
Site Address:	34 Deverell Place, Waterloooville, PO7 5ED		
Proposal:	Loft extension for the creation of a first floor with gable end and dormers to front and rear elevations		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/22/00761	Expiry Date:	28/09/2022
Applicant:	Mr Woods	Case Officer:	Jenni Price
Agent:		DMC Lead	
Ward:	Purbrook	Member	

Reason for Committee Consideration:

Density:

HDS Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

APP/22/00761 – 34 Deverell Place, Waterloooville, PO7 5ED.

(1) Site Description

The property is a semi-detached bungalow located on the northern side of Deverell Place. The locality is predominantly residential in nature, and is characterised by 1950s, semi-detached, hipped roof, bungalows of traditional brick and tile construction. A number of properties along Deverell Place have undertaken roof alterations to create dormers on their front, side, and rear elevations. The site, itself, is towards the end of the cu-de-sac and still broadly comprises its original built form. The property includes a front and a rear garden which are both laid to lawn and comprise depths of approximately 7.00m and 13.70m respectively. Finally, the site includes a detached rear garage and an approximately 22m long driveway.

(2) Planning History

HWU/02265 – OUTLINE PERMISSION in March 1954 for the use of land at London Road, Widley, for residential development.

HWU/03047 – PERMISSION in August 1954 for the layout of roads and plots for the erection of 58no. dwellings on land off Lone Valley, Briggs Nursery, Widley (5.17 acres).

HWU/03331 – PERMISSION in December 1954 for the erection of 57no. bungalows on 6.17 acres of land at Briggs Nursery, off Lone Valley, Widley.

(3) Proposal

Loft extension for the creation of a first floor with gable end and dormers to front and

rear elevations.

The volume of the dormer to the rear and the change of hipped to gable measures 50m³.

The two dormer windows to the front measure 2m wide, 3.1m in depth and 2.1m high with the dormer on the east set away from the common boundary with the attached neighbour No.32 by approximately 1.7m.

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

CS14 – Efficient Use of Resources

CS16 – High Quality Design

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

AL2 – Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements

5) Statutory & Non-Statutory Consultees

Cllr C Diamond

I object to this planning application on the grounds that it's; overdevelopment of the site; and not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Cllr G Hughes

Having seen the plans, I visited the site to better understand the street scene and the potential impact of this application. I cannot support this application. The intent is to turn a two-bedroomed bungalow into a four-bedroomed house. The size of the upper floor extension is not in keeping with other dormers in the street, which in comparison are modest. If approved, it would represent an overdevelopment of the plot and be out of keeping with the other surrounding properties, which would be detrimental to the existing street scene.

Building Control

The Building Control Team has confirmed that they have "no comments".

Environment Agency

The Environment Agency was notified of the proposal. At the time of writing this report no comments have been received.

Portsmouth Water

Portsmouth Water have reviewed the application and associated documents for APP/22/00761 and have no concerns regarding impacts to groundwater quality. Therefore, we do not recommend any planning conditions to be included on the planning permission

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:

Statutory advertisement: 14/10/2022

Number of representations received: 9

Comment	Officer Comment
Of the 9 objections received 7 were from adjoining occupiers and 2 from local Councillors. The proposed extension would render our recently installed solar panels (costing £8000) of little use. Bearing in mind the fact that electricity has skyrocketed and could go up even more, I need as much help as possible to be able to afford to pay my energy bills, I also thought that installing solar would also go towards helping the environment. I hope you would agree. We moved to a bungalow so we would have privacy in our garden and not be overlooked which would not be the case if a dormer was added [Redacted]. I strongly object to the proposal of APP/22/00761. <u>1. Additional comments:</u> I am writing regarding the planning proposal for 34 Deverell Place. Please can you ensure no extensions [REDACTED] are permitted. We have recently installed solar panels on the roof at the front of our property. Any front dormer extension would	The following are material planning considerations raised by adjoining and nearby occupiers and local Councillors that are applicable to the proposal: 1. Increase in noise 2. Over development/ Not in keeping/ Out of place 3. Privacy/ Overlooking 4. Overshadowing/ Loss of sunlight 5. Use as an HMO 6. Parking . It is considered that the proposal would not create an increase of noise from the property as it will continue to be used as a residential dwelling. Although the additional dormer windows would create extra rooms for occupancy it is considered that an increase in how many people move into the property does not warrant a refusal of planning in this instance. The proposed gable end extension and large dormer to the rear would on their own have the benefit of permitted development and therefore it is considered that this

block out sunlight, reducing our solar energy, which is obviously a huge disadvantage to us. At the rear of the property any extension would overlook our glass roofed living area and the whole of our garden, giving us no privacy. The reason we wanted to live in a bungalow is so we would not be overlooked. We hope to hear from you soon and that you are able to help us with this matter [REDACTED].

