

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address: 100 Silvester Road, Waterloooville, PO8 8TS

Proposal: Remodelling of existing property to include; single storey rear/side extension, hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormers and front rooflights, ground floor steps to front and rear and changes to roof materials.

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Application No: APP/24/00513 **Expiry Date:** 02/09/2024

Applicant: Ms Davey

Agent: Loretta Taylor **Case Officer:** Robert Riley
Thorns - Young Ltd

Ward: Hart Plain

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a semi-detached bungalow located on Silvester Road in Waterlooville. It features gardens to the front and rear with a driveway located to the side of the dwelling. The property's materials feature brickwork and render for the external walls, with brown concrete tiles in a hip pitch form, for the roof.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that would be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the street featuring generally similarly sized dwellings with variations in external materials and additions to roofs such as dormers.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant history.

3 Proposal

- ### 3.1 The application seeks 10 elements:
- Side extension
 - Rear extension
 - Dormer to front roof slope
 - Rear Dormer
 - Hip to gable roof extension
 - Steps to rear and front.
 - Porous addition of driveway to frontage.
 - Changes to fenestration
 - Change to external materials
 - 2No Rooflights to front roof slope

Officer Note

- 3.2 The proposal has been amended during the application process, and rear decking has been removed, the side extension has been amended to be one storey, and has been reduced in width, furthermore the first floor rear extension has been amended in order to be a rear dormer.

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)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

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

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Councillor Ann Briggs

No comments received

Councillor E Shimbart - Hart Plain

No comments received

Councillor James Blades

No comments received

Ecologist

Modern bungalow with tight-fitting concrete interlocking tiles. No reason to suggest there is anything to be concerned about.

HBIC

Within 50m - Notable and protected species - Grey Wagtail

Officer comment: The proposed works will be of a modest size, although it is noted that the works are at both first and ground floor level. It is not anticipated that there would be a negative impact on protected species.

Hampshire Highways

The applicant seeks to extend the vehicle crossover to the application site, however no existing or proposed plans with dimensions have been provided. The applicant is required to submit plans which present the existing and proposed dimensions of the vehicle crossover. Further comments will be provided upon receipt of the above information.

Officer comment:

The proposed crossover aspect of the works has subsequently been removed from the works.

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: 16

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 9 objections (2 from the same address) (some third party consultees have objected to both the original and amended scheme).

Comment	Officer Comment
Summary of comments	
Concern over property potentially becoming a HMO	The proposal would result in a four bed dwelling with one Kitchen / Dining Room and one Living Room. There is no indication that this would be a HMO, however, it is noted that the GPDO under Part 3 L (b) allows for a change of use as permitted development as follows: <i>(b) from a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, to a use falling within Class C4 (houses in multiple occupation) of that Schedule.</i> This is subject to not resulting in two or more separate dwellinghouses being created in Class C4. The proposals would not result in two or more separate dwellings being created. The GPDO also allows under C3 (c): <i>for groups of people (up to six) living together as a single household. This allows for those groupings that do not fall within the C4 HMO definition, but which fell within the previous C3 use class, to be provided for.</i> Should the property be used in another way to that indicated this would be a matter for the Councils Enforcement Team to investigate and it is recommended to contact them in case of a breach.
Parking is an issue	The proposal meets the Parking SPD's standards and is considered acceptable in this regard.

On a blind spot	The widened dropped kerb aspect of the works has been removed, and this proposal is now only able to be assessed on parking matters as opposed to highway safety.
Not in keeping	The design has been altered during the application process and is assessed in section 7.
Noise, smell and fumes from the build	This is not a planning consideration.
Reduction of light to neighbours room	Assessed in section 7.
Drainage issues	Not a planning consideration.
Undermining the foundations	Not a planning consideration, this would be a private matter between the relevant parties.
Also i do not see a deadline date for submitting comments for these new drawings, but i do know that there should be at least 21 days from the posting of new drawings etc , these drawings were first able to view on the 13 November 2024 so we have at least till the 3 December 2024 to comment, that is statutory.	The latest proposal was advertised on the 13th of November with a 7 day advertisement period for amended plans and description in line with the Councils procedures.
Where is the public notice displayed regarding this application	The relevant neighbours have been consulted during the application process, and a site notice has not been required to be put up for this proposal.
I further wish to complain about not being notified that further plans had been submitted and only found out by chance	An earlier draft plan was erroneously uploaded, and was subsequently removed.
The side elevation is not in keeping with existing building and will reduce natural light in to the other buildings room also upper windows will be so close to other building and able to see through to room.	Design and Neighbour impacts are assessed in section 7.
Noise,extra bins and general	Not a planning consideration of these proposed

