

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None received

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: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Comment: I also object to this planning application - our property was rejected to be converted from a 2 bed bungalow to having a 2nd storey with dormers - the same reasons ours were rejected is exactly the reasons I object to this - a juliet balcony - this was rejected as it stopped neighbours privacy. Dormers - these were also rejected as they too stop neighbours privacy, the distance between the properties either side is small like ours and so the same principles for rejection should be upheld. I also believe this is a property developer who just wants to do the property up and sell on - this is not what this road is about, people buy the houses to live in them. Lastly I think it will spoil the look of the properties - all the bungalows along Berkeley Square are single storey and do not have dormers approved - we should keep with the same standards and principles for all bungalows in this Square.	Concerns regarding the juliet balcony are addressed in the planning considerations section of this report. In regards to dormers- these were approved in a previous application. Additionally dormers of a certain size, meeting various conditions may be approved under permitted development and therefore would not require planning approval. The second storey element would be located to the rear of the property so it is considered impact on the streetscene and character on the area would be minimal in this regard. See Section 7 below.
I originally voiced no opposition to the original plans as we understood that they would fall within the realms of 'permitted development' and although	It is considered the proposed second storey element remains relatively modest in scale. The remaining comments are addressed in the 'planning considerations'

the proposed dormers would impact our privacy and enjoyment of the garden space, they were at least somewhat set back from the rear of the property.

The newly revised plans are of an unacceptably overbearing and obtrusive design that does not respect mine or the wider neighbourhood's right to privacy. As was mentioned in the officer's report in the previous application, the area solely consists of bungalows with a few dormer bungalows. The new plans however are not in-keeping with the character of the area as they are essentially creating a very large 5 bedroom house, which represents an unprecedented overdevelopment of the area.

The previous plans were for a standard loft conversion, however, the newly revised plans create a full second story wing to the property with the proposed Juliet balcony being many meters further to the rear than the approved dormer windows of the main roof.

There are no other properties in the immediate neighbourhood with such a design. Not only will this impact on the right to privacy of a number of neighbouring properties, including mine, it will seriously impact other neighbours as the proposed two-story elevations are located close to the boundary. It will block out much of the afternoon sun and therefore create a number of serious associated problems, such as uncontrollable damp and moss. Furthermore, the considerable increase in shade will reduce the solar gains of the adjacent property, increasing the need and use of carbon based heating.

The plans that have been proposed are from a property developer naturally looking to maximise their profit margin by creating an additional bedroom with en-suite on top of the two already approved, with little or no consideration to what the impact will be to the neighbourhood and therefore I strongly oppose this application.

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) 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 of a two storey rear extension alongside a hip to gable roof extension , front and rear dormers and fenestration alterations. It is noted that a previous application has granted permission for front and rear dormers to the application property. The rear extension has a total ridge height of approximately 6 metres to ridge height which would come to approximately the same height as the existing ridge line. The rear extension would include a juliet balcony at first floor level. There are also two roof lights proposed either side of the ridge of the rear extension.

The general character of the immediate area of Berkeley Square include fairly low level chalet bungalows with both hipped and gabled roof design. Some properties have made alterations to the roof slope in the form of dormers and window additions. Further up the road are some two storey properties. It is noted that part of this proposal includes the addition of a two storey element , however this would be located to the rear of the property and would not be visible above the existing ridge line. For this reason it is considered that this would not result in any adverse impact to the character of the area. Additionally, due to the existing variation in roof styles which exist in the immediate locale, the proposed hip to gable roof extension is also not considered to be harmful to the streetscene.

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). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.4 To the East of the application site lies No. 52 Berkeley Square which is a bungalow of similar design to the application site. The proposed rear extension works would be situated closest to the boundary shared with No. 52. The ridge height of the existing rear extension amounts to approximately 4.5 metres. Therefore the proposed rear extension would result in an increase in height of approximately 1.5 metres. The extension site would be separated from the boundary by approximately 3 metres where there is currently a single storey side extension which comes up to the boundary shared with No. 52. Although the extension would result in an increase in height towards the rear, this increase remains reasonably modest, which would not be significantly harmful to amenity.

There are roof lights serving the rear rooms at ground floor level at No. 52. These roof lights are an important source of light for these rooms, although there are large double doors to the rear which also provide light into this space. The proposed rear extension at No. 50 would be adequately set off from the boundary and with the fairly modest increase in height of the extension would not be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of No. 52, by reason of loss of light.

A Juliet balcony is proposed to serve the bedroom in the rear extension, which would have an outlook down the garden of No. 50, with oblique views over the amenity space of both neighbouring properties, which in a residential estate is often found. Such overlooking and any impact of this would not be substantial enough to warrant a refusal.

To the West of the application site lies No. 48 Berkeley Square. Although the roof slope will be altered to form a gable end at the Western elevation, this is not deemed to have any significant impact upon this adjacent property. The dormer windows to the rear have already been approved as part of a previous application where they were not found to have any harmful impact on the amenity of this property, or No. 52. There has been no change to policy since the grant of this permission, that would lead to a different decision.

- 7.5 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking 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).

(iv) CIL

The additional floor space would not exceed 100 square metres and therefore would not be CIL liable.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00016 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:

Block plan received 09.01.2020

Location plan received 09.01.2020

Proposed elevations received 09.01.2020

Proposed first floor received 09.01.2020

Proposed ground floor received 09.01.2020

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.