Following on from our telephone conversation yesterday (12.10.22), I feel the need to draw your attention to how our type of solar panels actually work.

If one panel has a shadow cast upon, it even if the others are in sunlight, the whole system will not generate energy. As you can see by the orientation of our property on the map information provided online, the sun's path across the sky, by afternoon (times will vary from summer to winter) the proposed dormer would cause shadow on our panels.

One scenario could be cloud in the morning generating no or little energy, but in the afternoon brilliant sunshine, but generate no energy due to shadow cast upon them.

Also, the winter sun is low in the sky when we would need to get the maximum use from them and not be in any shadows. Due to the energy crisis, I want them to be as efficient as much as possible as intended.

I object to the rear dormer, as you are aware the two properties are joined together, and we have an all clear glass roofed conservatory living area. The proposed rear dormer would over shadow and overlook our living area, invading our privacy.

I am inviting you or someone from your department to come and view our home for yourself to fully understand the impact this proposal would have on us.

We have been informed that the new owners have no intention of living at the

aspect of the proposal would be acceptable given the 'fall back' position available. The proposed front dormers have been reduced in size and are set away from the neighbouring (no.32) roof boundary by approximately 1.7m. Further to this there are other properties in the street that have front dormers of differing designs. It is considered that the gable end and front and rear dormers would not constitute an overdevelopment of the property and is not out of place/ keeping in the surrounding area and are acceptable in their design and siting.

The proposed dormers will have windows that face onto the street and into the rear garden with limited and angled views towards neighbouring gardens. This aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable.

The applicant/ agent was asked to provide an overshadowing report in relation to the potential impacts to solar panels at 32 Deverell Place which provided the following comments:

TFT have been appointed to consider the roof extension proposals to 34 Deverell Place and their potential effect on sunlight availability to solar panels to 32 Deverell Place. We have undertaken a 3D computer analysis with the methodology outlined in The Building Research Establishment Report "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight - A guide to good practice", 2022, 3rd edition (BRE 209 2022).

Where the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) received by a solar panel with the new development in place is less than 0.90 times the value before, a more detailed calculation of the loss of solar radiation should be undertaken." We have therefore undertaken this initial APSH assessment to gauge whether 0.9 of former sunlight hours will be retained i.e. a reduction of 10% or less. In addition to the holistic assessment of the overall panel area, we have subdivided the panels in to 12 separate sections to determine whether there are particular areas where sunlight reduction

property and will rent it out. A four-bedroom house would create much more activity and noise. The properties are not sound proofed and until recently our neighbour [REDACTED] we were able to clearly hear curtains being opened and closed and wall light switches being used. Recently a lady has been in the property and can be easily heard scraping the walls, this could be heard from both our living room and bedroom. The property was designed as a bungalow not a 4-bedroom house which would overshadow and dwarf our property and others and would look completely out of place, and most likely reduce the value of our home. I am also concerned that each of the 4 bedrooms could be rented individually making it a multiply occupancy property. This is causing my wife and I [REDACTED] I would respectfully ask you to put yourself in our situation. Not only are we experiencing high energy and food costs but also still recovering from covid 19 [REDACTED] I ask you please do not allow this proposal.	may be more apparent. The results can be seen by reference to drawings and results table at Appendix A. These indicate that in the proposed condition, the panels retain annual sunlight availability of at least 0.94 to any single panel assessed and an average of 0.98 to the panels as whole. In winter, the effect is reduced further still, with individual panels retaining at least 0.97 and an average of 0.99. Therefore, no reductions of 10% or greater will be seen and no further assessments are required. In accordance with the BRE guidelines, as 0.9 of the former APSH value has been retained, no detailed solar radiation testing is required. Therefore, is possible to conclude that no material reduction in sunlight will occur as a result of the proposals and the BRE guidelines are satisfied. In addition to the overshadowing report a site visit was undertaken and photos of the site were taken of the adjoining property at No. 32. At the time of the site visit the photos show shadowing which can clearly be seen coming from no. 32 and being over the subject property. This shows/ highlights the suns orientation as east to west which reduces the impact of overshadowing on this south facing roofslope. It is therefore considered that the proposed nearest dormer which is set away from the roof line by approximately 1.7m would be unlikely to have a significantly detrimental effect on the solar panels on the roof slope of No. 32.
The loft extension will have a detrimental effect on the amount of daylight received into 4 of our rooms as we are adjacent to their property. The rooms affected are our kitchen, bathroom, toilet and bedroom as all have windows facing onto the side of 34 Deverell Place across the driveway. It will also mean a loss of privacy for our garden as the windows at the back of the loft extension will overlook our garden which is not overlooked at the present time.	A number of objection letters received have raised the issue of using the house as a house of multiple occupation (HMO). Currently the property is a single-family dwelling and as such the review and recommendations of this planning submission are based on this proposal. The use of a residential property as an HMO (for more than 6 people) would require planning permission and a separate application would be required and dealt with as a separate matter.
This development does not appear to be a single-family home. It gives the impression of a rental property which would be	There is a garage located to the rear of the property offset to the side with a driveway to hold up to an additional 3 cars. This

