

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

Proposed refurbishment (including extensions and alterations) to No 10; proposed complete re-building of No. 8 (including extensions and alterations); revised

application to include dormer to No. 10; enlargement of ground floor rear extensions to both properties; and increase in width of No.8.

The works approved under APP/18/0001 were previously described as: It is proposed to demolish the end dwelling (No 8) and re-build it of near identical proportions and design to the front, but with a large two storey and single storey contemporary rear extension that crosses both Number 8 and 10. The rear two storey element would create a new gable end across the two dwellings with large glazed element and opening doors. The proposed single storey extension beneath would be flat roofed and staggered in depth, extending beyond the first floor element by 1.8m and 4.2m. Nos 8 would also have a single storey wrap around the rear half of the side elevation. It is also proposed to create a gravel parking space on the frontage of No 10, but No 8 would remain as garden area.

The current proposal seeks to vary the approved scheme and the proposed revisions include:

- 1/ the addition of a large flat roofed dormer that would extend across the whole width of the rear of No 10 to adjoin to the parapet with No 12 - this dormer would be entirely slate clad with a rooflight on the horizontal flat roof;
- 2/ an enlargement of the ground floor extensions - both are increased in length by 0.5m and No 10's is also extended forward such that the side extension that previously had a length of 9m and is now proposed at 14m, and the width of this element is marginally increased taking the extension closer to the shared boundary with No 6;
- 3/ the rebuilding of No 8 is now proposed at an increased width - previously it was 4.3m wide, now 4.5m wide.

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

- | | |
|------|---|
| CS11 | (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough) |
| CS16 | (High Quality Design) |
| CS17 | (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas) |
| CS21 | (Developer Requirements) |
| 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

Arboriculturalist

No objection

Building Control

None received

Southern Water

Exact position of foul sewers must be determined on site before development finalised; construction over or within the stand off distance of public sewers will not be permitted; suitable layout requested or if permitted then Building Regulations should be refused. 150mm sewer needs 3m clearance; no tree planting within 3m; no new soakaway within 5m of a sewer; all infrastructure protected during construction
May be possible to divert sewer at applicants expense; Request condition of measures to protect/divert sewer; Informative requested

Officer comment - see below, applicants intend to divert sewer

Waste Strategy Team

No concerns

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: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
While we generally support the long overdue refurbishment of the properties we must stress that strict conditions should be attached regarding the hours of work and contractors arrangement for parking in what is a narrow road with restricted space. A previous development some years ago next to the one in the application caused considerable annoyance and inconvenience to nearby residents for several months.	Noted - an Environmental Health matter and informative could be added
We note that this revised application does not include the glazing details as per drawing number 009 23/4/18 of the previous application (APP/18/00001) which specified a 1.1 m high fixed glass screen guard over the first floor French doors.	Noted
Due to our comments made on the previous application we would only be happy to support the revised	Noted

application for 8-10 Kings Road (APP/18/00858) if Condition 6 of the previous application is retained whereby "the flat roofed area to the rear of both No 8 and 10 shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area".	
--	--

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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways and parking
- (v) Southern Water
- (vi) CIL and SRMS

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

The pattern and character of the existing terrace is a strong feature in the street scene with an unbroken rhythm. Each property is of identical width (4m) with a single ground and first floor window. The approved scheme allowed a marginal increase in width of the rebuilding of No 8 to allow for modern construction methods/insulation etc. It was considered the additional 0.3m would be indiscernible to the eye and would not unbalance the terrace as a whole. However it is now sought to further increase the width of No 8 to 4.5m. Whilst this is only an additional 200mm over and above the approved scheme, nevertheless it is 0.5m above the remainder of the terrace. Considering each dwelling is so narrow, at just 4m wide, then an additional 0.5m would be significant and would start to be visually obvious. It is considered that this increase would unbalance the otherwise strong visual cohesion of the terrace, to the detriment of the character and visual appearance of the street scene, contrary to Policy CS16.

To the rear, it was acknowledged that the approved scheme did compromise the pattern of gable end projections with a re-arrangement of the shared gable ends resulting in the two storey projection of No 12 becoming truncated with a parapet wall. When determining APP/18/0001 it was a balanced decision as to whether the less integrated rear roof design was an acceptable change to the terrace as a whole and on balance it was determined that the harm caused was not so significant on the character of the area to be materially harmful and to justify a refusal of planning permission.

