

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design

CIL Liable: <http://www.havant.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy-charging-schedule>.

Councillor Gary Robinson

No comment

Councillor Kenneth Smith

No comment

Councillor Mark Inkster

No comment

Developer Services, Southern Water

Please find attached a plan of the sewer records showing the approximate position of a public foul sewer crossing the site. The exact position of the public sewer must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

Please note:

- The 150 mm diameter gravity foul sewers requires a clearance of 3 metres on either side of the gravity sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future access for maintenance.
- No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water.
- No soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 metres of a public sewer.
- All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

Furthermore, 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.

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Please read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which has now been published and is available to read on our website via the following link:

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

The disposal of surface water from this development shall follow the hierarchy within Part H3 of Building Regulations:

- a) An adequate soakaway or some other adequate infiltration system.
- b) A water course.
- c) Where neither of the above is practicable: a sewer.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing,

West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

Website: southernwater.co.uk 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: 7

Comment	Officer Comment
I write to with regard to the above Planning Application. I am the owner of a property in Chestnut Avenue and wish to lodge a refusal to the above application. My objection is on the basis of the development overlooking my property from the proposed first floor rear windows of the extension and the general bulk and mass of the proposal. This will have an overbearing impact on my property as well as being totally out of keeping with the surrounding properties and area. From the first floor windows in the proposal, it will overlook my Lounge and patio, the conservatory with an adjacent bedroom and back garden. The original bungalow consisted of 3 bedrooms with 1 bathroom and a toilet adjoining the kitchen area. The proposed changes will transform the property into a two story house with 5 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms/shower rooms.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report

Overall the development seems to be too big for the property, without overlooking several adjoining bungalows.	
I write following the submission of further details of the above application. The small changes to windows that have been made, will not have any effect on the overlooking issues on my property or the overdevelopment/massing issues in my original submission.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report
I write to you with deepest concerns regarding the proposed planning to 2 Ashwood close. I am a resident of (REDACTED) and would like to request a refusal to this proposal. My reasons are as followed. The side extension would restrict the natural light entering the side door to our property leading to our kitchen. Please see attached photos for your reference. The dormers on the back of the property, because of how the bungalows are positioned, would over look our garden restricting our privacy. In relation to this I look after my 8 grandchildren on a regular basis and the privacy of them is crucial. This is one of the reasons we brought the property. Structurally speaking the proposed planning, if to go ahead, would look completely out of character to the rest of the properties in the area resulting in a lack of interest from potential buyers and potential loss in value. The proposed side extension, if to go ahead would require scaffolding on our side of the border and I fear the health and safety of our grandchildren. I am also sure it would restrict our side access. Please see pictures for your reference. I would like to thank you for your time and the consideration of our thoughts on this over development.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report

We have received the recent plans and upon review we are still unhappy. Our concerns have still not been considered. Regarding the extension to the side of the property, our light will still be restricted and it has come to our attention that the roof on the existing garage is asbestos. If this goes ahead we are fearful for our safety as the garage is on our boundary line. As for the two proposed velux windows even without the dormer, will still look directly into our garden resulting in a complete invasion of our privacy.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report
I object as the proposed dwelling is too big making it out of character with the remaining 3 bungalows in the Close. Standing on a rise it will be too dominant for the surrounding properties, thereby destroying the nature of this small Close. I would also point out that the Close itself is not a wide road. A property of this size will inevitably have more vehicles with no access to road parking and limited turning capacity. The Council itself understandably is against parking on the verges	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report Please see 'Parking' section of the report
Adding to previous comments the dormers of this proposed extension would seriously infringe the privacy of my rear garden.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report
We have received the recent plans and upon review we are still unhappy. Our concerns have still not been considered. Regarding the extension to the side of the property, our light will still be restricted and it has come to our attention that the roof on the existing garage is asbestos. If this goes ahead we are fearful for our safety as the garage is on our boundary line. As for the two proposed velux windows even without the dormer, will still look directly into our garden resulting in a complete invasion of our privacy.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report

