

---

|                 |                                                                                              |               |             |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Site Address:   | 2 Langstone Road, Havant, PO9 1RE                                                            |               |             |
| Proposal:       | Single storey extensions and creation of second storey including terrace to south elevation. |               |             |
| Application No: | APP/17/00351                                                                                 | Expiry Date:  | 08/06/2017  |
| Applicant:      | Mr Laly                                                                                      |               |             |
| Agent:          | Mr Bloomfield                                                                                | Case Officer: | Tina Pickup |
|                 | Bloomfield Parker Architects                                                                 |               |             |
| Ward:           | St Faiths                                                                                    |               |             |

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

---

## **1 Site Description**

2 Langstone Road is a large detached dwelling located on the west side of Havant Road, just south of Langbrook Close. It is of unique design, being a two storey art-deco style dwelling sited within a larger than average plot. The main, original house is two storey white painted, having a flat roof with a water tower and chimneys on the roof. The property has been extended in the past with a large detached garage in the north eastern corner which has a pitched roof with dormers and is used as ancillary accommodation. There is also a large single storey extension projecting along the northern boundary which has 2 parts - the first a traditional design housing a swimming pool, and the second, western a modern design guest suite with galleried area above.

The frontage boundary of the site comprises a distinctive high white painted wall with tiled top. The vehicular gates to the site are wrought iron, located at the southern end. There are two large trees on this road frontage, one within the site and one within the highway verge. The northern, western and southern boundaries are all highly screened with a mix of old timber fencing with mature, largely evergreen trees, on the boundaries. The site is therefore quite private. The site is relatively flat but marginally higher than the properties to the north - which are a mix of two storey detached dwellings and chalet style dwellings. Those to the north in Langbrook Close are set close to the northern boundary having garden depths of only between 8m and 11m, whilst those to the west have garden depths of about 13m.

The site is quite distinctive in street scene terms and known locally as "The White House" - but it is not a Listed building, nor on the Council's list of interesting buildings, and neither is the site within a Conservation Area. The trees on the site or highway are not TPO'd.

## **2 Planning History**

02/65221/000 - Addition of pitched roof to existing flat roof incorporating dormers into north and south roof slopes and new chimneys., PERM,21/02/2002  
04/65221/001 - Two storey rear extension., REF,17/03/2005  
08/65221/002 - Discharge of condition 4 of Planning Permission 04/65221/001., PERM,24/07/2008  
APP/12/00955 - Dormer window to west elevation of garage., PERM,08/11/2012  
APP/13/00290 - Retention of dormer window to west elevation of garage (incorporating 'as built' changes to Planning Permission APP/12/00955).,

PERM,20/05/2013

Of the above, most relevant is 02/65221/000 which allowed the addition of a large hipped roof with dormers above the main two storey house. This was never implemented but would have significantly changed the design and character of the dwelling, losing its art-deco style.

### **3 Proposal**

Single storey extensions and creation of second storey including terrace to south elevation.

The proposal is quite comprehensive and involves:

1. a single storey side extension to the east (front) elevation with flat roof, parapet and lantern light, aswell as a lightweight glazed lobby that would link to the existing detached garage;
2. a single storey lightweight largely glazed 'triangular' extension infilling the north-western corner between the main 2 storey house and swimming pool addition, providing a gym and kitchen extension;
3. adding a third floor on the flat roof providing a bedroom and terrace - this would be flat roofed and set back from the eastern and southern elevation by some 3m. The terrace would have glass balustrading limiting access to the entire flat roof.

As originally submitted the proposed second floor addition was to be grey polymeric material giving a contemporary design solution; amended plans have changed the materials and window design/proportion to more closely match the art deco style with white render.

### **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)                                                          |

#### Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

- |      |                                                                  |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| DM20 | (Historic Assets)                                                |
| 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**

### **Conservation Officer, Development Control** **On Amended Design/Materials: No Objection**

2 Langstone Road is not located within a conservation area and is not a listed building. The property dates from the 1930's and has some particularly attractive external detailing from the art deco period. Due to its appearance and detailing the property is considered to be a Non Designated Heritage Asset.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications along with the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Paragraph 135 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Paragraph 64 (Section 7 Requiring Good Design) is also particularly relevant to this case in that development should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

It is proposed to create single storey extensions and provide a second story to the existing flat roof. The single story extensions are of an acceptable design and scale that would cause no harm to the interest of this non designated heritage asset.

The second floor extension is to be set back from edge of the existing building which includes a terraced area. I believe this helps mitigate its impact on any potential street views. The extension has been designed to compliment the Art Deco style of the existing building. Overall, the combination of materials and design detail, gives the extension a horizontal streamline appearance, which is complementary to the Art Deco style of the building.