disruption	works.
Removal of the grass verge and front garden to facilitate access and hard standing for 4 vehicles is environmentally unsound and I consider is contrary to current thinking on flood management needed from predicted more regular heavy rain due to global warming	The application proposes a porous driveway which is able to be carried out under permitted development rights. Parking is now for 3 cars which meets the Councils parking standards.
Did my earlier objection be registered . Please confirm	This earlier objection was noted and is considered in this section.
The high decking proposed at the rear would mean a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.	This has been subsequently removed.
Will the store continue to be used by a relative to continue the business storage entailing traffic coming and going as at present.	If there are concerns in relation to a possible business use that may require planning permission this should be raised with the Councils Enforcement Team.
Has the applicant supplied evidence that they are the sole registered owner	A Certificate A has been completed indicating that the applicant is the owner.

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
- (v) Ecology
- (vi) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

(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 application proposes 10 elements; being a side extension, a rear extension, a dormer to the front roof slope, a rear dormer, a hip to gable roof extension, steps to

the rear and front, Porous addition of driveway to frontage, changes to fenestration, a change to external materials of the dwelling and 2No Rooflights to front roof slope

Character, bulk and the streetscene

- 7.4 The proposed changes would be readily visible upon the streetscene, with the changes proposing substantial alterations to the dwelling in terms of additions of bulk.
- 7.5 The rooflights to the front roof slope are considered to be an acceptable addition to the dwelling with regards to the impact upon the dwelling and visual amenities. Furthermore the proposed steps to the front and rear are considered acceptable with regards to the character of the dwelling and visual amenities. Additionally, both the proposed addition of porous driveway aspect of the works and changes to fenestration are considered to have limited and acceptable impacts upon the character of the dwelling and visual amenities.
- 7.6 The dormer to the front elevation would be of a moderate scale and is (having regard to other similarly sized front dormers in the vicinity) considered to be appropriate in the roof slope not detracting from the design of the dwelling. The dormer can be seen to be an acceptable addition to the dwelling and to have an acceptable impact upon the visual amenities of the area.
- 7.7 The proposed hip to gable aspect of the works would ordinarily be able to be done under permitted development rights if it were a standalone aspect of the works. It is noted that nearby properties No's 109, 103 and 101 feature gable pitched roofs. In light of this, this aspect of the works is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.8 The single storey side extension would result in an addition over the host properties side driveway, furthermore it would bring side walls of Nos 100 and 98 to be significantly closer. In consideration of the modest height of the side extension and that it would now only be one storey, its addition is considered subservient and is not considered to unacceptably increase a terracing impact. In light of this, it is considered on balance an acceptable addition regarding the character of the dwelling and visual amenities.
- 7.9 Regarding the rear dormers, The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states that: "*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 guide also states that *Dormers should not dominate the roof or the existing building. To help avoid this they should be the same size or preferably smaller than the windows below. Generally the dormers should have pitched roofs, with slopes in keeping with the existing roof.*
- 7.10 Whilst the rear dormer is substantial, it is set down from the ridge line and up from the proposed rear extension. Whilst this is a bulky addition to the property, its siting to the rear with limited public views together with the existence of similar examples of rear dormers in the vicinity of the site would result in the dormer appearing as an acceptable addition in the character of the area. Furthermore, there is a permitted development fallback position under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the GPDO for the provision of rear dormers which often do not require planning consent. Whilst this rear dormer does require consent, a rear dormer to the exiting rear roof slope meeting limited criteria would be permitted development. With regards to the above points, the proposed dormer is considered acceptable.

- 7.11 The ground floor rear extension, would not be readily visible on the streetscene, and would be of a single storey nature, and would not feature an unduly prominent scale upon the dwelling. With regard to these considerations, the rear extension is able seen to be an acceptable addition.

Materials

- 7.12 This application proposes flat roof construction to be used for the flat roof aspects of the works, the ground floor and first floor rear extensions which is considered acceptable. The application also proposes white render for the external walls and proposes a slate roof. In consideration of the relatively mixed variety of external wall and roof materials on Silvester Road, these materials are considered acceptable.
- 7.13 The design and appearance of the proposal is on balance deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore on balance considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy 2011). 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

- 7.14 To the western, eastern and northern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 102 and 98 Silvester Road and No.4 Birch Close. Due to proximity, the main impacts to assess would be in regard to these properties. Due to the nature of the works, properties to the front are considered to be acceptably impacted by the works. The proposed, change to external materials, 2No Rooflights to front roof slope, steps to rear and front of the dwelling, hardsurfacing to frontage are considered to have acceptable and limited impacts on neighbouring properties. Due to the nature of the works, properties to the front of the application site are considered to be acceptably impacted.

