and a gable style front side. To the rear of the dwellinghouse is a flat roof rear extension in addition to a rear conservatory. At upper floor level, the property benefits from existing flat roof dormers on both side elevations.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character with properties of similar design heights. Many neighbouring properties within the area have extended flat roof dormers in both side elevation or in both front and rear elevations.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

The proposal comprises the enlargement of the side dormers in depth and width extending to the rear and building over the existing flat roof rear extension. The proposal would also result in the alteration of the main roof at rear elevation from hipped to gable to incorporate the new extended dormers.

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)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Carly Scannell - Hart Plain

No comments received.

Councillor E Shimbart - Hart Plain

No comments received.

Councillor James Blades

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>Neutral:</u> Concerns regarding the loss of privacy and potential overlooking.	Comments are addressed in planning consideration section.

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 Matters

(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 proposal comprises the replacement of the existing side dormers with larger dormers containing three windows on each side elevation. Based on the submitted amended plans, the enlarged dormers on each side would be reconstructed to have a flat roof similar in design to the existing and positioned at approximately 185 mm from the roof ridge and 80mm from the roof's eaves and the rain box gutter. Due to inaccuracy of existing plans, it was undetermined if the dormers would be reconstructed or extended as the existing dormers are bordering the roof ridge line at the top and positioned further from the roof eaves occupying approximately half of the roof slope surface. It is noted that there are many inaccuracies on the existing plans and where the current design and condition of the dwellinghouse is not reflected as well as the dimensions of the existing building in the existing and proposed plans.

7.4 Assessing only the proposed design, and although the extended width of the dormers would mainly be to the rear of the property, and where the additional windows would only be visible from limited vantage points within the streetscene, the additional depth and the overall size of the proposed dormers as well as the proximity to the roof ridge is considered bulky and oversized vis-à-vis the existing built form. Furthermore, from the main front elevation viewpoint, the additional mass on top of the roof would conceal the gable roof aspect of the original dwellinghouse and impose a two-storey flat roof building appearance on the streetscene; thus, would be out context of the area and the main dwellinghouse. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states in paragraphs 5.47 - 5.48 state:

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.

7.5 Additionally, due to the position of the dormers and where their side walls are part of the main front elevation, the impact of a poorly designed alteration at roof level would have a significant detrimental impact on the streetscene and the character of the residential amenities in the area. The deep form of the dormers would dominate the original roof slope and appear excessively bulky. Whilst it is noted that flat roof dormers are a common feature the surrounding properties it is noted that in neighbouring properties, the existing dormers are generally smaller in bulk, are facing the main street and positioned at an appropriate distance to roofs eaves which maintains the traditional bungalows with roof accommodation aspect within the neighbourhood. Therefore, it is considered that the bulk and massing of the proposed development would significantly detract from the appearance of the property and is deemed unacceptable.

7.6 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate to the context of the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, conflicting with the requirements of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality. In accordance with guidance in the NPPF, permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.7 The proposed development would mainly be at the upper level of the existing dwellinghouse. The proposal would incorporate an additional floor space to the rear of the loft to allow for a newly designed roof accommodation and additional windows to

serve the new bedrooms and bathrooms. Therefore, it is considered that the immediately adjacent properties to the side boundaries of the application site would be likely to receive an additional impact of the proposal.

- 7.8 To the northwest side, property at No. 128, is the closest to the proposal. Although the tall trees would provide a partial screen to the proposal, the additional windows to the rear serving the bathroom and en-suite would have a direct view on the adjacent property. Further to these concerns, amended plans have been submitted where these windows are to be obscure glazed and opening only at 1.7 metres to avoid harmful overlooking onto the private spaces of the adjoining property. The dormer and roof extension would also appear over bearing when viewed from the rear of No.128 due to its position, height mass and bulk. This would harmfully impact both the external private amenity space and the outlook from the rear windows.
- 7.9 To the southeast side, is the property at No.132. By dint of the separating distance of approximately 4.7 metres, the existing rear garage and rear extension at the neighbouring property as well as the existing dormers at the application site, it is considered that the level of overlooking of the two windows serving bedroom 3 and 4 would not be materially different from the existing. As for the third window serving bedroom 5, it is considered that the impact would be limited and acceptable as a direct view would be prevented by the existing build. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would result in a limited and acceptable impact to this neighbouring property.
- 7.10 To the rear southwest side, it is considered that the neighbouring properties on this side are located at sufficient distance to avoid any harmful impact from the proposed development.
- 7.11 Considering all of the above, the proposal is deemed to cause harm to the residential amenities due to overbearing aspect of the scheme and is therefore conflicting with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(iv) Parking matters

- 7.12 The property would have three additional bedrooms at the upper floor level in addition to the existing two bedrooms at the ground floor level. Therefore, a minimum of 3 parking spaces would be required on site in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards SPD. The submitted plans show three potential car parking spaces at the front area of the dwellinghouse and within the curtilage of the property. Therefore, the current and proposed provision of car parking spaces would meet the requirements of Havant Borough Council Parking Standards SPD and Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal is considered inappropriate in terms of design and would have significant and adverse impact on the character of the area and the neighbouring amenities and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00438, for the following reason.

- 1 The proposed development would by reason of its design, height, mass and bulk result in an unacceptable form of development to the harm of the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. The dormers would dominate the existing and extended roof slope and have the appearance of a two storey flat roof addition to the property when viewed from ground level. Furthermore the dormers and extended roof would have an overbearing impact on the private external amenity space and rear windows of 128 Silverdale Drive to the harm of the occupants residential amenities. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan and Havant Borough Council Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.