

Planning, Design & Access Statement

85 Geoffrey Avenue, Purbrook, PO7 5BH

Proposed construction of side and rear extensions, alterations to front elevation and the provision of rear and side dormers.



(Source: Bing)

Prepared by
Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd
on behalf of Mr T. Ferati

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to support a pre-application enquiry which seeks advice with respect to the aforementioned proposal, prior to the formal submission of a householder application.

This statement explains the nature and extent of the proposal and how it responds to the local environment, in its built and socio-economic contexts. It has regard to key national and local planning policies relating to new extensions and design and should be read in conjunction with the other supporting documents.



The approach to the site from the southwest, along Geoffrey Avenue.

Context

This rectangular site of **0.036 hectare** lies to the west of Geoffrey Avenue in Purbrook, within Havant Borough Council's administrative area. Fine long views are enjoyed westwards to open countryside. Public Footpath no.36, ('Wayfarers Walk') lies beside the site's western boundary.

Public views towards the rear of the site from the east on Geoffrey Avenue are blocked by the properties that face to that road. Several tall trees stand on the common northeast boundary, to the rear of 87 Geoffrey Avenue.



The site, viewed from the northeast on Geoffrey Avenue.

Vehicular and pedestrian access to the site is afforded via an ungated driveway at its northeast corner. Clear views to the north and south along Geoffrey Avenue ensure that vehicles entering and leaving the site enjoy good visibility and are themselves seen clearly by approaching drivers, riders and pedestrians. A dropped kerb and surfaced forecourt afford access and parking for two vehicles at the front of the property, with another in an integral garage.

In his 'Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth' of March 2011, Decentralisation Minister Greg Clark

confirmed that the *'Government's clear expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes' except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy'*. Paragraph 14 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF) reiterated that principle in 2012, by generating a presumption in favour of sustainable development and the approval without delay of proposals that accord with the development plan.

Paragraph 56 of the NPPF ('Requiring good design') recorded that *'Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment' and 'Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development'*. Paragraph 60 stipulates that local planning authorities '...should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle

innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles' but should encourage '*...local distinctiveness.*' (emphasis added).

Section 38 of the 'Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004' requires an application to be determined in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; an element of flexibility is provided which enables decisions to be made which may disagree with the development plan. The development plan for Havant Borough comprises the 'Havant Borough Core Strategy' (2011), the 'Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations)' (2014) and Supplementary Planning Documents. Policies Map 4 of the development plan shows this site within the '*Urban Area Boundary*' with no special designations. It does not fall within a Flood Zone.

Policy CS16 ('High Quality Design') generates a presumption in favour of '*...development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax*' that '*Responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and... Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site; Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors; The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.*'

Paragraphs 5.42-5.44 ('Rear Extensions') and 5.47 ('Dormers and Roof Lights') of the 'Havant Borough Council Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document' (2011) respectively state that '*Rear extensions should be a maximum of 3 metres from the rear wall of the existing house, providing that this does not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties...The design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours... Obstruction of light and outlook from an existing window can be mitigated against if the extension does not result in the centre of the existing windows being within a combined plan and section 45 degree overshadowing zone...Dormers are considered an acceptable way of providing light and ventilation to existing buildings...They should be designed to sit back into the roof, back from the front line of the wall below, in from the verge and below the existing ridge line*'.

The frontage of this part of Geoffrey Avenue is characterised by semi-detached bungalows in a variety of formats, styles and roof additions (that stand to the south of the application site) together with a substantial detached house at no.87 (the neighbour to the north) (see aerial photograph on the cover page) that notably includes a flat-roofed dormer at the rear (with a pair of outward-opening French doors) that is clearly visible from Geoffrey Avenue - ie no.83, the neighbour to the south. Notably, the closest rear window of no.83 is obscure-glazed and serves a bathroom ie it is not a habitable room and no outlook is enjoyed from it.



The side/rear dormer of 83 Geoffrey Avenue, the neighbour to the south.

