

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

5.1 No consultations were required for this application.

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: 0

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 This retrospective application comprises three distinct elements which include the dormers to the front and rear, the hip to gable enlargement and the cladding to the front and side elevations.

7.4 It must first of all be acknowledged that in respect of the hip to gable enlargement, the applicant could have undertaken these works utilising their permitted development rights. It is by virtue of the cladding proposed which is a contrasting material to the original dwelling as to why this aspect has been incorporated within this application. Whilst it is acknowledged that the alterations to the roof result in the loss of symmetry between the application site and the semi detached property to the west (56 Linda Grove), it is not considered that the principal of this alteration would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

7.5 Cream cladding has been added to the front dormer and first floor of the new gable wall. The previously refused application acknowledged that there are other examples within the streetscene where householders have used alternative materials

to brick. It is also acknowledged that paragraph 60 of the NPPF should not stifle innovation and the Local Planning Authority acknowledge that many householders are now wanting to improve and modernise their homes utilising contrasting materials such as cladding. On this basis, whilst the cladding presents a contrasting material and there are currently no other examples within Linda Grove where properties have utilised cladding of this style, it is acknowledged that the applicant could paint their house cream and given the other examples evident within the streetscene, it is not considered that this element of the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area to such an extent which would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

- 7.6 In respect of the dormers, similarly to the hip to gable enlargement, the rear dormer could also have been constructed without the need for planning permission utilising the property's permitted development rights. Whilst the dormer is considered to be relatively large in terms of its size, scale and design, taking into account that the applicant could construct a dormer of this size and scale without the need for planning permission, it is not considered that this element of the proposal would warrant a refusal of planning permission. Furthermore, this aspect of the development would not be readily visible from the public realm by virtue of its position to the rear of No.56.
- 7.7 The dormer to the front of the property however does require the benefit of planning permission by virtue of its position to the principal elevation, and it was this aspect of the proposal that led to the refusal of the previously submitted application APP/17/00670, as it was considered that the dormer to the principle elevation would result in excessive bulk and mass, which would dominate the original roof slope and as such would form an incongruous feature within the streetscene, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as the visual amenity of the surrounding locality. The development was therefore considered to be non-compliant to policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and Havant Borough Councils Design Guidance. Subsequently the front dormer has been reduced in size and it is now considered to be proportionate to the size of the host dwelling, and will not result in a significant impact to the character of the locality.
- 7.8 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

- 7.9 It is acknowledged when considering the impact on neighbour amenity, that the hip to gable enlargement and dormer to the rear could have been constructed under Permitted Development and on this basis the applicant could proceed to make these alterations to the property subject to the materials being similar in terms of their appearance regardless of the outcome of this application. The submitted plan shows that the window to the new gable wall is to be non-opening and glazed in opaque glass. It was noted on the site visit that a clear glazed opening unit has been inserted, however the window only overlooks an obscure glazed window and door on the eastern elevation of No. 55 Linda Grove. This neighbouring property has a rear conservatory, however there is no glazing on the western elevation. Therefore it is not considered that the hip to gable enlargement and clear glazed first floor window would result in a significant impact on the adjacent neighbouring property (No. 55 Linda Grove). The proposed dormer to the rear is sited in excess of 35 metres from the residential properties to the rear and as such is unlikely to result in any significant

overlooking, loss of light, or privacy to neighbour amenity.

- 7.13 The dormer to the front is sited in excess of 20 metres from the properties immediately adjacent and as such are not considered to result in any loss of light, privacy or create any overlooking which could be considered detrimental to the neighbouring amenity of these properties. It must also be acknowledged that dormers to the front are a common characteristic in the streetscene and whilst the dormer subject of this application is not considered to be acceptable in terms of its design, the principle of a dormer to the front is not.
- 7.14 The use of cladding is not considered to result in any harmful impact on neighbour amenity.
- 7.15 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal does 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 has a 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/18/00263 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Block/site plan - received 06.03.18

Site location plan - received 06.03.18

Existing and proposed plans - received 06.03.18

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.