
Site Address: 6 Talbot Close, Havant, PO9 3HS
Proposal: Demolition of garage. Erection of ground and first floor side extension, single storey rear extension with roof lantern, dormer additions to the front and rear elevations and rooflight to front elevation.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00394
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Stamp
Agent: Mrs Fox
Case Officer: Robert Riley
Critchley Architecture and Design
Ward: Bedhampton
Expiry Date: 19/07/2024

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a 2-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in Bedhampton in Havant. To the front it features a dormer attached to the adjoining dwelling, and 1No garage attached to the side of the dwelling, with a small driveway adjoining onto Talbot Close, to the rear elevation the dwelling features a rear adjoining dormer, to the rear of the dwelling there is the application sites rear garden. The property's materials, feature brickwork to form the external walls and brown concrete tiles in a pitched hip design to form the roof.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that could be considered urban and residential, with the character of the street featuring dwellings with the same or similar materials and some variations in shapes and designs of the dwellings.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant history

3 Proposal

- 3.1 This application proposes 4 elements:
- Demolition of the existing garage
 - Two-storey side extension
 - Single storey rear extension with roof lantern
 - Dormer additions to front and rear elevations (to be sited on the first floor side extension aspect of the works) with rooflight on front elevation.

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)

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

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 Liz Fairhurst - Bedhampton

No comments received

Councillor Michael Lind

No comments received

Councillor Phillipa Gray

No comments received

Ecologist

Roof appears generally sound, but not possible to ascertain if gaps around gable ends or along soffits. Small section of hanging tiles on dormer not affected. Probably not enough to justify assessment. Suggest adding bat informative note

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: 0

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
- (v) 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

- 7.3 The proposal would feature a significant change in bulk and mass to the dwelling and proposes the demolition of the existing garage, ground and first-floor side extensions, a single-storey rear extension and dormer additions on the first-floor side extension.

Character, bulk and the streetscene

- 7.4 The works would be visible upon the streetscene with regards to the demolition of the existing garage, the ground and first floor side extensions and the front dormer addition.
- 7.5 The single-storey rear extension would be of a modest scale upon the dwelling, and would be considered subservient to the existing dwelling and is considered acceptable upon this dwelling, furthermore, it would not be visible upon the streetscene, with consideration of these regards, it is considered acceptable in terms of visual amenity.
- 7.6 The proposal to demolish the existing garage is considered acceptable.
- 7.7 Regarding the side extensions it is noted that these would create significant mass and bulk upon the dwelling, with the first floor section featuring an approximate 4.3 metre width, however, the ground floor aspect would replace the garage and only provide approximately 1.6 metres more width than the existing garage.
- 7.8 The potential for a terracing impact is considered to be important to assess due to the reduced separation that would result between Nos 6 and 7's side elevations. It is noted that there would be between approximately 6 metre minimum separation distance and approximately an 11 maximum separation distance between Nos 6 and 5's side walls. With the Havant Borough Design Guide ordinarily preferring at least a 1 metre separation distance between dwellings, to signify different developments, this proposal can be seen to accord with this and is acceptable.
- 7.9 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD with regards to subserviency of side extensions, states "*It is important that the extension remains subservient to the main building, so it can be read which part of the building is the original and which is a later addition. Two storey side extensions should be set back behind the main building line. The ridge height of the extension can also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage. The angle of the roof should be the same as or similar to the existing roof. Flat-roofed extensions are not normally acceptable, particularly at two storey height*". It is noted that side extension together would feature a pitched roof, but however would not feature a reduced ridge line compared to the existing dwelling or be set back. In consideration of this, though it is noted it does not accord with this guidance from the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, the extension would

be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and would not be unduly prominent in the streetscene.

- 7.10 Regards how visually Nos 6 and 5 would be read together, the proposed side extensions would provide more symmetry with No.5. In light of this, though these extensions may not be reflective of an extension that could be noted as a later addition, in consideration that the dwelling would be more similar in appearance to No.5, officers are not of the opinion that these side extensions in this regard would warrant a refusal on this basis and in this case on balance are considered to be acceptable.
- 7.11 Regarding the proposed additional dormers to the front and rear of the dwelling. The rear dormer though would feature a flat roof, would be of a modest height and scale, and would not be visible upon the streetscene, with regards to this, it is considered to be in keeping with the dwelling. Regarding the front dormer, it would also be of a modest scale regarding its width and height, and though it would not be symmetrical with No.5's non adjoined front dormer, it is not considered that it would create a contrived appearance regarding the front elevation of Nos 5 and 6. Furthermore, there are other dormers with non uniform designs on the street seen at Nos 1,3 and 4 Talbot Close. With these regards, the front dormer, is also considered to be acceptable and in keeping with the streetscene and the dwelling.

Materials

- 7.12 The materials are proposed to match the existing dwellinghouse which is considered acceptable.
- 7.13 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 on balance that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.14 To the northwestern, eastern and southwestern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 5 and 7 Talbot Close and Nos 7 and 9 Woodstock Road. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these properties. The proposed demolition of the existing garage aspect of the works is considered acceptable with regards to neighbourly impacts.

