
Site Address:	32 Andrew Crescent, Waterloooville, PO7 6BE		
Proposal:	Enlargement of first floor rear extension and construction of front dormer.		
Application No:	APP/19/00084	Expiry Date:	20/03/2019
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Holding	Case Officer:	Rachel Ballam
Agent:			
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application property is a semi-detached chalet bungalow situated to the east of Andrew Crescent in Waterloooville. The application site is surrounded by residential development which is predominantly characterised by detached and semi-detached bungalows with simple forms and traditional finishes.
- 1.2 The existing property is clad in white painted render with areas of hanging tiles, with profiled concrete roof tiles and dark grey uPVC fenestration. The rear curtilage is surrounded by a timber fence and contains a detached single garage building with flat roof and pebble dash render.

2 Planning History

05/71137/000 - Single storey rear extension., PERM,02/03/2006
06/71137/001 - Single storey rear extension - relief of condition 3 of Planning Permission 05/71137/000., PERM,16/08/2006

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application proposes a replacement roof to the existing first floor rear extension and the construction of a flat-roof dormer to the front pitch of the main roof.
- 3.2 The rear hip of the extension roof would be elevated to provide a rear gable and the height of the roof would be increased. Two roof lights would be inserted into the new roof, one in each pitch, and a rear-facing first floor window would be inserted in the gable end. The footprint and ground floor fenestration of the extension would remain unchanged.
- 3.3 The existing hipped roof of the rear extension currently achieves a maximum ridge height of 4.3m above ground level, sitting 0.7 lower than that of the main roof, and an eaves height of 2.2 above ground level to match the main house. The eaves of the proposed pitched roof would measure 2.6m above ground level, 0.4 higher than those of the main property, whilst the proposed ridge would be level with that of the existing main house (5.5m above ground level).
- 3.4 The proposed front dormer would measure 3m in width by 2m in height and achieve a depth of 2.5m as measured at eaves level.

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**

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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
The grounds for my objection are that it will affect both my light and privacy. A similar proposal was rejected in 2005 on the same grounds and that it was too big & bulky however this new proposal is even more extreme than the first. The new proposal shows a gable end with a window that will look directly into my garden and as with the 2005 proposal is too obtrusive. With regards to the front dormer I would like to see at least a 2 tiles space from the boundary (approx. 600-700mm) as I feel leaving this gap would leave a clear indication to his property and mine.	See section 7 of officer 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

(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 As originally proposed the replacement roof to the rear extension was considered to result in an overly dominant structure with elevated eaves that would appear overlarge and disproportionate relative to the main property. Following negotiations with the agent the bulk and scale of the roof was reduced by way of lowering the eaves height by 0.4m. On balance the reduction results in a proposal that would be proportionate to the main house and in-keeping in scale relative to the curtilage and neighbouring properties. The proposed form, style and materials would be in-keeping with those of the existing property and surrounding development. The extension is situated to the rear of the bungalow where it is obscured from public view by the bulk of the existing property; as such the proposal would not have a significant impact upon the character of the street scene.

7.4 The proposed dormer would appear subservient to the main roof slope and would be constructed of materials to match those of the existing bungalow. The dormer would not appear out-of-keeping within the street scene, with several similar examples of front dormers already visible within the immediate locality. The dormer would not impact negatively upon the appearance or character of the application property or its setting.

7.5 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

7.6 Concern has been raised in respect of the proposed extension with regard to its bulk and scale and the impact this would have upon neighbour amenity. Reference is made within the objection comment to an earlier application in 2005 which was amended following advice to the applicant that the large scale of the extension was inappropriate. Upon reviewing the details of this earlier application (05/71137/000) it appears that the Case Officer's concerns related to the depth of the extension rather than the height or mass of the roof. By contrast, the current proposal maintains the existing footprint of the approved extension; the current proposal would not, therefore, result in any protrusion of the extension to within 45 degrees as measured from the centre of the ground floor rear windows of the attached neighbouring property. The

proposed roof extension would represent a significant increase in the bulk and mass of the rear projection, but owing to its position relative to surrounding development would not be considered to represent a significant negative impact upon outlook or light for neighbouring properties.

- 7.7 Concern has been raised in respect of the proposed first floor rear window with regard to the impact this could have upon the privacy of neighbouring residents. However, it must be acknowledged that rear windows could be installed under permitted development rights without need for the owner of the application property to secure planning permission and that the properties are situated within a built up urban area where some degree of overlooking from rear facing windows is expected from surrounding residential dwellings. It is noted that following amendments to reduce the bulk of the roof the window in question has also been reduced in scale.
- 7.8 Following concerns raised in respect of the proximity of the front dormer to the neighbouring roof space the proposal has been amended so as to reduce the width of the dormer away from the attached neighbouring house. The proposed dormer, as amended, would not have a significant negative impact upon the outlook or light of surrounding developments and would be situated at a great enough distance from the facing properties so as not to impact negatively upon privacy.
- 7.9 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). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

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/19/00084

(A)

(B) for the following reasons/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
5161/3 Rev C - Proposed First Floor Plan
5161/5 Rev D - Proposed Elevations

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, 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.

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the first floor windows in the north-east and south-west facing roof pitches of the extension shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights 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.