

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address: 50 Andrew Crescent, Waterlooville, PO7 6BG
Proposal: Single storey side/rear extension and loft conversion with side dormers.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00506 Expiry Date: 24/09/2024
Applicant: Mr Kai Razzell
Agent: Mr D Treagus Case Officer: Robert Riley
 Derek Treagus Associates
Ward: Waterloo

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is located on the northwestern side of Andrew Crescent and is occupied by a detached single storey bungalow. The property features light green render to the front elevation at ground floor level, with brown tilework for the gable, it also features brown brickwork to other elevations at ground floor level. The property features a gable pitch designed roof with brown concrete tiles. Parking is currently provided by a long driveway to the side of the dwelling.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character comprising of bungalows of varying styles and design with numerous dormer additions in evidence.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant history

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Single storey side/rear extension and loft conversion with side dormers. This application also proposes first floor windows to the front and rear gable which would fall under permitted development rights. This application also proposes the demolition of the existing rear extension.

Officer Note

- 3.2 During the application process, the side dormers have been reduced in both width, depth and height. The fenestration has also been altered on the plans to feature high level windows to serve the master bedroom and bedroom 3 , a fixed obscure window to serve the landing and an obscure bathroom window only openable with fanlights at 1.7 metres cill height.

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 Gwen Robinson

No comments received

Councillor Peter Wade

No comments received

Councillor Ryan Brent

No comments received

Ecologist

This looks fine also. Modern bungalow with interlocking concrete roof tiles and the gable end hanging tiles appear in sound condition. No justification for further information

Building Control

Further to our telephone conversation I can confirm that the arrangement on the first floor in regards to the means of escape windows proposed for the bedrooms would be acceptable from a Building Regulations perspective. Therefore, it would be highly unlikely that there would be any changes required at the Building Regulation application stage that would have an impact on the proposal.

With this proposal it would also not be necessary to have fire doors within the hallway of the dwelling.

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: 3 objections

Comment	Officer Comment
Comment about overlooking resulting from the proposed side dormers, and side of property being overshadowed from side dormers aspect of the works.	Concern is noted, and impact on neighbouring properties is assessed in section 7.
Comment about side dormer allowing sight lines into rooms and rear garden and worsening existing high level of privacy.	See point above.
After viewing the planning application, the front parking would not fit in to the current street scene with 3 cars would seem overbearing to the front of the property.	The proposed parking would meet the Havant Parking SPD's standards the front area is already hard surfaced although changes would be needed for parking. See part 7
The side dormer elevations would intrude in to neighbouring properties privacy .	Comment about overlooking is noted, and overlooking is assessed in section 7.
The design proposed is overbearing to the existing neighbourhood	Comment about design is noted, and is assessed in section 7.

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) Ecology
- (v) Parking
- (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

Character, bulk and the streetscene

7.3 The works would be readily visible upon the streetscene with regard to the side dormer aspects of the works, the addition of a front window to the first floor and the side extension would also be visible.

- 7.4 The works would feature a loft conversion, this is able to be done under permitted development rights and is considered acceptable, the proposed dormers are considered below. Moreover, this application proposes 2 No windows to the front and rear of the existing gable, these are both able to be done under permitted development rights and are considered acceptable.
- 7.5 The rear extension would not be readily visible in the streetscene. It would part replace an existing rear pitched roof extension. The proposed rear extension would feature a flat roof design with an approximate height of 2.6 metres and a proposed approximate depth of 2 metres. Regarding that it would not be readily visible on the streetscene, its modest depth and modest height, it is considered to be subservient to the main dwelling and considered to be an acceptable addition regarding the main dwelling. The rear extensions impact on the character of the area is considered acceptable.
- 7.6 The side extension would be readily visible on the streetscene. It would feature a flat roof design. It would feature a proposed approximate width of 2.2 metres (2.4 metres with roof overhang) a proposed approximate maximum height of 2.7 metres and a proposed depth of approximately 11.2 metres. Although it is noted that the single storey side extension would be close to the common boundary with No.52, its single storey flat roofed nature and the gap to No.52 afforded by that properties drive would help to reduce any concerns in relation to a potential 'terracing effect'. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states *"Single storey extensions should therefore be at least 1 metre from the boundary with adjacent properties"*. Although the proposed single storey side extension would be within a metre of the boundary it is noted, that there would still be approximately a 2.4 metre separation distance between Nos 50 and 52 Andrew Crescent's side walls, and that the side extension aspect were it not to be connected as effectively a wraparound extension would be able to be built under permitted development rights. In consideration of the above points, it is not considered that this side extension to warrant a refusal of the application, and on balance can be seen to be an acceptable addition.
- 7.7 The application also proposes side dormers. These proposed side dormers have been amended in width, depth and height during the application process. They are proposed to feature further set back from the eaves line and are proposed to be set down from the ridge line in amended plans. They would feature a proposed approximate depth of 9.5 metres, a proposed approximate width of 2.3 metres (2.8 metres including roof overhang) and a proposed maximum approximate height of 1.9 metres. They would also be set off 0.1 metres from the ridge line and 1.3 metres from the eaves line.
- 7.8 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states *"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"*. It also states that works should *"look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such as ridge, verge and eave finishes, head and cills, brick coursing, dressings and quoin work"*.
- 7.9 The proposed dormers in superseded plans were considered to be overbearing and dominant upon the dwelling, and would provide dormers that would effectively make this dwelling a flat roof property, were permission to be forthcoming and would not be in keeping with the existing dwelling.
- 7.10 These proposed dormers have been reduced in size during the application process. The proposed dormers would be a large addition to both roof slopes of No.50 Andrew