No.5 Talbot Close

- 7.15 The ground and first floor side extensions are considered to have acceptable impacts on No.5, due to shielding from the existing dwelling. The rear extension would be single storey and feature a modest approximate 2.9 metre height and at its scale would have an acceptable impact regarding the sense of overbearing. However, it is in close proximity to No.5's rear curtilage and No.5's rear extension, which appears to be a sun room which appears to feature ample fenestration. In regards to overshadowing concerns, the officer performed a 45 degree angle test regarding depth regarding No.5's rear extension and No.6's proposed rear extension. Regarding this test, the rear extension would meet this test and this rear extension would be considered acceptable in regards to overshadowing concerns. Regarding the additional dormers, the front dormer fenestration, would face the public realm and is considered acceptable in this regard. The rear dormer was confirmed to feature obscure glass

and could not permit unacceptable levels of overlooking of No.5 Talbot Close. With regards to these considerations, this proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.5.

No.7 Talbot Close

- 7.16 Regarding the side extension of this dwelling, it is noted that there would be an approximate 6 metre eaves height and that it would be 8 metres at the ridge line. It is noted that it would feature a minimum 6 to 11 metre separation distance from No.7's side elevation which is considered to be sufficient to prevent overshadowing, regarding the rear garden as the dwelling angles away from No.7's curtilage it is considered any overshadowing beyond the boundary treatment would be limited and acceptable due to the separation distance and angle of the dwelling regarding No.7. Regarding overbearing concerns of this elevation, though it is noted that it would increase the sense of scale of the dwelling, with regards to the separation distance of the proposal to No.7's rear amenity space, it is considered acceptable. Regarding overlooking concerns from this proposed side extension, the fenestration on the side elevation would feature face No.7 Talbot Close, but would feature high level windows, this would be conditioned if permission is forthcoming and is considered to be acceptable with regards to overlooking concerns.
- 7.17 The proposed rear extension would be of modest height at approximately 2.9 metres tall and would feature a sufficient separation distance from No.7 that it would not increase overshadowing or the sense of overbearing from its proposed location. Furthermore its fenestration would face No.6's rear garden and boundary treatment, and it would therefore have an acceptable impact regarding overlooking. Regarding the addition of the front and rear dormers on the side extension it has been considered important to assess the potential of overlooking. The rear dormer was confirmed in an email to be obscure and would not face No.7, and the front dormer would face the public realm. With regards to these considerations of the side extensions, rear extension and dormers, this proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.7 Talbot Close.

Nos 7 and 9 Woodstock Road

- 7.18 The side extensions would feature a sufficient separation distance from both these properties and would not have unacceptable impacts regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns. The rear extension though noted to feature a limited 1.7 metre separation distance from No.7 Woodstock Road's curtilage and would not feature fenestration facing No.7 Woodstock road. In consideration of its modest height and that it could not overlook this property, it is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.7 Woodstock Road. The rear extension would be sufficiently far enough away from No.9 Woodstock Road and its fenestration would face boundary treatment, regarding this, No.9 Woodstock Road is considered to be acceptably impacted.
- 7.19 The side extensions would feature approximately a 7 metre separation distance from No.7's curtilage and approximately a 6.2 metre separation distance from No.9's at these distances it is considered these dwellings would be acceptably impacted regarding overshadowing and the sense of overbearing. Regarding overlooking concerns, the front elevation fenestration would not impact these dwellings and the side fenestration would face No.7 Talbot Close and would be high level windows and therefore could not impact Nos 7 and 9 Woodstock Road. The ground floor side extension would provide a new door and window but these would face No.6 Talbot Close's rear garden and boundary treatment and would have an acceptable impact

regarding overlooking. Regarding the dormers aspect of the works on the side extensions, the front dormer would not impact Nos 7 and 9 Woodstock Road and is therefore acceptable with regards to these properties. Regarding the rear dormer, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD ordinarily desires 20 metres between rear first floor to first floor windows, it is noted that the rear dormer window would feature an approximate 20 metre distance from No.7 Woodstock Road's rear elevation and approximately 18.5 metres from No.9 Woodstock Road's rear elevation. Though it is noted that it would not accord with this guidance, the agent confirmed that the rear dormer would feature obscure glass and in light of this, is considered to be acceptable with regards to privacy and overlooking concerns.

- 7.20 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 no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Parking

- 7.21 The proposal seeks to increase occupancy of the dwelling, from 2 to 3 bedrooms which in either case would require 2 parking spaces which is shown on the plans and would accord with the Havant Parking SPD and Policy DM:13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(v) Ecology

- 7.22 Due to works to the garage and that may otherwise impact the roof of the dwelling, the ecologist was consulted during the application process. In light of this, the ecologist commented "*Roof appears generally sound, but not possible to ascertain if gaps around gable ends or along soffits. Small section of hanging tiles on dormer not affected. Probably not enough to justify assessment. Suggest adding bat informative note*". In light of this, an informative will be added if permission is forthcoming, warning applicants of potential risks to protected bat species. Regarding this, it is considered 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 on balance 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/24/00394

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: 101: LOCATION & BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 28/5/24
Drawing Number: 201: EXISTING FLOOR: Uploaded 28/5/24
Drawing Number: 301: EXISTING ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 28/5/24
Drawing Number: 401F: PROPOSED FLOOR: Uploaded 28/5/24
Drawing Number: 501F: PROPOSED ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 28/5/24
Drawing Number: 24014 601 Revision 0: Proposed side section plan:
Uploaded 17/7/24

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, the window serving an additional rear dormer serving an ensuite on the first floor 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 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, the window serving bedroom 1 on the first floor on the side elevation shown on the plans hereby approved shall have a cill height that is no less than 1.7metres above finished floor level and shall be 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