In the attached image you can clearly see the existing garage and how close it is to our home.	
My objection is on the basis of the development overlooking my property from the proposed first floor rear windows of the extension and the general bulk and mass of the proposal. This will have an overbearing impact on my property as well as being totally out of keeping with the surrounding properties and area. From the first floor windows in the proposal, it will overlook my Lounge and patio, the conservatory with an adjacent bedroom and back garden. The original bungalow consisted of 3 bedrooms with 1 bathroom and a toilet adjoining the kitchen area. The proposed changes will transform the property into a two story house with 5 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms/shower rooms. Overall the development seems to be too big for the property, without overlooking several adjoining bungalows. I write following the submission of further details of the above application. The small changes to windows that have been made, will not have any effect on the overlooking issues on my property or the overdevelopment/massing issues in my original submission.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report
We strongly do not agree with transforming a bungalow into a house. This proposal would overlook our property, taking away our privacy. Also would there be sufficient off road parking to accomodate a 5 bedroom house. Previous applications for houses were refused as being bungalows only.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report

If you agreed to this application you would be going against the will of your forefathers. We are asking for a refusal of the above application as a very concerned neighbour.	
I think this proposal will be an over build and will look out of character to the existing properties	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report

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) CIL

(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 comprises a first floor side extension above the existing garage as well as a two storey rear extension and loft conversion incorporating dormers to the front and side elevations. The first floor side extension would have a barn hip roof , following the existing ridge height set by the main roof and would also follow the existing width of the garage and depth of the main property. The two storey rear extension would have a ridge height of approximately 6.5 metres , forming a projecting gable end to the rear with a barn hip - it would have a depth of approximately 4.6 metres and a width of 9.6 metres. The rear extension would be set in from the side boundary to the east by 3 metres and 2 metres from the west side boundary. Materials proposed include brick and render.

7.4 Other elements of the proposal include two pitched roof dormers to the front roof slope which would serve bedroom 2 - these would be casement style windows with widths of approximately 1.6 metres and height of 2.5 metres and would be located centrally in the roof slope. A dormer of similar style and proportion is also proposed to the side elevation (facing west) sited on the rear extension which would serve bedroom 1 towards the rear. An additional window is also proposed to the side elevation (west) which would serve a landing. There would also be a window at second floor level on the rear elevation facing south serving Bedroom 1 and a dressing area as well as two velux roof lights on the side (east) elevation serving bedroom 3. The current proposal is an amended proposal following concerns initially raised by the case officer including impact on neighbour amenity and on the character of the area - changes made include the reduction of the ridge height of the proposed rear extension- initially this was raised above the ridge of the existing roof slope .

The dormer to the east elevation has been removed due to concerns of overlooking and replaced by two velux rooflights and the rooflight previously proposed to the front roof slope has been removed.

- 7.5 Ashwood Close comprises predominantly bungalows and bungalows with rooms in the roof space which are set back from the road up on a rise as the land slopes upwards towards from north to south. These properties all follow a similar design, a design that is also consistent along Chestnut Avenue sited to the north and properties of which back on to Ashwood Close.
- 7.6 Policy CS16 of the HBC Local Plan requires that characteristics of the locality are used to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors.
- 7.7 The Havant Borough Design Guide states that extensions should look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details. Rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building.
- 7.8 The Havant Borough Design Guide states that 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. The dormers proposed to the roof are not judged to result in an unacceptable impact upon the character of the streetscene as there are other examples of similarly modestly sized dormers in the immediate area. The materials proposed would include brick and render to match existing and this is judged to be acceptable and in keeping with the main property.
- 7.9 The proposed rear extension is judged to appear contrary to the guidance set out in the Havant Borough Design Guide and policy CS16 which references that developments should look to the host dwelling to allow for a subservient addition to the dwelling. The rear extension would have a reasonable depth when judged within the context of the plot size and the two storey height would result in substantial massing to the currently modestly sized single storey bungalow which is a form of development consistently reflected in the immediate area. The footprint of the rear extension , although only adding an additional 33 square metres of floorspace, would increase bulk by virtue of the two storey height , coupled alongside the first floor side extension proposed which further adds to the massing of the proposal. This is judged to be unsympathetic when considered within the context of the bungalow and is judged to harm the character of the host property . This would be intensified due to the siting of the property on a rise, this increase in land height means that the two storey element would appear overly prominent .