Crescent, they would furthermore not feature pitched roofs or be in keeping with the existing roof.

- 7.11 Policy CS16 High Quality Design states that development should "*Use the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors*". It is noted that this street mainly features bungalows, many with rooms in the roof and dormers. Nearby No.69 Andrew Crescent features side dormers of a similar scale to the current proposal to No.50, furthermore, Nos 79 and 81 both feature significant front and rear dormers and both Nos 44 and 36 feature a significant side dormer to one side of the roofslope. Regarding this, although it is noted that these roofslope additions would not be in keeping with the existing roofslope, it is considered that (when taking account of the character of dormers already on the streetscene), these proposed side dormers would not be out of character with the established pattern of development and a refusal of planning permission would not in this case be justified.

Materials

- 7.12 The works would feature brickwork and render to match the existing dwellinghouse and for the proposed roof works to feature EPDM, these materials are considered acceptable. The dormer walls have been confirmed in an email to feature "vertical tile hanging, colour and texture to match existing", which is 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 considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy 2011). It is considered that the scheme on balance would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.14 To the southwestern, northeastern and northwestern sides of the application site, are Nos 52 and 48 Andrew Crescent and No.70 Charlesworth Drive. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these two properties. Due to the nature scale and location of the works and as the proposed front window would face the public realm, properties to the front of the application site are considered to be acceptably impacted. The proposed loft conversion is able to be built under permitted development rights and is also considered to have an acceptable neighbourly impact. The proposed first floor front and rear windows to the gable would both be able to be built under permitted development rights, and are unable to be assessed as part of this application.

No.52 Andrew Crescent

- 7.15 To the southwestern side of the application site is No.52 Andrew Crescent. The proposed side extension aspect of the works would not feature any fenestration facing No.52, and it is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. The side extension would be approximately 0.15m away from No.52's curtilage, in consideration of the proposed modest height of the side extension (2.7 metres), a proposed side wall to side wall elevation separation distance of approximately 2.4 metres and that impacts would be primarily felt upon No.52's driveway, officers consider that overbearing and overshadowing impacts would not be unacceptable. The rear extension would not feature any fenestration facing No.48 and any oblique views

facing No.52 would face boundary treatment and is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. The rear extension aspect of the works would be approximately 0.15 metres from No.52's curtilage, however, in consideration that it would primarily impact the driveway of No.52, its impact is not considered unacceptable regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns. The rear extension would feature rear fenestration, however, this would face the rear garden of No.50 and any oblique views facing No.52 would face boundary treatment. In light of this, the rear extension is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns.

- 7.16 The proposed side dormers have been considered important to assess regarding No.52 Andrew Crescent. The proposed dormer on the northeastern side would face No.48 Andrew Crescent, and would be shielded by No.50 Andrew Crescent, in light of this, this dormer is considered to acceptably impact No.52 Andrew Crescent. The proposed dormer on the southwestern side would feature an approximate 5.4 metre separation distance from No.52's side wall and would feature an approximate 2.4 metre separation distance from No.52's curtilage. In consideration that overbearing and overshadowing impacts would primarily impact the driveway, and in consideration of the separation distance, on balance, it is considered that impacts would not be so unacceptable to warrant the refusal of this planning application. Regarding overlooking concerns, the proposed side dormer would feature a window to serve a bathroom to be conditioned to be obscure, only openable at a fanlight above 1.7 metres. in light of this, this window is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. The proposed dormer on the southwestern side would also feature a window to serve a bedroom. This window would be clear glazed, however, it would face the roofplane of No.52 and oblique views at its proposed location would provide some views of a ground floor window towards the centre of No.52's side elevation, this window is obscured, and is considered to be acceptably impacted.

