

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Not required in relation to 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

Summary: No representations received.

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 to be acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

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

7.3 The proposed development comprises three distinct elements which include the proposed dormers to the front and rear, the hip to gable enlargement and the cladding proposed to the front, side and rear elevations.

7.4 It must first of all be acknowledged that in respect of the hip to gable enlargement proposed, the applicant could undertake 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 this element of the proposal would be visible within the streetscene and has the potential to unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings to which No.56 belongs to, it is not considered that the principal of this alteration would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

- 7.5 In respect of the proposed dormers to the front and rear, similarly to the hip to gable enlargement, the rear dormer could also be constructed without the need for planning permission utilising the property's permitted development rights. Again, it is by virtue of the cladding proposed as to why this has been incorporated within this application. Whilst the dormer proposed 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 to that this element of the proposal would warrant a refusal of planning permission. Furthermore, this aspect of the development would not be relatively visible from the public realm by virtue of its position to the rear of No.56.
- 7.6 The dormer proposed to the front of the property however does require the benefit of planning permission by virtue of its position to the principal elevation. Havant Borough Council's design guidance specifies that dormers should not dominate the roof of the existing building and should be designed so that they sit back into the roof, back from the front line of the wall below, in from the verge and below the existing ridge line. Furthermore, Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) states that planning permission will only be granted for development that uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights and massing.
- 7.7 The proposed dormer to the front has the appearance of forming an additional gable end to the front of the property and is not considered to comply with the guidance specified in the Havant Borough Design Guidance and Policy CS16 specified above. This is by virtue of the appearance of the front dormer which by reason of its added bulk, mass and prominent location would be an incongruous feature within the streetscene and would not only have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building and character of the streetscene but harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding locality.
- 7.8 It is acknowledged that there are many other examples within the streetscene of Linda Grove where front dormers have been provided, however, these are all much smaller in terms of their size, scale and design and do not dominate the roof of the dwelling in the way that the proposed front dormer subject of this application would. The front dormers evident within the existing streetscene are all relatively uniform in terms of their design, sit back into the roof and appear to be a common characteristic within the streetscene.
- 7.9 It is acknowledged that paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies and decisions 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. It is however proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. It is not considered for the reasons specified above that the addition of the front dormer reinforces local distinctiveness and the design is such that it would result in an appearance which constitutes overdevelopment of the site and one which is harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
- 7.10 Lastly, in terms of the cladding proposed to the front, side, and rear elevations, it is acknowledged that there are other examples within the streetscene where householders have rendered their properties and painted them cream, white and one which has clad their property in stone. As specified above, it is 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 proposed cladding would present 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.

- 7.11 Overall, whilst it is acknowledged that some elements of the proposed development could be undertaken utilising permitted development, it is considered that the addition of the proposed dormer to the principal elevation does not comply with Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) or Havant Borough Councils Design Guidance and as such is likely to result in a harmful impact to the character and appearance of the host dwelling but also to the streetscene of Linda Grove.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.12 It must be acknowledged when considering the impact on neighbour amenity, that the hip to gable enlargement and dormer to the rear could be 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. Notwithstanding the above, the hip to gable enlargement is unlikely to result in any impact on the adjacent neighbouring property (No. 55 Linda Grove) and 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 additional overlooking, loss of light, or privacy to neighbour amenity.
- 7.13 The proposed dormer to the front would also be sited in excess of 20 metres from the properties immediately adjacent and as such unlikely 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 Due to the nature of the alterations to provide cladding, this is not considered to result in any harmful impact on neighbour amenity.
- 7.15 On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development complies with Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) Part 1 (e) refers and is unlikely to harm the amenity of any adjacent or immediate neighbours.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the proposed dormer to the front of No.56 Linda Grove would result in excessive bulk and mass which would dominate the existing 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 is therefore considered to be non-compliant with Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and Havant Borough Councils Design Guidance and is therefore recommended for refusal of planning permission.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/17/00670 for the following reasons

- 1 The front dormer by reason of its added bulk, mass and dominance of the existing roof slope together with its prominence in the streetscene, has an adverse impact on the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area. The front dormer is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.