conductive to this area (who would the tenants be?). The property is opposite to my home and the resulting work would be of great stress to me as I am [REDACTED]. Also being a cul-de-sac, access to my home would be prohibitive.	would be in line with this Councils requirements on bedroom numbers and additional parking provision. It is therefore considered that the proposal would include adequate parking for the increase in bedroom numbers proposed.
The proposal to alter and extend a two bedroomed bungalow into a four bedroomed property is totally unacceptable. It is not in keeping with other properties, and will cause huge problems regarding parking as the road to narrow and is a cul-de-sac. It will also affect neighbours' privacy as the gardens will be overlooked.	
The reason I am objecting to this planning application is we came here to retire in a bungalow estate, our privacy in our back garden is one of our greatest joys, we would not be overlooked by this development but I feel sorry for the other property owners that would be affected. My main concern is that everybody is struggling to park here already cars and vans are half parked on pavements, and we have elderly residential that are in wheelchairs that due to parking on the pavement struggle to get about as it is, so adding a multiple occupancy property with a minimum of another 4 cars is totally unacceptable, and why would you want to buy a bungalow and turn it in to a 4 bedroom conversion, only reason is money without a care or thought to the residents that already live here. I strong object to every aspect of this development.	
2. <u>Additional Comments</u> The following adjoining and nearby occupiers have made further comments regarding the proposal: 14 Deverell Place: Objects to the property becomming a multi-let, parking issues, excessive noise, letting out rooms to younger students, impact on residents lifestyles of needing a quiet location for their health. 16 Deverell Place: Objects to use as a HMO, noise and effect of development on residential area.	Adjoining occupiers were notified on 15/02/23 of additional information received regarding the proposal. These objections have been addressed in this report. See section 6 under officer comments and section 7 planning considerations.

32 Deverell Place:

Objects to privacy from the garden, overshadow living space at the back, effect on the solar pannels and noise.

36 Deverell Place:

Objects to loss of light into the four rooms opposite the new gable wall, limited parking facilities, cause of mayhem in the road and use as a HMO

66 Deverell Place:

Objects to parking, use as a HMO or large family dwelling, Traffic issues and noise.

7) Planning Considerations

7.1 In having due regard to the policies in the development plan, it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of Development
- (i) Impact on Character of the Area & Appropriateness of Design
- (ii) Impact on Neighbouring Properties
- (iii) Parking

(i) Principle of Development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area as set out in Policies CS17 and AL2. As such, development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

A search of the planning history has revealed that the property's permitted development rights (PDR) are still intact. As such, hip to gable end and the rear dormer could be carried out under Permitted Development depending on the additions volume.

(i) Impact on Character of the Area & Appropriateness of Design

7.3 It is noted that there are dormer roof extensions of differing size and design within the surrounding street. In taking this into account it is considered that the change from hipped to gable end and the dormers to the front would not appear incongruous in the street scene. Measurements of the proposed hip to gable and rear dormer show that the volume is within the allowed permitted development allowance of 50m³. Therefore, the change of hipped to gable end and the rear dormer could be built under permitted development rights. It is considered that the proposal would not be an overdevelopment of the site,

would not have a detrimental or adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality or be out of character in the immediate area.

(i) Impact on Neighbouring Properties

- 7.4 The hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer could be constructed under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the GPDO – so main impact to be considered is that of the front dormers.

The front dormers would face Deverell Place and there would be a gap of 20m and an intervening road between the application property and No. 16 Deverell Place. This relationship is considered acceptable.