No.48 Andrew Crescent

- 7.17 To the northeastern side of the application site is No.48 Andrew Crescent. The side extension would be shielded by the existing dwelling and would not impact No.48 and is considered acceptable in this regard. The rear extension would not feature any fenestration facing No.48 and is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. The rear extension is considered to feature a sufficient separation distance from No.48's curtilage to prevent unacceptable overshadowing and overbearing concerns. The dormer to the southwestern side of the application site would acceptably impact No.48 Andrew Crescent and is considered acceptable in this regard. The dormer to the northeastern side of the application site would feature a separation distance from No.48 of approximately 11.2 metres, at this distance, overshadowing and overbearing impacts would be acceptable. The dormer to the northeastern side of the application site would feature 3 windows. The plans have been amended in order to show the rear window of this dormer (serving a master bedroom) and the front window (serving bedroom 3) to be high level, these will be conditioned to feature a minimum height of 1.7 metres from finished floor level if permission is forthcoming to prevent views of No.48's rear garden space, side small windows and conservatory and in consideration of this, these windows are considered to have an acceptable impact. There would also be a window on the dormer to serve a landing, this will be conditioned to be obscure and fixed, which was agreed in an email by the agent and is considered to have an acceptable impact in light of this.

No.70 Charlesworth Drive

- 7.18 To the northwestern side of the application site is No.70 Charlesworth Drive. The

dormers would not feature any fenestration facing No.72 and would not increase overlooking of this property. Furthermore, they are considered to have a sufficient separation distance from No.72's curtilage, that they would have acceptable impacts regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns. The side extension aspect of the works would not feature any fenestration facing No.72, and furthermore is considered to feature a sufficient separation distance from No.72 to prevent unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing impacts and is considered to have an acceptable impact on No.72. The rear extension would feature fenestration facing No.72, however due to the existing boundary treatment on site, it is considered to have an acceptable impact. Furthermore, as the rear extension would be single storey, would feature a modest height of approximately 2.7 metres and would feature a separation distance from No.72's curtilage of approximately 10.9 metres it is considered to have acceptable impacts regarding overbearing and overshadowing concerns.

- 7.19 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy 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 2011). It is noted 3 letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Ecology

- 7.20 Due to proposed significant works to the roofslopes, the ecologist was consulted regarding potential risk to protected bat species. Regarding this, the ecologist stated *"This looks fine also. Modern bungalow with interlocking concrete roof tiles and the gable end hanging tiles appear in sound condition. No justification for further information"*. In light of these comments, this proposal is considered to accord with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011), and is considered acceptable regarding ecological concerns.

(v) Parking

- 7.21 The works would increase the number of bedrooms on site from 2 to 5. This would require 3 parking spaces on site to accord with the Havant Parking SPD. This has been shown on the plans and this proposal is considered to accord with the Havant Parking SPD and Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(vi) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.22 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 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/24/00506

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:

Drawing Number: 24/390/03 C :AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS with section plan: Uploaded 29/10/24

Drawing Number: 24/390/02 A :AMENDED PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR FLOOR PLAN: Uploaded 17/10/24

Drawing Number: 24/390/04 B :AMENDED PROPOSED SITE PLAN, PROPOSED PARKING PLAN, LOCATION PLAN, EXISTING FLOOR PLAN and EXISTING ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 15/10/24

Drawing Number: 24/390/01 REV A PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR: Uploaded 1/10/24

Email dated 25th October 2024 from Agent confirming dormer materials

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans and details, 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 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, the 2 north-eastern (side) dormer windows serving the master bedroom and bedroom 3 on the plans hereby approved shall have a cill height that is no less than 1.7 metres above finished floor level and shall be retained as such thereafter.

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

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the works hereby permitted the window proposed for the north-eastern (side) dormer serving a landing/stairs shall be non-opening and feature textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core

Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework

- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, the window serving the south-western (side) dormer serving a bathroom on the plans hereby approved shall be fitted with textured glass, which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter, with only fanlights to feature a minimum 1.7m cill height above finished floor level to be openable.

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