
Site Address: 48 Fir Copse Road, Waterloooville, PO7 5HZ
Proposal: One and half storey rear extension off the back of a bungalow with raised roof height.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00174 Expiry Date: 22/05/2024
Applicant: Mr Williams
Agent: Mr Rosenthal Case Officer: Ikrame Essalih
 Rosenthal Design Services Ltd
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 48 Fir Copse Road, Waterloooville is semi-detached bungalow constructed in off-white walls with roughcast finish, and a hipped roof with concrete slate tiles in grey colour and rustic red hips and ridge. To the front area of the property is a paved driveway leading to the rear garden and allowing for approximately two car parking spaces, a paved area and a retained grass area. The rear garden comprises a patio closer to the main building, a grass area with an existing tree in the middle, and two outbuildings, one to the north side and one to the rear. The different areas of the rear garden are connected through paved steps due to the sloping characteristic from west to east of the application site.
- 1.2 The boundary treatment consists of a low brick wall to the front, and standard wood fencing of approximately 1.8 metres to the north side boundaries of the rear garden, coupled with thick hedging to the south side, and tall trees with tall hedges to the west rear boundaries.
- 1.3 The surrounding area is mainly residential in character with a mix of semi-detached bungalows with hipped roofs and two-storey dwellinghouses.

2 Planning History

None relevant.

3 Proposal

The proposal comprises the construction of a rear extension at ground floor and first floor level forming a one and half storey new built with a raised roof ridge height and resulting in the creation of accommodation in the roof space of the existing bungalow.

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

CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
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)
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 Husky Patel

No comments received.

Councillor Ms C Diamond - Purbrook Ward

This would be overdevelopment of the site. Impact on neighbouring properties. Not in keeping with the area.

Conclusion: **OBJECTION**

Councillor Ryan Brent

No comments received.

Environment Agency

No comments received.

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre

Within 50m - Priority habitat - Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland
Within 50m - SINC - Sandy Dell
Within 50m - Moving watercourse

***Officer Comment:** these designations relate to the woodland located to the east (rear) of the application site. This area is not considered to be impacted by the proposed domestic scale development.*

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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 5 (2 from same address)

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>Objections</u> to the scheme:	
1. Highway, health, safety and traffic issues as building works in the property would increase obstruction to public pavement.	(1) and (2) These comments are not material consideration in the planning application. The residents are advised to contact the relevant services to address these issues.
2. Untidy site, running business from home and concerns regarding noise and fumes.	
3. Oversized proposed building/ Overdevelopment of the site	(3) , (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) Noted. These comments are addressed in planning consideration section.
4. Loss of privacy and overlooking due to the addition of a floor level with a side dormer and as application site is located uphill.	
5. Loss of light and overshadowing to adjoining properties	
6. Excessive mass, bulk and disproportionate increase of building footprint	
7. Adverse impact on neighbouring properties and streetscene	
8. Not in keeping with the area	

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 matters
- (v) Flood risk
- (vi) CIL
- (vii) Third-party comments

(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 proposed development consists of the demolition of the existing kitchen and part of the dining area at ground floor level and the construction of a ground floor extension incorporating a large kitchen/dining area and a first-floor extension with two bedrooms and a bathroom. The ground floor extension would be of a regular shape with a width of approximately 5.43 metres, a depth of approximately 8.89 metres and would be served by two windows on the north side and a rear bi-fold doors facing the garden. The proposed works would also result in an increase of the roof ridge height and alteration to the roof design from hipped to gable style to create an upper floor space to accommodate for the proposed two bedrooms and bathroom. The development would result in an overall height at rear elevation of approximately 5.91 metres in comparison to the overall height of the existing flat roof rear extension of approximately 3.1 metres. Assessing the overall design proposal and taking into consideration, the change in height at rear and side elevations, the depth of the proposed extension, the significant increase of the building footprint as well as the addition of an upper floor level as part of the rear extension, it is deemed that the proposed works would be dominant and out of context of the main dwellinghouse.
- 7.4 Although the development would be mainly located at the rear of the property, the amount of development is considered excessive and would adversely alter the original character of the dwellinghouse from a hipped roof bungalow to a two-storey dwellinghouse appearance with a significant height increase and bulk; this is also due to the sloping nature of the land going down towards the rear garden. Furthermore, from the main front elevation point of view, the increased roof ridge height would create an out of context roof shape which is considered of poor design.
- 7.5 Additionally, considering the neighbouring properties of similar types, the proposed side dormer and the construction of an extension comparable to a two-storey extension in height and mass is considered out character vis-à-vis the streetscene design and the character of the area.
- 7.6 The NPPF states in part 12 *Achieving well-designed and beautiful places* states:

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, all local planning authorities should prepare design guides or codes consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, and which reflect local character and design preferences. Design guides and codes provide a local framework for creating beautiful and distinctive places with a consistent and high quality standard of design.