The use of kerbside parking facilities on Geoffrey Avenue and Victoria Avenue within 100 metres (one minute's walk) of the application site has been recorded on three separate occasions recently, at times when most residents were assumed to be at home:

8.00am on Thursday 20th July 2017 – 17no spaces:

- Geoffrey Avenue = 8 kerb-side spaces were available (one was outside the application site and another outside no.79).
- Victoria Avenue = 9 kerb-side spaces were available.

6.15pm on Friday 21st July 2017 – 17no spaces:

- Geoffrey Avenue = 6 kerb-side spaces were available (one was outside the application site).
- Victoria Avenue = 11 kerb-side spaces were available.

8.00am on Wednesday 26th July 2017 – 16no spaces:

- Geoffrey Avenue = 6 kerb-side spaces were available (one was outside the application site)
- Victoria Avenue = 10 kerb-side spaces were available

These three 'snapshot' surveys revealed that a significant number of parking spaces are available close to the subject site at times when most residents may be assumed to be at home.

A more recent car parking survey was conducted by 'Modal Data' on 28th and 29th November 2017. In their 'Parking Survey Technical Note' of December 2017 (copy enclosed), RGP Design Ltd recorded that *'The survey revealed an average parking stress of 58% across the overall study area equating to 47 remaining parking spaces within a 200m walking distance of the site...Geoffrey Avenue experienced an average parking stress of 41% equating to 28 available parking spaces which demonstrates that Geoffrey Avenue alone can comfortably accommodate the additional 2 spaces demanded by the development'*. It is evident that sufficient capacity exists within the locality to reduce the level of parking spaces on the subject site (and increase the number of bedrooms within it) without significantly reducing the availability of spaces for other residents.

The subject site is a two-bedroomed bungalow with an attached garage at its north (side) elevation and a playroom at first-floor; it has a gross internal area (GIA) of **94.6m²**. The existing dwelling is finished in cream render beneath a hipped roof of brown concrete interlocking tiles.

Planning permission APP/15/00182 was granted by Havant Borough Council in 2015 for the construction of side and rear extensions to the subject dwelling, together with alterations to the roof and the provision of a rear dormer (to enlarge the existing first-floor playroom) with a Juliet balcony. The design principles and details of the permitted proposal were evidently seen to accord with the local surroundings and Havant Borough Council's customary requirements, so it has provided a useful model for this proposal.



The application dwelling viewed from the east, on Geoffrey Avenue.

Consultation

In accordance with the advice proffered at paragraph 188 of the NPPF ('Pre-application engagement and front loading'), the views of Harriet Pitney (Planning Enquiry Officer, Havant Borough Council) were invited on preliminary schemes. By letter dated 6th September 2017 (ref: GEN/17/00964), Miss Pitney opined that:

'...the adjacent neighbouring property to the north is set back from the original building line and as such the proposed extension to the side would be sited immediately adjacent to the southern elevation of the neighbouring property, which does not benefit from any windows and as such would be unlikely to result in any privacy concerns.'

'...it is considered that the dormer to the rear is acceptable in principle, however the width of the dormer does raise some concern with the local planning authority by virtue of the added bulk, mass and scale to the existing roof slope and on this basis, this aspect of the proposal would be considered more favourable if the dormer was reduced in width, without the wrap-around section to the side, which creates an unusual relationship with the roof slope.'

'The rear of the property faces directly onto an area of public open space and as such the provision of a Juliet balcony to the rear is also considered to be acceptable in principle.'

'The extension of the existing roof is also considered to be acceptable in principle in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the hipped roof which remains in keeping with the pair of semi-detached dwellings.'

'The alterations to the front of the property incorporate an additional bay window to replicate the bay window which already exists and the relocation of the front door. These alterations are considered to be acceptable in principle and worthy of a planning application.'

