
Site Address:	109 Haslar Crescent, Waterlooville, PO7 6DD		
Proposal:	Proposed rooms in re-pitched roof and rear extension to kitchen.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/23/00370	Expiry Date:	10/07/2023
Applicant:	Mrs C Stanley		
Agent:	Mr I Marshall	Case Officer:	Selina Donophy
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

This application site comprises a detached bungalow located on the north side of Haslar Crescent, Waterlooville. This property has a pitched roof with tile hanging and brickwork to the elevations. Towards the front / side there is a driveway allowing for on site parking and there is also a lawned area towards the front of the property. The area is predominantly residential in character.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Proposed rooms in re-pitched roof and rear extension to kitchen.

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)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014
AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Carly Scannell - Hart Plain
No comment received

Councillor E Shimbart - Hart Plain
No comment received

Councillor Gwen Robinson

No comment received

Councillor James Blades

No comment received

Councillor Mike Seal

No comment received

Councillor Peter Wade

No comment received

Developer Services, Southern Water

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk and please read our New Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link:

southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

In situations where surface water is being considered for discharge to our network, we require the below hierarchy for surface water to be followed which is reflected in part H3 of the Building Regulations. Whilst reuse does not strictly form part of this hierarchy, Southern Water would encourage the consideration of reuse for new developments.

- Reuse
- Infiltration
- Watercourse
- Storm Sewer
- Combined Sewer

Guidance on Building Regulations is here:

gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-document-h

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site.

Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

Website: southernwater.co.uk or by email at:

SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4 (including applicant comment)

Comment	Officer Comment
With respect to the revised drawings for an installation of another window on the west facing side of the property - we do not object in principal- but insist that it must be 'opaque' glass as the same as the bathroom, as the proposed position of the window will look directly into our (redacted)	Comment noted
We are located immediately adjacent to the applicant's property. Our home is a single-storey retirement bungalow. Whilst we understand the desire of the applicants to extend their property for use as a family home, and do not object to this in principle, we have the following queries/concerns. Please can you consider these as part of the application process: 1. We understand the side window directly facing our property (Redacted) is to be a bathroom. In view of its location, we would request a condition is applied that this window be kept as a fixed and glazed window at all times so as to protect the privacy of both parties. 2. We are not concerned about extension of the footprint of the building. However, the increase in height of the roof pitch, coupled with the proposed dimensions of the 'dormer' room extensions (which are pushed to their maximum height/width and are to run the full length of both sides of the building) significantly changes the size and nature of the dwelling. The properties are located close to one another and the increased dimensions will dwarf our home. The building layout is not shown by reference to the size of the whole plot. It would be helpful if this information was shown on the same plan in order to give a true reflection of the size of the proposed building relative to its curtilage. Whilst other properties in the area have received permission to create roof dormers most are of smaller dimensions than the proposed works. 3. The plans appear to show that the existing garage is to be demolished or relocated in order to make room for the extension. There is no information as to what is to happen with this garage. Presumably relocation of the building should form part of the planning application, particularly if it is to be relocated close to the property boundaries? We would ask for clarification on this.	Comment noted. Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report. This is shown on the existing site plan- plans have now been provided to show this.