It is important to note that a previous permission has been approved for a pitched roof with dormer windows on the property. This largely removed the Art Deco character of the building. Heritage considerations have moved on since this decision, however, I feel the extension does reflect the style and period of this dwelling.

Overall I do not believe the second storey extension as proposed will harm the character of the building and such I have no objections subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

Material samples to be submitted prior to commencement

Window details to be submitted prior to commencement

## **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: 14

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: **On Original Scheme - 14 letters were received from 13 addresses ; 11 of which Object; 1 is Neutral and 1 has No Objection**  
**On Amended Scheme - 11 further letters of objection from 10 addresses**

The **Original Objection** representations can be summarised as follows:

Design & Streetscene

Art Deco built in 1930's by and for George Carrell - distinctive and unique property in Langstone; historically important building; clearly visible from Langstone Road and box on top would adversely alter the character and appearance of attractive front elevation; out of keeping with area; overpowering and intrusive development;  
*Officer Note - see comments below*

Size

dis-proportionate extension on already large and extended property; continuing excessive development possibly for change of use to some nursing home business purpose, not just a family home; already close to boundary; rear extensions an overdevelopment; should be on HBC's List of Local Buildings of Interest; no need to go up when adequate ground floor area; character of area 2 stories not 3 storey;  
*Officer Note - application submitted as householder extensions for private dwelling and not for any business use - which if planning permission is required would be the subject of a future application;*

Second Floor

out of character; will overlook; loss of privacy; will be visible from windows and more invasive; existing water tower and chimneys visible so additional floor oppressive and dominant; visible from upper flat in Bartlett Court above trees; request glass balustrade increased in height to remove possibility of looking north over glass; west facing windows will overlook; north windows should protect privacy  
*Officer Note - see comments below*

Trees/Hedges/Boundaries

fast growing conifers currently 25-30ft high overgrown and un-managed; deny light to neighbours; removal of T1 T2 T3 & T4 on north boundary could affect ground water levels and clay heave damaging our property; removal of trees will mean no privacy; future maintenance of hedge will be difficult; applicants do not maintain fence and neighbours replace at own expense; not all trees evergreen and during winter will be visible;  
*Officer Note - planting, maintenance or removal of non-TPO'd trees outside of CA does not require planning permission and is a private matter between neighbours;*

D&A

incorrect stating 8 Langstone Road flats when it is one dwelling; no photos from roof looking north; why reference to larger properties on east side of Langstone Road;  
*Officer Note - noted*

### Other

unsuccessful application in 2002 for pitched roof and dormers; planning history on website missing plans; existing structure on roof already an eyesore; request for Committee decision; query why not informed when live opposite;

*Officer Note - this was permitted in 2002; 2004 application allowed on appeal; No Member request for application to go to DMC so delegated procedure appropriate; only those who share a boundary with the application site are notified of applications, not those opposite.*

The letter raising **No Objection** comes from the bungalow directly to the south and is based on strict compliance with the plans

The **Objection letters on Amended** scheme:

Original comments remain; privacy lost; open conservatory and living room will be overlooked; loss of sun light; only art deco property in area will be ruined; does this create precedent for other properties to add an additional level?; out of scale; change in colour does nothing to improve its over-prominence; drawing of SE aspect from road should be provided; no way of controlling what put on terrace ie umbrellas, washing, plants, furniture which would be an eyesore; overdevelopment; unfortunate site outside Langstone Conservation Area that was designated in 2013 - if within would not be approved.

*Officer Note - domestic paraphernalia on rooftop terrace cannot be controlled as such items do not constitute development*

## **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
- (iv) Highways and parking
- (v) CIL

(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. The application is for householder extensions to a single dwellinghouse and not for any business or nursing home use as alleged by third party representations. The site is exceptionally large compared to surrounding development and whilst the dwelling has had cumulative additions in the past, the site is considered to be of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed development in principle.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 As noted by the Conservation Officer the existing Art Deco style building is not located within a conservation area and is not a listed building; but it does date from the 1930's and has some particularly attractive external detailing that warrants it being considered a Non Designated Heritage Asset. As such the NPPF requires a balanced judgement to be made on the scale of any harm or loss relative to the significance of the heritage asset.