As set out in part 6 the rear dormer windows would face down the garden of the application site and to allotments beyond. Views to No. 32 and 36 would be at an angle and are considered acceptable and similar to those presented by other dormers in Deverell Place to their adjacent properties.

Concerns have been raised in relation to the impact of overshadowing/ loss of light to the solar panels of the adjoining occupiers at No. 32 in the afternoon. The dormer closest to this roof line is set away by approximately 1.7m and in considering the submitted overshadowing report, the site visit photos and the suns orientation to the property it is considered that the overshadowing/ loss of light to the solar panels at the adjoining property at No.32 would not be significantly detrimental to their purpose or sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission..

Overall it is considered that proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to unacceptable additional overlooking and would not have a harmful effect on the properties adjoining or within the immediate area to the application site meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(i) Parking

- 7.5 The Havant Borough Parking SPD, which supplements Policy DM13, explains that dwellings with 4-bedrooms or more should have, at least, 3no. onsite vehicular parking spaces. The existing detached garage measures 3m by 6.5m and, therefore, meets the Parking SPD's standards for the garage to constitute as a vehicular parking space. In addition, the existing driveway is 22m long and has a width of approximately 2.45m. As the Parking SPD explains that all outdoor vehicular parking spaces should measure 2.4m by 4.8m, it is considered that there is sufficient tandem parking provision onsite to accommodate the increase in the number of bedrooms.

Additional Information

- 7.6 The Agent/Applicant were requested to provide further information as to the effects of the proposal on the solar pannels to the adjacent property at no. 32. The additional information submitted included a Shadowing report, 3D drawings and information explaining the effects of the proposed dormers and loss of sunlight on the solar panels. On the 15/02/23 adjoining occupiers were re-notified of the additional information that was provided and invited to make any additional comments. Please see section 6 additional comments 2.

8) Conclusion

- 8.1 The adjoining occupier at no.32 has objected in part to the loss of sunlight to the solar panels and has highlighted that they feel that if any one of the panels are affected this would lead to all the panels not working. However, the report and information from the BRE show that the maximum loss of sunlight to any one panel is not considered to affect the other panels due to the percentage of possible loss. (see 8.2)
- 8.2 The application has been supported with an overshadowing report document which has referenced The Building Research Establishment Report "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight - A guide to good practice", 2022, 3rd edition (BRE 209 2022). The overshadowing report explains in more details the effects of the roof extension to the existing solar panels at no. 32 further to this additional information has been provided by the agent/applicant to explain the BRE report it states "The BRE suggest that the degree of change in sunlight availability (overshadowing) to determine if any reduction will be noticeable. Each individual section of the solar panel has been assessed, reference W1, W2...etc., as the change to any one panel may affect the performance of the overall system.

The sunlight availability test is undertaken both pre 'existing' and post 'proposed' development i.e. before and after the installation of the dormers to the roof.

For example, Panel W1 will receive 97.00 '*existing*' and 96.00 '*proposed*' Annual Probable Sunlight Hours, therefore the absolute sunlight available has reduced by 1.00. However, as we need to consider the reduction, the 'Existing' figure is divided by the 'Proposed' to determine the percentage change (Pr/Ex). In this example, the proposed is 0.989 (rounded to 0.99). This is undertaken both annually and in during the winter months in isolation, when sunlight is less available.

The BRE suggests that if existing sunlight availability is reduced by more than 10% i.e. below 0.90, the reduction maybe noticeable and further testing is required. If 0.90 or above is retained, the reduction will not be noticeable, no further testing required and should be considered acceptable.

By reference to both the Annual *Pr/Ex* and Winter *Pr/Ex* columns, all remain 0.94 and above. Therefore, no noticeable change will occur and therefore should

be considered acceptable”.

- 8.3 Given the additional information provided it is felt that the scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and on the character of the area and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9) Recommendations

- 9.1 That the head of Planning be authorised to GRANT PERMISSION for application APP/22/0761 subject to the following conditions:

Appendices

- A – Location Plan
- B – Proposed Site Plan
- C – Proposed Elevations
- D – Proposed Floor Plans
- E1 – Overshadowing Details
- E2 – Overshadowing Report
- F – Solar Panel Information

- 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:

5805-4 Rev B
5804-5 Rev A
5805-500 Rev A

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension / building hereby permitted the windows in the west side elevation facing the adjoining occupier at no. 36 shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening and 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.

- 4 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.

Appendices:...