4. In view of the proximity to our house, we would ask if a condition could be imposed as to the hours and days of building works.	
I would strongly dispute [redacted] comments that the flat bed truck is only OCCASIONALLY parked on the road, this is absolutely not true. It is more often than not, left outside on the road all day and all night, sometimes loaded with another vehicles sometimes not, and only occasionally parked on the drive. It is also always parked facing the wrong direction for the side of the road it is parked on. I Feel that really does need to be taken into consideration before more vehicles are left outside. This is an accident waiting to happen.	Noted.
Issues and concerns regarding Highway, Traffic and Parking. The end of Haslar Crescent is already continually congested with vehicles from 109 not being parked within the boundaries of their property. Various vehicles including a trade flat bed (often loaded) are left on the highway and sometimes encroaching on double yellow lines. This has resulted in neighbouring properties paying for dropped kerbs and increasing their own front garden parking and causing neighbours in 94 and 96 to encroach on each others drives to both leave and access their properties. As the applicant has stated parking is not effected it may be prudent for Planning to check the current and future vehicle situation, and make it conditional that all vehicles are parked/stored within the curtilage of 109 and not on the highway. This could easily be done by the occupants utilising their front garden as others have done. There are huge safety concerns regarding this matter. Haslar Crescent is a designated cycle route used mainly, but not only by school children. There have been several near misses with vehicles being on the wrong side of the road (maneuvering around the parked vehicles) while exiting Haslar Crescent onto Charlesworth Drive. Concern is raised when building work commences that it will be impossible to access close proximity properties with the inevitable increase in works vans etc. There is currently nowhere for residents to park other than in their own drives due to the problems already outlined. Please ensure consideration is given to this	Understood.

matter	
Thank you for your time	
To whom it may concern I am sending this on behalf of a relative, who resides in [redacted] in relation to the above ref for planning permission. Although the building work its self will not be a concern to me. The additional vehicles related to such work is. As unfortunately the resident of this property already has vehicles left on the road outside the property including a flat bed truck. This causes many issues for other resident's drive access, and also several near misses due to the proximity of vehicles to the end of the road/ junction. This has been reported to the council by many residents. This addition of vehicles will only exacerbate the already difficult and potentially dangerous situation.	The parking issue has been noted.
To whom it may concern, I thought that this was an application for an extension of the property which bares no relation to the parking. Once the extension is complete and the garage has been moved back the property will have an additional two spaces to park cars on. Occasionally there is a flat bed truck parked outside the property which follows the Highway Code, 'As long as the vehicle is taxed and you are not in breach of any other traffic laws then you can park anywhere on a public highway, so long as it is not on footpaths/pavements, where it is legal to do so'. It also states 'all road users have the same right to park anywhere on the public highway as long as they do not contravene parking restrictions'. Any near misses along this road would be caused due to speeding and any vehicle being parked along the highway not just the occupants. This is the only vehicle that is parked outside the property when we are using the drive to gain access to the back garden as we cannot do this with vehicles parked down the side of the property. If there are visitors they may park on the highway as do all the neighbours visitors. Spaces outside the property are no where near	Comment noted.

the yellow lines at the beginning of Haslar crescent. In fact it measures 33ft from our drive way until the yellow lines begins (flatbed truck is 16ft) so there is no way said vehicle can be parked outside the property and encroach on the double yellows at the same time.

Since moving into the property only one property has had their curb dropped and this is on the corner of Haslar crescent and not opposite 109, this property also has additional parking and a drive way in Charlesworth drive. So I feel it is unfair that this is allowed to be wrote when it is clearly not true as any application for a dropped curbs would have been submitted before the property was purchased by the current owners.

As with any building works there will be an addition of work vans. However this will be in working hours so vehicles belonging to the property would obviously not be there at this time as they will be at work also.

Thank you for your time in reading this.

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) Flood risk
- (v) 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.

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

7.3 This proposal has been amended following its initial submission with the roof ridge lowered from the originally proposed 6 metre total height, the initially proposed wing style dormers have also been taken down from the ridge and split into four separate dormers. These changes follow concerns raised by the case officer in relation to the mass and bulk of the proposal in an area characterised by low height bungalows.

7.4 This proposal now comprises the raising of the ridge by approximately 0.4 metres (total height of 5.6 metres proposed). The proposals also include four dormers, two to each side of the roof slope. The proposal comprises of two smaller dormers located

towards the rear which would have side elevation windows on both sides serving bedrooms and two larger dormers located towards the front- on the east side elevation two of these windows would serve a front bedroom and to the west side elevation one of the side dormer windows would serve a bedroom, one a stairwell and one a shower room. Also proposed is a single storey rear extension which would square off the rear of the property creating an open plan dining area served by bi-fold doors to the rear elevation. The proposed rear extension is not considered to result in harm to the character of the area - the resulting scale and appearance would be in keeping with the host dwelling. The garage would be relocated towards the rear of the site- the applicant has provided plans showing this and this shows the garage would fall within permitted development criteria and therefore would not require planning permission.