- 7.4 The ground floor additions are not generally contentious, and whilst increasing the footprint of the property and extending development along the rear, northern boundary, necessitating some tree removal, they are of an appropriate design and scale to reflect the host dwelling. It is the proposed second floor addition that has resulted in significant local objection, both in terms of its design and privacy impact. As originally submitted the design solution proposed modern grey materials (to match the western single storey addition) which was argued would blend into the skyline and subdue the outline and unify with the modern extensions. However the modern extension and use of this grey material is not visible from the street scene and public domain whereas the main two storey building is highly prominent through the gates and in association with the white boundary wall. It is the white Art Deco style that gives the site its unique character and to respect that character and more appropriately link with the main building, amended plans were requested using a more sympathetic material and window proportion.
- 7.5 The final white design repeats some of the parapet detailing of the original house whilst using the a line of contemporary glass at eaves level which provides high level light to the rooms. The fact that the bulk of the addition is recessed back some 3m from the eastern and southern edge would significantly reduce the prominence of the structure from the roadside - the angle of vision up to the top floor would restrict view of the structure reducing its impact. Compared to the previously approved hipped roof and dormer design, the current proposal respects and retains the Art Deco style of building that is important in the street scene.
- 7.6 Therefore the combination of materials and design detail, gives the extension a horizontal streamline appearance, which is considered complementary to the Art Deco style of the building. Accordingly it is considered that no material harm would be caused to the non-designated heritage asset. 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

- 7.7 Concern has been raised of potential overlooking and loss of privacy from the second floor addition and roof terrace. However there are no windows in the north elevation except the eaves line of glazing which would be above eye level and impossible to obtain a view down to the properties in Langbrook Close. It must also be noted that the addition does not sit adjacent the boundary but above the two storey roof, resulting in a separation of 11.8m from the north boundary and therefore a back to back separation with No 3 Langbrook Close of about 22m.
- 7.8 It is accepted that the outlook from No 3 and other adjacent dwellings would be altered - currently they see the quite large flat water tower and this would be replaced with the proposed addition. But regard must be had to the fact that the existing dwelling is currently two stories but flat roofed, with a height of approximately 6m, so missing the roof bulk of a traditional dwelling - the proposal effectively adds the bulk of a roof, giving an overall height of about 8.5m, but in the form of a further flat addition that respects the Art Deco style. The impact of a traditional roofspace converted with dormers and rooflights (similar to the approved 2002 scheme) would equate to the current proposal and in this residential area is not considered inappropriate. Therefore the outlook and view of the proposal from neighbouring properties is not considered

harmful in its own right.

- 7.9 The two windows at the northern end of the east and west elevation serve a bathroom and dressing room and could be obscure glazed to further limit the possibility of views out. The south facing patio doors and extra window in the east elevation would be clear glazed. But because of the 3m recess back then views from within the room and the terrace are indirect ie people could not go right up to the edge and look down, so the angle of vision protects neighbouring amenity. It is also noteworthy that the property to the south, is the one that has written raising no objection. The terrace would be some 23m to the southern boundary and aligned with the front, more public area of that dwelling. Considering the high screening trees and separation distances, the actual overlooking and loss of privacy would be very minimal. It is however considered necessary to condition that there be no access to the roof, except for maintenance and emergency use, beyond the identified terrace, aswell as the requiring the balustrade to be higher than 1m and opaque, not reflective.
- 7.10 Overall it is considered that the detailing of proposal is sufficient to ensure the development would 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).

(iv) Highways and parking

- 7.11 The main house would become 5 bedrooms but there are also additional rooms in the guest suite and above the garage so there is no change to the on site parking requirement to meet the parking SPD 2016. the site has plenty of hardsurfaced area for the parking and turning of several vehicles. therefore there is no highway objection to the proposal.

(v) CIL

- 7.12 The additional floorspace amounts to 117sqm and as such the proposal is CIL liable. The appropriate Additional Information and Assumption of Liability forms have been completed and the CIL team advised - a Draft Liability Notice will be issued asap.

## **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/17/00351

(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:  
Site Plan Drawing No 005  
Proposed Extension & Alterations Plans Drawing No 011 Revision A  
Proposed Extension & Alterations Elevations Drawing No 012 Revision A  
**Reason:** - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 The external elevations of the hereby approved second floor extension shall match, in type, colour and texture, the elevations of the existing building so far as practicable.  
**Reason:** To achieve a satisfactory form of development in the interests of the character of the host dwelling and amenities of the area and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the windows, rainwater goods, and details of the balustrading including height, (and the balustrade should be opaque and non-reflective,) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.  
**Reason:** To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5 There shall be no access to the existing first floor roof beyond the hereby approved roof terrace, except for maintenance and emergency use only. This excluded roof area shall not be used for sitting out or domestic use at any time.  
**Reason:** To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.