
Site Address: 3 Durham Gardens, Waterlooville, PO7 7BB
Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension, single storey side/rear extension and loft conversion.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/22/00126 Expiry Date: 01/04/2022
Applicant: Mr McIntyre
Agent: Mr Donaldson Case Officer: Graham Speller
Carpentry and Construction
Ward: Stakes

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located on the southern side of Durham Gardens and is occupied by a detached two storey dwellinghouse with single storey rear element and attached single garage.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character with properties of similar style and design, some of which have been extended at first floor level, including the adjacent property at No. 4.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 There is no relevant site history.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Erection of two storey side extension, single storey side/rear extension and loft conversion.
- 3.2 The description of development was amended to more accurately reflect the proposals. Reconsultation was not considered necessary as it was considered that no one has been prejudiced by the change to the description as the drawings clearly depicted the proposals and comments received acknowledged the development proposals.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

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

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

Councillor Diana Patrick
No comments received.

Councillor Elizabeth (formerly Dianne) Lloyd
No comments received.

Councillor S Milne
No comments received.

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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

5 letters of representation from 4 households raising the following concerns:

- Size of property not in keeping with the area, in particular the height
- Road infrastructure insufficient to support property of this size
- Will have detrimental impact on views and loss of privacy
- Noise pollution and dust
- Parking extremely limited
- Impact of works
- Any further development would be overdevelopment of plot
- Out of character with other buildings in the Close
- Will become a three storey house
- Overlooking
- Change direct sunlight to other houses
- Could become a house of multiple occupation
- Close unable to support infrastructure needed
- Close is used for overflow of parent's cars coming to drop off and collect children from school
- Impact on kitchen window
- Substantial increase in roof height
- Increase in mass and scale
- Overlap of site will be noticeable in street scene
- Present gap provides spaciousness
- Alien in the street scene

- Lack of subservience
- No set back
- Result in loss of daylight to ground floor flank facing window
- Rear patio doors at first floor will facilitate direct overlooking of private rear amenity space
- Nothing is indicated to prevent kitchen roof being used as a terrace
- Applicant has not submitted a daylight report
- Would greatly affect outlook from other houses
- Concerns about reduction in value of properties caused by such an imposing structure

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) Parking

(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 The proposals would increase the width of the property and combined with the increase in height would significantly increase the scale, bulk and massing of the property which would appear incongruous in the street scene. This resultant visual impact would be compounded by the proposed dormer roof extension, which would be substantial, and would add to the significant scale, bulk and massing of the resultant building which would be out of character in the locality and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene. In addition, due to the juxtaposition of the adjacent property No. 4, whilst recognising that No.4 has been extended at first floor level, the visual gap between the properties would be significantly reduced and the resultant building would appear cramped on its plot and be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the locality that retains spaces between buildings, albeit, as noted above there are other examples of first floor additions in the area.

7.4 The proposals would also include a single storey element to the rear of what is the existing garage and extending to the rear of the existing dwellinghouse. The property already benefits from an existing single storey rear extension. As such, it is considered that there would be no adverse affect on the character of the area as a result of the single storey element.

7.5 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, by reason of significant scale, bulk and massing contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy) and the Borough Design Guide. It is considered that the scheme would result in an adverse impact on the character of the locality and the visual amenities of the street scene.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.6 Whilst it has been considered that the proposal is unacceptable, for the reasons stated above, it is considered that there would be no direct adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity as a consequence of the increase in scale, bulk and massing. However, the representations to the proposals have been considered and due to the boundary alignment between the application property, No.3 and the adjacent property, No.4, the proposed rear first floor Juliet balcony would result in an increase in overlooking the neighbouring private amenity area; as such, it is considered that this would also result in an increased perception of overlooking. Comments have been made regarding the potential use of the single storey rear element as a balcony, however, this could be controlled by an appropriate planning condition.
- 7.7 Comments have also been made regarding impact on a side kitchen window, however, this would not be regarded as a habitable room and it is noted that there is an existing boundary fence. Whilst the proposed single storey element would be closer to the boundary than existing, whilst recognising that the mutual boundary with No.4 is at an angle, it is not considered that this element would result in any significant impact to the amenities of the immediate occupiers.
- 7.8 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will lead to increased overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbouring property and, as such, is contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.9 The property currently has 4 bedrooms with a parking requirement of 3 spaces. Whilst the number of bedrooms would increase, the parking requirement remains the same. The frontage of the property is all hardstanding and there is sufficient space for 3 vehicles to park.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposal, by reason of design, increased scale, bulk and massing, would appear cramped on its plot and be out of character with the locality and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

The proposed rear first floor Juliet balcony would give rise to an unacceptable increase in overlooking of the private amenity area of the adjacent property No.4. As such, this is considered contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00126 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposal, by reason of design, increased scale, bulk and massing,

would appear cramped on its plot and be out of character with the locality and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

- 2 The proposed rear first floor Juliet balcony would give rise to an unacceptable increase in overlooking of the private amenity area of the adjacent property No.4. As such, this is considered contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.