7.10 It is noted that the rear extension would not be visible from the road and therefore would have a limited impact on the streetscene, however it is also noted that the development would be highly visible from the properties to the south as well as to the east and west and therefore would result in some harmful outlook. The proposed first floor side extension would be visible from the public realm and this would come right up to the side boundary to the east - generally the gaps between buildings have been retained in the form of the space above the side garages and by extending the property into this space, the pattern of development would be disrupted. This would remain contrary to the Havant Borough Design Guide which recommends a minimum of 2 metres should be retained between extensions and side boundaries with neighbouring properties.

7.11 For the reasons outlined above this proposal is not considered to be a subservient addition to the host dwelling, it would result in unacceptable mass and bulk which would be out of character with the original dwelling and therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would result in an inappropriate development when judged within the context of the host property and surrounding area, having an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.12 Policy CS16 states that all development should demonstrate that its design does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

7.13 To the east of the application site is no 1 Ashwood Close which is stepped slightly forward from no 2. The single storey garage at no 2 is located on the boundary alongside the rear garden of no 1. The development proposed closest to no 1 comprises the first floor side extension proposed above the existing garage, this would bring the building line to two storey level alongside the side boundary, with an increase of approximately 2.7 metres in wall height, with roof barn hipped away, following the existing depth of the garage. There are two windows on the rear elevation of no 1 which serve a kitchen, both windows are set in slightly. The first floor side and rear extensions are judged to have some impact upon notably late afternoon sunlight from the west received by these windows as well as to the private amenity space which is located immediately adjacent to the extension site. Due to the stepped back relationship between the properties, the proposal would mean a total of approximately 12 metres of two storey level wall along the boundary, although towards the rear this would be set in by 3 metres off the boundary. This is judged to be an overbearing and unneighbourly development located in very close proximity to the neighbouring property and therefore impacting the rear amenity space.

7.14 The dormer window previously proposed to this elevation has subsequently been removed and replaced with two velux rooflights. This is judged to mitigate against the previous overlooking issue- the rooflights appear to be set 1.7 metres above floor level although no section drawings have been provided.

- 7.15 To the west of the application site is no 3 Ashwood Close. This property is stepped back behind no 2 and therefore in general impact is judged to be lessened. There is a single storey garage separating the properties on the side of no 3 and following that, a blank gable wall forming the side elevation of the property at two storey level. Towards the rear is a small conservatory. Although the rear extension would extend back alongside no 3, there are no windows to be impacted. The dormer proposed is judged to have a limited impact as it would have outlooks over the roof slope. The window proposed at first floor level on the west elevation is judged to overlook the windows towards the front of no 3, including the dormer window at first floor level. Although this is the case, this window would serve a hallway and therefore could be conditioned to be obscure glazed.
- 7.16 Immediately towards the rear of the site is no 29 Chestnut Avenue and properties either side. The rear gardens of both properties back on to one another. A first floor window is proposed to the rear elevation serving a dressing area/ bedroom 1 and in addition the building line would be brought closer back towards the rear boundary - 14 metres of rear garden space would be retained, creating a total of 25 metres back to back distance between the properties. This meets the 20 metres back to back distance guidance as specified in the Havant Borough Design Guide. It is judged that, on balance the rear window would not result in any significant harmful overlooking towards these properties.
- 7.17 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will appear overbearing, having an unneighbourly and unacceptable impact on the amenity of no 1 Ashwood Close contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.18 Bedroom number would be increasing from 3 to 4 bedrooms. as a result of this proposal. The Havant Parking SPD states that a 4 bedroom property should have 3 allocated parking spaces on site - this is judged to be accommodated on the hard standing towards the front of the property.

(v) CIL

- 7.19 The proposed extensions total above 100 square metres, therefore this is CIL liable.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the proposed two storey and first floor extensions would result in unacceptable mass and bulk which would be out of character with the existing dwelling, having an overbearing and unneighbourly impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property by way of loss of light and outlook. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00586 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposal would result in development at a 2-storey height across virtually the whole width of the plot, coupled with a substantial addition to the rear elevation of the dwelling. Taken together the development would not be subservient to the host dwelling and would result in a loss of space about the building to the detriment of the visual amenities and spatial characteristics of the streetscene and surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of its mass and bulk and proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring residential property at No.1 Ashwood Close, would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of that property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.