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

- 7.7 The proposal has been assessed against the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 which states:

5.35 In general, an extension should not be bigger than the main building and therefore should appear smaller in mass and height. Extensions should look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such ridge, verge and eave finishes, head and cills, brick coursing, dressings and quoin work. The positions and proportions of solid wall to opening of windows and doors is also important. The roof form and slope should also reflect that of the main building. The proposal fails to meet these criteria and in particular the raised ridge and eaves height, significant mass of tall walls all result in a dominant development to the harm of the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area.

- 7.8 Consequently, the design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate to the context of the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, conflicting with the requirements of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core strategy) and the guidance of Havant Borough Design Guide SPD and the NPPF. It is considered that the scheme would result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.9 The proposed development is mainly located to the rear of the property, albeit the proposed side dormer and roof alteration would be noticeable from the public realm.
- 7.10 The closest property to application site from the north side is No.50 Fir Copse Road. Due to the proximity of the properties and the existing bungalow character, it is considered that the proposed double floor rear extension would be overbearing due to the increased height at side and rear elevations, the application site sitting on higher ground and the depth of the proposed building. Furthermore, the proposed side dormer would be facing this adjacent property. Although it is arguable that there is a direct view inside the adjacent building, due to the angle of the rooflights and the position of the proposed dormer, it is considered that there would be potential overlooking onto the neighbouring property. Due to the installation of a side dormer serving a bedroom at the upper floor level, the private amenity space to the rear of the adjacent property would be directly overlooked, resulting in loss of privacy to the adjacent residents.
- 7.11 To the south side, is the adjoining property at No.46. Although it is noted that there is existing hedging at the side boundary, due to the proximity of the two sites and of the proposed construction to boundary line, it is considered that the increased height and the overall mass of the proposed extension would be overbearing and would result in an adverse impact of overshadowing and loss of light to this neighbouring property.

7.12 The Havant Borough Design Guide comments on rear extensions stating:

5.41 Rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building. They also need to have particular regard to neighbouring properties and should not cause an adverse affect, such as overshadowing.

7.13 To the rear of the property is a woodland while it is considered that the properties facing the application site to the west are located at a sufficient distance to avoid any adverse impact resulting from the proposed works.

7.14 Considering all of the above, it is deemed that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the immediately adjacent properties due to the overbearing aspect of the scheme, the potential overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of daylight, therefore conflicting with the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and the Borough Design Guide.

(iv) Parking matters

7.15 The proposal would result in the addition of one bedroom to the existing two bedrooms. Currently the front paved area and the driveway accommodate two car parking spaces. Considering the minimum requirement of car parking spaces for two to three bedroom properties, it is deemed that the current provision of car parking spaces would be concurring with Havant Borough Council Parking SPD and Policy DM13 of Havant Borough Council Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(v) Flood risk

7.16 Part of the rear garden at the application site is located within the Flood Zone 2 and 3. The proposal includes an increase in ridge height and an additional floor space at ground floor and upper floor levels. A flood risk assessment form has been submitted by the applicant indicating that the development is considered to have a low flood risk, however the submission confirms that floor mitigation will be provided in relation to floor levels and flood proofing where appropriate. Based on the submitted plans and provided information, it is deemed that the proposal would not result in an increase of flood risk meeting the requirements of Policy CS15 and Policy DM9 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(vi) CIL

7.17 The proposed works would result in a net gain of residential floor space of less than 100 sqm, therefore it is not CIL liable.

(vii) Third-party comments

7.18 Every planning application is assessed on its own merits, therefore concerns regarding untidiness of the site, building works, parking provision for builders and materials, health and safety issues would not be justifiable reasons to refuse this planning application.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal is considered inappropriate in terms of design and would have significant and adverse impact on the character of the area and the neighbouring amenities and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00174, for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed development would by reason of its design, height, mass and bulk result in an unacceptable form of development to the harm of the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. The increase in roof ridge height, building footprint, eaves height and the overall building mass would have an overbearing impact on the adjacent properties and would lead to adverse loss of daylight to the adjacent property at No.46 Fir Copse Road. Furthermore, the proposed side dormer would result in harmful overlooking to the private amenity space at the rear of No.50 Fir Copse Road. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.