However the approved scheme retained the basic pitched roof profile of the main rear roof slope. The current proposal adds a large box dormer that would link from the new gable projection, across the whole width of No 10's roof to abut the parapet with No 12. This would erode the natural recesses of the roof and effectively result in a flat

roofed boxy addition across the rear. This would be visually incongruous and a bulky addition that would not blend well with the host terrace nor the approved contemporary architecture. It is considered a poor design solution that does not meet the adopted Borough Design Guide SPD, 2011 in respect to dormers at Chapter 5 and is contrary to policy CS16. Whilst this rear addition cannot be readily viewed from any public viewpoint, this is not considered a reason to allow a poor design solution which can nevertheless be readily viewed from nearby residential properties.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The approved single storey rear projections do not meet the 45 degree guidance within the Borough Design Guide SPD. When determining APP/18/0001 it was noted that the single storey rear projections were only flat roofed with parapet height of 3m. Since under permitted development and with prior notification, a rear extension could be up to 6m deep, then the impact of the proposed single storey elements would be similar with no identified harm to neighbours in terms of outlook, overbearing or overshadowing. The now proposed additional 0.5m would still be considered the same way and it is not anticipated that the additional length would have any material harm to neighbouring amenity.

With respect to the increase from 9m to 14m in the length of the side extension to No 8, this would be close to the shared boundary with No 6 which is a chalet style bungalow and has a detached garage and lean-to style greenhouse against the shared boundary with high shrubs providing some screening. The additional length is primarily the forward section which would largely align with the adjacent garage. It is unlikely that this additional length would result in any material harm to the amenity of the neighbours. Consequently, this element of the current proposal is considered unlikely to 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) Highways and parking

The properties are currently 2 bedroom units with no on site parking - reliance is on street parking. Number 8 would remain as a 2 bedroom unit with no change to parking arrangements; No. 10 would now become a 4 bedroom unit (with 2 bedrooms in the roof space) (under APP/18/0001 it became 3 beds) and the plans show the creation of a single frontage parking space. The Parking SPD would normally require 2 on site parking spaces per 3 bed dwelling, but 3 spaces for a 4 bed unit. Previously it was noted that the on site space provided for the additional bedroom meant that the demand for on street parking would not be increased ie the space met that triggered by the proposed development. However as a 4 bedroom unit 3 spaces would be required ie 2 additional spaces. Since only one is provided and there has been no parking survey demonstrating availability of on-street parking, then the development does not meet the Parking SPD and could result in loss of highway amenity to neighbouring residents from additional pressure to park. This would be contrary to policy DM13 and the Parking SPD.

(v) Southern Water

Southern Water have noted that the development would be over a public sewer and this layout cannot be permitted. They have however indicated that instead it may be possible to divert the sewer, and the applicant is aware of this issue and agreed in

principle to the need to divert the sewer in advance of any construction. If permission were to be granted then a condition would need to be imposed to cover this issue.

(vi) CIL and SRMS

CIL forms have been completed which indicate that the additional floorspace would be 36sqm for No 8 and 33.5 sqm for No 10. Since No 8 is a replacement dwelling then it is CIL liable for any net additional floorspace, in this instance the forms state 36sqm. It is however noted that the net gain was also stated at 36sqm in the previous application APP/18/0001 and the current proposal has a marginally larger footprint. The applicants have claimed self build exemption. In view of the recommendation for refusal, the correct internal net gain has not been verified with the agent and the Draft CIL Notice has not been generated and sent; this could all be done at appeal stage if necessary. The additional floorspace for extensions to No 10 falls below the 100sq m threshold and as such there is no CIL liability for No 10.

In terms of Solent Recreational Mitigation Strategy, which would apply to No 8 being a replacement dwelling, it is however noted that No 8 would remain a 2 bed dwelling. Since there would be no additional bedrooms then it does not trigger the need for a SRMS contribution.

8 Conclusion

It is considered that this revised scheme is seeking to maximise the development on the site but this has harmful consequences. The proposed additional width of the rebuild of No 8 is considered to be detrimental to the visual cohesion of the terrace as a whole and the flat roofed rear dormer is considered a bulky poorly designed addition that does not respect the character of the dwelling and is contrary to the Borough Design Guide and Policy CS16. With insufficient parking to serve the resultant 4 bed roomed property created at No 10, the proposal is also contrary to policy DM13 and the Parking SPD. Accordingly the proposal is recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/18/00858 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed additional width in the rebuilding of Number 8 is considered to visually unbalance the otherwise strong visual cohesion of the terrace, to the detriment of the character and visual appearance of the street scene. Furthermore the proposed flat roofed rear dormer is considered to be visually incongruous and a bulky addition that would not blend well with the host dwelling or the terrace. As such the proposed development is considered a poor design solution that would have a harmful effect on the appearance of the building and character of the street scene and would therefore have an adverse effect on the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Borough Design Guide SPD, 2011, policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

- 2 The proposed 4 bedroom dwelling at Number 10 would not be provided with adequate provision of on site car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's adopted standards and would therefore encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway. This could result in additional pressure to park to the detriment of neighbouring residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to the adopted Parking SPD 2016 and policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.