No.102 Silvester Road

- 7.15 Due to shielding from the existing dwelling, the proposed hip to gable roof extension and side extension are considered to have acceptable impacts upon No.102. The ground floor rear extension would only moderately extend beyond No.102's rear, and it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable increase in the sense of overshadowing and the sense of overbearing. Regarding overlooking, the rear extension would feature rear fenestration however this would face the rear garden of No.102 and any views would only be oblique facing No.102, regarding this, the rear extension is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. Regarding the front dormer, at its proposed scale and location it is not considered to unacceptably increase a sense of overbearing or overshadowing. Regarding the potential of overlooking from the front dormer, as it would face the public realm, its impacts are considered acceptable. Regarding the rear dormer, it may increase a sense of overbearing for No.102 but with regards to its location, it is not considered so unacceptable to warrant the refusal of this planning application. Regarding overlooking, the rear dormer would feature rear fenestration, however, any views provided of No.102 would be angled and on balance this is not considered unacceptable.

No.98 Silvester Road

7.16 The proposed side extension is now proposed to be at ground floor level, there is no fenestration on No.98's lower ground floor level, and impacts of the side extension would impact No.98's driveway, there would also be no fenestration proposed on the side extension facing No.98, with regards to this the side extension is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.98. The proposed rear extension, would be shielded by the existing building of No.98, and its impacts are not seen to be unacceptable. The proposed rear dormer, is considered to feature a sufficient enough separation distance from No.98's curtilage to prevent unacceptable increase in overshadowing and the sense of overbearing. The rear dormer would feature rear fenestration, however this would face the rear garden of No.100 and any views provided of No.98 would be oblique which is considered acceptable. The hip to gable proposal would only be approximately 6.2 metres from No.98's first floor side window serving a bedroom, however this could ordinarily be done under permitted development rights as a standalone aspect, and on balance is not seen to be an unacceptable addition.

No.4 Birch Close

7.17 The previously proposed decking was considered to potentially increase overlooking, however this has been removed from the proposal. Due to the location of the works, the proposed extensions and the proposed hip to gable change of the dwelling are considered acceptable upon No.4 Birch Close regarding neighbourly impacts. It has been considered important to assess the impact of the rear dormer upon this dwelling. The proposed rear dormer would be approximately 27.5 metres away from No.4's rear ground floor windows which would exceed the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD's requirement for 24 metres between first floor to ground floor rear windows, and this is considered acceptable.

7.18 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal on balance would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and on balance 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) Parking and Hampshire Highways

7.19 The dwelling, would go from a 3 bedroom to a 4 bedroom dwelling, with regards to occupancy. This would require 3 parking spaces. The proposal to widen the dropped kerb has been removed during the application process. This application seeks to provide porous hardstanding if permission was forthcoming, the plans have shown that 3 parking spaces would be able to be provided which would meet the requirement of the Havant Parking SPD. Due to the application originally proposing additional dropped kerb, Hampshire Highways was consulted during the application process. They stated "*The applicant seeks to extend the vehicle crossover to the application site, however no existing or proposed plans with dimensions have been provided. The applicant is required to submit plans which present the existing and proposed dimensions of the vehicle crossover. Further comments will be provided upon receipt of the above information.*" Due to the proposed widened dropped kerb being removed during the application process, this proposal is considered to accord with the Havant Parking SPD and Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(v) Ecology

- 7.20 Due to large scale works at first floor level to the roof of the dwelling, the Council's Ecologist was consulted during the application process, with regards to bats. In light of this, the Council's Ecologist stated "*Modern bungalow with tight-fitting concrete interlocking tiles. No reason to suggest there is anything to be concerned about*". In light of this, officers are satisfied that the works would be acceptable with regards to potential risks to bats. Furthermore, the HBIC has found that the application site is within 50 metres of a notable and protected species; Grey Wagtail. However in light of the scale of the works, officers are of the opinion that the impacts would likely be acceptable upon this species. With regards to these concerns, officers consider that this proposal would be acceptable with regards to ecology and would accord with policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(vi) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.20 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is on balance acceptable in principle, is on balance appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and would have a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00513

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:

LOCATION PLAN: Uploaded 5/7/24

AMENDED BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 12/11/24

AMENDED PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS Drawing

Number: 8067.24.2 REV D: Uploaded 12/11/24

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the hereby approved plans, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 The car parking, shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the extensions being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.