
Site Address:	40 Glenleigh Park, Havant, PO9 2PH		
Proposal:	Single storey rear and front extensions, loft conversion, hip to gable roof, side dormer, rooflights and dormer windows; porch canopy and cladding to dormers and rear elevation.		
Application No:	APP/18/01043	Expiry Date:	26/12/2018
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Knight	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
Agent:			
Ward:	St Faiths		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site relates to a detached bungalow constructed with red brick plinth and cream painted render above, beneath a hipped dark tiled roof that features a half hip above the lower front forward projection and bay. All the properties in Glenleigh Park are similar style bungalows with original materials and roof tiles creating a strong visual uniformity and character to the road. The application site, No 40, is set at the head of what was originally the cul-de-sac (now a link road through to Hallett Road and the Manor Farm development to the north). It is therefore in a fairly prominent position within the street scene but the character of the road then changes with the new development to the north.

Number 38 to the south is within a corner plot such that it is set at an angle to the application site and both plots have narrow road frontages but taper out. The application site has a side drive serving a small flat roofed garage set back within the site and up to the shared boundary with No 38. Number 42 to the north has a higher ridge with half hip gable ends such that there is one and half storey side gable with first floor bedroom window close to the shared boundary. The northern side boundary is currently overgrown with shrubs. To the rear are open fields and the rear boundary is low fencing enabling views across. The application bungalow has an existing white UPVC conservatory across part of the rear elevation.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Single storey rear and front extensions, loft conversion, hip to gable roof, side dormer, rooflights and dormer windows; porch canopy and cladding to dormers and rear elevation.

During the course of determining this application amended plans and details have been received that introduced a barn hip to the front gable; lowered the dormers and added a slope to their roof; lowered the ridge line of the rear extension and agreed to retain the existing roof tiles rather than slate as originally proposed.

Materials have also been confirmed as: roof tiles will re-use the existing to match; the ground floor elevations will be render to match except the rear elevation and dormer

which will be clad in a heritage duck-egg green cement boarding.

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)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS19 (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
DM10 (Pollution)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Southern Water

Development is close to public foul sewer that crosses the site and building over not normally permitted. However under certain circumstances may be allowed. Formal application to build close will be required;

Should any sewer be found during construction works then an investigation of the sewer will be required;

In order to protect drainage apparatus request that if consent granted a condition attached to protect the public sewer; and Informative re connection

Disposal of surface water needs to comply with Part H3 of the Building Regulations.

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
I am of the view that the proposed	

development will have a serious impact on my standard of living. My specific objections are as follows:

1. Loss of privacy and Overlooking
Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy, Policy CS16 High Quality Design, 1 e): The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

see section 7

The proposed plans, as at 15 November 2018, show five windows for proposed new rooms in the new roof area on the south side elevation.

see section 7

These rooms and windows will overlook my property, specifically:
master bedroom
second bedroom
third bedroom
sitting room
garden

This will result in a serious invasion and consequent loss of my privacy and one which I must object to in the strongest possible terms.

2. Overshadowing

The plans, as at 15 November 2018, show a significant increase in the footprint of the roof area compared to the existing one. This will increase the overshadowing to the surrounding properties resulting in a loss of light and, again, privacy.

see section 7

The loss of light will impact the following areas of my property:
master bedroom
second bedroom
third bedroom
sitting room
garden

3. Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood

The area is characterised by single storey dwellings. The plans as at 15 November 2018 go against the character and nature of the dwellings by creating a second storey that is out of keeping with the majority of the

see section 7 - no increase in height of ridge

road, especially the surrounding properties.

The proposed development is out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity

4. Effect on public services

As noted in the Consultee Response - Southern Water:

"It appears that the developer is intending to build close to a public foul sewer which is crossing the site. Building over a "public sewer" is not normally permitted by Southern Water...

Furthermore, due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site."

I believe this will cause a significant disruption for the adjoining dwellings with additional public works required to ascertain the required information as well as a potential temporary loss of services. The possible inclusion of Bonded Asbestos Cement in the public sewer will add further complication and a possible increase in the amount and scale of disruption.

