
Site Address:	4 Privett Road, Waterloooville, PO7 5HJ		
Proposal:	Two storey front extension.		
Application No:	APP/22/01182	Expiry Date:	31/01/2023
Applicant:	Mr Turner		
Agent:	Mr Tutton	Case Officer:	Denise Sheath
	Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd		
Ward:	Purbrook		
Site Visit Date:	16/05/2023		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

4 Privett Road, Waterloooville, is a chalet style bungalow with a front dormer. The property is constructed with brick with white painted render to the elevations. The first floor elevation to the rear is tile hung to match the existing roof. The front garden contains space for parking. The site is positioned on a slight slope and as a result no. 2 is marginally lower than no. 4 and no. 6 is marginally higher than the site. Privett Road is a residential road in Purbrook which is characterised by regularly spaced, detached and semi-detached properties.

2 Planning History

92/57777/000 - Raise height of existing roof and provide dormer window on elevation facing highway. PERM 02/11/1992
03/57777/001 - First floor roof extension creating new living accommodation. PERM 02/05/2003
APP/21/00513 - Two Storey Front Extension with 2No. Side Dormers. REF 06/07/2021

3 Proposal

Two storey front 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
CS16 (High Quality Design)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

No adverse comments based on plans provided. There may be a drain and cable duct affected by the work as indicated in your consultation but these are not shown on the plans or the GIS sewer map therefore I am unable to comment further. It will be for the applicant to ensure all services are located and adequately protected from the proposed work

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: 2

Summary of Objections:

- Loss of light and outlook from the two storey extension - *See Section 7.*
- Concern regarding existing drain which would be located within the proposed garage - *Building Control were consulted as part of the application please see their comments above in Section 5. The agent has also confirmed that the proposed extension would not impact the neighbouring sewage drainage network.* Consent may be required from Southern Water to build in the vicinity of a public sewer.
- Concerns Hedge between the boundary will be harmed or killed - *Any damage to a boundary hedge would be a civil matter between the parties involved*
- Rooms are not correctly marked with the correct use within the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment - Noted
- Inadequate Sunlight and Daylight Report - *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.

7.3 Policy CS16 promotes and recognises the value of high quality design, an aim positively promoted by the National Planning Policy Framework and Havant's Design Guide SPD, which applies to all new development.

Policy CS16 also requires that:

"The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking."

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

- 7.4 The application is a revised submission of the previously Refused application APP/21/00513. The refused application was dismissed at appeal stage for the following reasons:

'The proposed front extension would be of a considerable depth, the overall bulk and massing of which would be compounded by the changing ground levels down from the rear of the site towards the road. Whilst I accept no6 itself is a rather imposing feature within the road, nonetheless the proposed front extension, by virtue of its overall scale, combined with the flat roof dormers to each side, would give rise to a bulky design that would be out of keeping with the host building and the visual amenities of the locality.'

'Overall, I consider that the proposed development, by virtue of its depth would have a detrimental impact upon the outlook from and the light available to the occupiers of 2 and 6 Privett Road and from this basis the proposal conflicts with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 which, in addition to that referred to previously, stipulates that planning permission will only be granted if a development is designed to a high standard and does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours.'

- 7.5 The revised proposal is for a two storey front extension which includes alterations to the front roof slope to create a half hipped gable. The proposed front extension would protrude 5.1m from the ground floor and extend the roof ridge by 7.1m with an eaves height of 3.2m and a maximum roof height of 6.5m, a large side dormer is proposed for each side elevation of the new roof slope, the application site slopes down from the south (rear) to the north (front).
- 7.7 The previous proposal was for a two storey front extension which included alterations to the front roof slope to create a gable. The previous front extension protruded 6m from the ground floor and extended the roof ridge by 10m with an eaves height of 3.8m and a maximum roof height of 6.8m. A large side dormer was proposed for each side elevation of the new roof slope, with a balcony area to the front first floor gable to serve the master bedroom.
- 7.6 The proposed dormers are still considered to be very large and bulky in scale which will dominate the side elevations of the new roofscape. This alteration together with the proposed front extension and gable would significantly alter the character of the existing dwelling.
- 7.7 Although the proposal has been revised with regard to the design, reduced slightly in depth and height from the previously refused under reference APP/21/00513. ie the eaves reduced by 0.6m; the maximum height will be reduced by 0.3m, with the depth reduced by 0.9m respectively. The proposed front extension has not addressed the concerns raised with regard to the overall scale and bulky design which combined with the flat roof dormers to each side of the proposed extension, would be out of keeping with the host building and the visual amenities of the locality.
- 7.8 The overall development would in effect change the shape, form and massing of the dwelling to a point that would be significantly incongruous within the existing streetscene and the character of Privett Road. The works are therefore considered to be contrary to Policy CS16 and recommended for refusal of planning permission.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.9 The proposed extension would have a 0.5m gap between the proposal and shared boundary to the west with No.2 with an approximate 2m distance from the proposed facing wall and the side elevation of the neighbouring property. Concerns have been raised with regard to loss of natural light to the kitchen window within the east side elevation of the neighbouring property. This window currently serves the kitchen breakfast table area. The only other natural light source for the kitchen is a window within the rear wall elevation (approximately 5.5m from the side elevation window). As the proposed development would protrude forward further 5.1m at ground floor level the natural light into this area of the kitchen would be significantly lost replaced with a view of the side facing extension wall. Presently this window has no development blocking light or outlook.