By letter dated 19th October 2017 (ref: GEN/17/01173), Miss Pitney helpfully opined that:

'Whilst flat-roofed dormers are not normally encouraged by Havant Borough Council by virtue of the Borough Design Guidance, it is again acknowledged that there are many examples within the streetscene where properties have incorporated dormers to the principal elevation and therefore appears to be a relatively common characteristic within the streetscene...This addition is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle.'

'It is acknowledged that revisions have been made to the dormer to the rear following previous advice which have sought to significantly reduce the bulk and mass to this elevation...which was initially proposed and is now considered to be more in keeping with the adjacent neighbouring property.'

Amount, Layout, Scale & Appearance

In light of the favourable presumption set down in the development plan, the established character of the area, the previous consent and Miss Pitney's favourable comments, it is proposed that extensions be erected at the side (north) and rear (west) elevations of the existing dwelling, to increase the ground floor area; a new bay window be introduced at the front (east) elevation; the front entrance door be centralised; and provision be made for dormers in the front (east) and rear (west) roof-planes, with a pair of inward-opening French doors and a Juliet balcony to the rear, to achieve two bedrooms at first-floor level. The GIA of the additions would be **74.4m²** (ie less than 100m²).



The rear elevations of nos.83 and 85 Geoffrey Avenue.

Respect for the amenities of existing and future residents has been accorded priority in the formulation of this proposal, since concept stage. As demonstrated by the ground-floor plan (drawing 04), the proposed rear extension would stand outside the '45 degree overshadowing zone' of the rear bathroom window of no.83 Geoffrey Avenue.

In this configuration and finished in cream render (at ground floor level) and hung brown tiles on the dormer with a hipped roof of brown concrete interlocking tiles, the proposed additions would make more efficient use of this sustainable site in a manner that accords with the mixed character of its surroundings and would not result in detriment to the amenities of neighbours.

Access

The site would continue to be served by the existing access arrangement.

Parking

Although the increase in the number of bedrooms would customarily require the provision of three on-site parking spaces and only one space exists, the aforementioned parking surveys demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity within the locality to accommodate the shortfall in on-site provision without a significant reduction in the availability of spaces for other residents.

In their 'Parking Survey Technical Note', RGP opined that '*...the survey identified an average of 28 available spaces on Geoffrey Avenue which would comfortably accommodate the additional on-street parking demand associated with the development...In addition, the survey also identified a total of 47 available spaces across the overall study area demonstrating considerable capacity within a 200m walk of the application site*' and '*...the parking survey has demonstrated that there is sufficient parking capacity on Geoffrey Avenue and the surrounding LRN to accommodate the shortfall in on-site parking and the displacement from the proposed development site.*'

Trees & Ecology

No trees or protected species would be harmed as a result of this proposal.

Landscaping

No special landscaping measures are considered necessary.

Site Waste Management

Brick, block and concrete will be crushed and retained on-site for re-use as hardcore and timber will be salvaged where possible. Inert waste material would be disposed to a licensed Hampshire County Council site and other waste would be segregated into skips and removed by licensed collectors.

Working Practice

To protect the amenities of neighbours, the operation of construction machinery on the site will be restricted to 8.00am-6.00pm Monday-Friday, 8.30am-1.00pm on a Saturday, with no working on a Sunday or Bank Holiday. All materials and plant would be kept within the curtilage of the application site.

Community Infrastructure Levy

Since the proposal comprises only **74.4m²** of additional GIA (ie <100m²), it is understood that Havant Borough Council would not seek a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Conclusion

It is submitted that the requirements of the development plan are *satisfied* by this proposal, as it would not detract from the existing mixed street-scene; would be in keeping with the mixed character of its surroundings; is of a high standard of design; incorporates materials and design elements sympathetic to local character; respects privacy, outlook and sunlight; and the prospect of criminal activity and anti-social behaviour has been taken into account.

The proposal provides an acceptable form of development that would accord with the character of the area and the development plan without detriment to the amenities of neighbours; no other material considerations suggest otherwise.

Niall Tutton BSc (Hons), MA
Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd
9 February 2018