5. Site access

The proposed site of development is small and contained, with little road frontage and shared driveway access. There are no details in any of the application documents with regard to the consideration about how and where construction vehicles and staff would gain access to the site for unloading and parking without causing a highway

SW seek protection of the public sewer during construction - this can be adequately conditioned and ultimately a SW matter under their own legislation. Any possible asbestos would need to be dealt with in accordance with appropriate legislation

Environmental Health matters and Informative's can be added advising of acceptable hours etc

hazard or inconveniencing neighbours. Should the application be approved, I would like the council to consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable.	
Whilst support desire to maximise the potential of the property the development would give rise to unacceptable impact on our amenities. Principal concern the design, scale and bulk which would cause overbearing impact and design not in character with local vernacular. Consider proposal contrary to policy CS16 and Design Guide SPD, esp 1.e). Height and extent of extension and northern dormer will reduce available light to patio and garden and due to offset siting result in a structure almost entire length of garden; interrupting outlook, compounding feeling of enclosure and overbearing effect. Contend contrary to para 5.41 of Design Guide SPD as not subservient - new rear elevation dimensions only marginally less than original building and height and glazing will dominate rear facade and be large overbearing mass; shallower roof pitch not sympathetic to original building; plans show cladding but render specified in forms; rear garden already limited and would be significantly less than the 8m set out in Design Guide. Contrary to para 5.42 of Design Guide SPD as in excess of 4m from existing house. Contrary to Policy CS16 1. c) Glenleigh Park has consistent vernacular with hipped roofline, proposed development change appearance and style with 2 large gable ends and dormers; proposed slate and dormer finish out of keeping with traditional roof finish; Northern dormer and forward extension of roof line would change appearance of property; dormer will present as blank elevation in excess of height and width of our bedroom window and	see section 7 see section 7 Rear extension is much lower than main dwelling and set marginally in from side elevations - as such it is considered a subservient addition cladding is proposed Design Guide dimensions been superseded by GDPO which allows for greater extensions under permitted development

within 1m; plans inaccurate as side wall is less than 1m from boundary. Side dormers add a second storey to a bungalow contrary to 5.42 of SPD which states 2 storey extensions should be no closer than 2m; No other side dormers in Glenleigh Park and would be out of character; Proposed front facade incompatible with character of forward projection with lower ridge line and hipped roof; forward projection with raised roof and dormer is significant extension ; token hip is inconsistent, haphazard and ad hoc appearance; plan inaccurate and shows front elevation level; fenestration haphazard and lack of windows in dormers gives boxy oppressive form; light emissions from glass at rear;	Dormers not equivalent to a 2 storey extension Plans are accurate as take into account the eaves overhang of No 42.
--	---

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

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, with the eastern rear boundary line being the policy line between the current built up area and non developed land between Havant and Emsworth. 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 Glenleigh Park does have a distinctive character with uniform roof materials, although there are a mix of bungalow styles within the road with numbers 38, 36 and 44 all having half hipped features to their front projections; and numbers 42 and 27 are higher with side half hips. The amended plans and details have confirmed the use of tiles to match which will remain in keeping with the character of the road. They have also incorporated a barn hip to the front elevation. The front corner infill extension proposed results in a full width front projection at the full height of the bungalow. Whilst this is different to others nevertheless the eaves line and ridge height all match and the barn hip does repeat a feature of the neighbouring properties.

7.4 Objection has been received to the fact that there are no other side dormers and their introduction would be out of character with the street scene. Whilst this may currently be the case, regard must be had to the fact that the insertion of side dormers can be undertaken under permitted development rights (within certain criteria). Accordingly

there is no objection to the principle of the side dormers and the visual impact that has on the character of the road.