7.10 A revised Daylight and Sunlight Assessment was submitted 15 June 2023 as part of the application. Page No.20 of the report states:

'There is one room at No.2 Privett Road which is experiencing a potentially noticeable reduction in annual sunlight to one of its four windows. However as this room is served by more than one window it means that this room will still receive direct sunlight throughout the year from three other unaffected windows, including during the winter months where no reduction is seen'.

The other three windows mentioned above in the report are:

W4 which is a secondary bedroom window, with the bay window to the front elevation the primary light source; and

W2 and W3 which serve the side elevation of the kitchen area. The report is not accurate when it states these windows are secondary windows to a room served by multiple windows as the only other window which serves the kitchen is W1 window which is located within the rear elevation wall approximately 5.5m from the side elevation windows. As a result of the proposed development the natural light available to the kitchen would be materially impacted, with the only window not to suffer a loss of light from the development being W1.

7.11 The proposed window to the west elevation of the ground floor garage and the windows within the side facing dormers have the potential to create additional overlooking. That said, if permission was granted, a condition would be recommended that these windows be obscured as these windows would not be the primary light source for any habitable rooms.

7.12 The proposed extension would have a 1.6m gap between the proposal and shared boundary to the east with No.6 with an approximate 2.6m distance from the proposed facing wall and the side elevation of the neighbouring property. Concerns have been raised with regard to a loss of natural light to the living room, porch and hall.

7.13 The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has marked the main living room area of No.6 Privett Road as R2 Unknown and shows window marked W4. This window (W4) will be impacted greatly by the proposed extension, which services a living room. There is a secondary window to this living area which faces on to the boundary with No.8 Privett Road. The secondary window's natural light is already impacted by the forward building line of No.8. The proposed extension would further reduce any natural light to this main living area having a detrimental impact on the living standards of the occupiers.

7.14 The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment also states that the Porch to No.6 is treated as a non habitable room. At present the window within the porch and hall shines through to the living room area; the natural light from these areas help with the already limited natural light to the living room. The proposed extension would protrude further than these windows which would significantly reduce the amount of natural light available to the living room area.

7.15 The proposed front extension would also create a loss of outlook to the adjacent neighbouring properties (No.2 & 6) with regard to the size and mass of the proposed extension. This would be in conflict with Policy CS16 1.(e) which states:

"The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of the neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking."

(iv) Parking

7.16 The proposed extension would create an additional bedroom taking the property from a 3 bedroom property to a 4 bedroom property. In order to comply with the Borough's Parking SPD three parking spaces are required to be provided onsite. The proposal shows a garage, although the garage does not meet the internal requirement for a proposed garage, there is sufficient space to the front of the property for the parking of 3no. vehicles. Therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable from a parking perspective and accords with the SPD. Should permission be granted, a condition would be recommended as to the provision of the car parking.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring dwellings to the east and west, due to its overall scale and design. The development would also appear overbearing and visually intrusive, within the street scene. The extension to the front would also result in the loss of natural light and outlook to neighbouring properties. It is therefore considered the design, by virtue of the scale and siting would, lead to a detrimental impact on the character of the existing dwelling and the streetscene and the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be inappropriate and recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/22/01182 for the following reasons

- 1 The design and appearance by reason of its bulk, height, design and prominent location be significantly detrimental and out of keeping with the main building and the visual amenity of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed extension is of excessive depth adversely affecting the outlook from, and light available to, the occupiers of the adjacent residential properties (No.2 and No.6 Privett Road). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