- 7.5 The alterations to the proposal have been noted and have gone some way in meeting some of the concerns raised initially in relation to roof heights and subserviency of the proposed dormers within the roof slope. Despite this, the proposal is still considered to result in a top heavy design and appearance within an area which comprises of bungalows which are generally not considered to be of appropriate design to accommodate habitable space in the roof. In the immediate streetscene there are no examples of comparable roof alterations to the front or side roof slopes and therefore the low height character has been retained within the streetscene. The raised ridge and dormers would therefore stand out above the original roof line in a highly prominent location close to the junction where Haslar Road meets Charlesworth Drive. The design is considered to be top heavy and would set a precedent for this type of development within the road, resulting in a disruption in the pattern of development set within the road.
- 7.6 The proposal is not considered to be appropriate within the context of the host dwelling nor is it cohesive with the surrounding pattern of development within the road and is considered to result in unacceptable mass and bulk at first floor level which is at odds with the low height appearance of the road which comprises of bungalows which have largely remained undeveloped at roof height, notable when viewed from the highway. Overall this proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.7 To the east of the application site is No. 111 Haslar Road. It is considered that the rear dormer window would result in some level of overlooking back towards the rear garden of No. 111 as the dormer window would be located towards the rear and within close proximity of No. 111.
- 7.8 To the west of the application site is No. 107 Haslar Road. There is approximately 4.5 metres between these properties and the proposed rear extension is not considered to result in unacceptable overshadowing to No. 107. The proposed rear bedroom dormer window, however is considered to result in overlooking back towards the rear garden of No. 107 with the window located within close proximity of the boundary. The side dormer windows also could offer views down towards the ground floor side elevation windows of No. 107.
- 7.9 To the rear of the site are No's. 114 and 116 Sunnymead Drive. The proposal is not considered to result in harmful impact to the amenity of either of these properties.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will impact upon the privacy of adjacent properties and would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the amenity

of these properties immediately adjacent to the application site contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Flood risk

- 7.11 The site is not located within a flood zone however it is located within a future flood zone.

(v) Parking

- 7.12 This proposal would result in a total of 4 bedrooms and therefore 3 parking spaces are required on site to meet the parking standards. It appears the applicant currently parks vehicles in the space down the side of the property however this space appears to be below the 2.4 metres width guidance for a standard parking space and appears to be very tight in terms of access and being able to access/egress the vehicle. If the proposal were to be granted approval then the applicant would be required to specify where the parking spaces would be allocated and this would then be enforced via a planning condition.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The general design of this proposal, including the side dormers and raising of the roof ridge would result in an overdeveloped roof slope, which is considered to have a harmful impact upon the character of the property, street scene and the visual amenity of the immediate locality. It is not considered to be appropriate within the context of the existing property nor the surrounding pattern of development. The dormer windows would have a harmful impact on the privacy of adjacent properties and therefore would result in detriment to neighbour amenity. As such, the application is contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide SPD 2011 and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00370

(A) for the following reasons

- 1 The design of this proposal, including the side dormers and raising of the roof ridge would result in an overdeveloped and top heavy roof slope which is considered to have a harmful impact upon the character of the existing property, the street scene and the visual amenity of the immediate locality. It is not considered to be appropriate within the context of the existing property nor the surrounding pattern of development. As such, the application would be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough (Core Strategy) 2011, the adopted Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed dormer windows would offer views down towards the private amenity spaces and the side elevations of the adjacent properties No's 107

and 111 Haslar Crescent to the west and east and would therefore cause harmful overlooking resulting in detriment to neighbour amenity. As such the application is contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough (Core Strategy) 2011, the adopted Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.