- 7.5 The proposed gable to the rear would not be visible from the street scene and hence there cannot be any objection to this profile in terms of impact on character of area. Materials at the front would utilise render to match and the dormers would be clad in heritage duck-egg green cement boarding. Whilst this is a new material it is considered visually acceptable for use on the dormers which are set back from the front facade by some 3m and would not be considered overly intrusive or dominant. Overall the amended design and materials is now considered to adequately reflect the design of the streetscene to be acceptable and not result in any significant harm to the visual amenity of the character of the road. Policy CS16 requires designs to respect the local context and it is considered that the amended plans comply with this policy.
- 7.6 It has further been noted that the proposed development would further limit the available rear garden depth. Whilst the depth would be reduced to between 5.4m and 4.3m nevertheless the plot width is some 15m and existing old outbuildings are shown as to be demolished, opening up and maximising the available garden area. The private curtilage is considered sufficient for the dwelling and also benefits from an open aspect over adjacent farmland. As such the proposal is not considered an overdevelopment of the plot. Overall the design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and street scene 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

- 7.7 No 38 to the south is set at an angle such that there is a tapered separation between the application dwelling and this bungalow. There are 4 rooflights proposed in the southern roofslope, of which the eastern most one is set above the ceiling height and provides light only to the kitchen below; the 2 at the western end are set at 1.5m above floor level and serve a bedroom. The large central rooflight was originally proposed as a Cabrio style velux which could open up as balcony. Concern about overlooking and impacting neighbouring amenity led to this being amended to a tandem velux with the lower portion obscured. This can be conditioned. The top pane would be clear glass and openable, but with a separation of 4m to the side boundary and 10m to the side of No 38, whilst there would be some perception of being overlooked from the addition of this large velux the actual harm to private amenity is unlikely to be significant.
- 7.8 With respect to the rear extension, this has a depth of 4m and has now been reduced and stepped down in height to have a ridge height of 4.2m and eaves line matching the bungalow at 2.5m high. The depth is within permitted development criteria but the height is 0.2m above permitted development meaning this rear extension does need planning permission. It replaces an existing conservatory that is 2.5m in deep. Whilst the flank wall of the dwelling is increased by 4m in close proximity to the shared boundary with No 42, that will have some overshadowing impact, nevertheless the bulk of this extension could be constructed under permitted development. The roof is hipped away from the shared boundary and at only 0.2m above permitted development allowances, it is considered that it would be hard to justify a reason for refusal based on any additional material harm to the occupiers of No 42.
- 7.9 There is also objection to the proposed dormer on the north roofslope which would be

directly opposite the bedroom window of No 42 which only has a separation of about 2m. Combined with the hip to gable roof alteration elongating the ridge line, this would have some effect on the outlook from and light available to this room. However it is noted that this room has a dual aspect with second window in the front. Furthermore it is noted that a dormer could be inserted into this northern roofslope under permitted development that would have a similar impact. The proposed duck-egg cladding would be a pale colour and help to reflect light back into this bedroom. Again it is therefore considered that a reason for refusal based on harm caused by this dormer would be hard to substantiate.

- 7.10 Overall it is considered that the more contentious elements of the proposal are so close to permitted development allowances that this must be considered as the fall back position. The differences are marginal 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).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the amended proposal using detailed materials including matching roof tiles, 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/18/01043

(A) 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:

Location Plan, Block Plan, Elevations and Plans Drawing Number KAD 01 A PP Rev A

Email dated 7th December 2018 detailing materials as: roof tiles to re-use the existing to match; ground floor elevations render to match except the rear elevation and dormer which will be clad in heritage duck-egg green cement boarding

Email dated 19th December 2018 changing Cabrio to Tandem velux with lower portion obscure glass

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The central rooflight on the southern roofslope serving Bedroom 1 shall at no time be a Cabrio Style rooflight. It shall be fitted as a tandem velux with only the top light capable of being opened. The lower pane shall be fixed shut and fitted with obscure glass, the particular type of which glass shall provide a degree of obscuration no less obscure than that which is provided by Pilkington's Texture Glass Obscuration Level 4. The window shall be retained as such in perpetuity.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 4 The external materials used shall be as indicated by email dated 7th December 2018 (roof tiles to re-use the existing to match; ground floor elevations render to match except the rear elevation and dormer which will be clad in heritage duck-egg green cement boarding), or 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.
- 5 The hereby approved void shall remain so in perpetuity and the first floorspace shall not be extended over the void.
Reason - To protect the neighbouring amenity from overlooking from the side roof light within this space, and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 6 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the measures which will be undertaken to protect the public sewer crossing the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Southern Water). The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the adequate protection of infrastructure having due regard to Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 policies CS19 and DM10 and the National Planning Policy Framework