
Site Address: 21 Berkeley Square, Havant, PO9 2RT
Proposal: Single storey front and rear extensions, new roof with rear and front dormers. Glass full height entrance, new bay windows, new roof over garage, brick finish with black window frames and doors, grey cladding.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/22/00319 Expiry Date: 24/05/2022
Applicant: Mr Tigwell
Agent: Mr Rosenthal Case Officer: Selina Donophy
Rosenthal Design Services Ltd
Ward: St Faiths

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

This application site is a detached bungalow located on the north side of Berkeley Square, Havant. This property has a hipped roof with a top gablets to the top and projects forward with front bay windows. Towards the front is a lawn and driveway leading to the garage located to the side of the property. The dwelling would have originally matched with no 27 , although no 27 has undergone development. The area is residential in character.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Single storey front and rear extensions, new roof with rear and front dormers. Glass full height entrance, new bay windows, new roof over garage, brick finish with black window frames and doors, grey cladding.

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

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)

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

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Councillor Imogen Payter

No comment

Councillor J Branson - St Faiths

No comment

Councillor T Pike - St Faith's

No comment

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: 9

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

Comment	Officer Comment
Comment:I have looked over the plans and its hard to see from the plans if the original front building on the right as you look at the property is being extended out or not? if it is I would object to this - it wouldn't be in line with the other properties along the same side of the street. Secondly i don't agree with the current parking statement - it would affect the parking as the drive would be taken up by the proposed front extension on the left side as you look at the property. I also massively object to the use of Black - Black windows and Black Cladding - this is not in keeping with the colours of all the properties in Berkeley Square and I feel we would lose some of the character of the Square by having such a colour implemented - I believe a Grey would be better and much more in keeping. Lastly I think the whole structure is vast and imposing - the property is far too small to have such a	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

large extension done to it - the front will not be in keeping with the rest of the Square and certainly not the glass frontage being proposed. I think these plans need to be looked at again in the keeping with the area and the size of the bungalows in the square.

Case Officer comment - Further comment receiving following submission of amended plans :

Comment: I do not see much difference in the original proposal to the new proposal so my issues still stand:

The drive will be too small to have 2 cars/vans - the angle of the drive and the amount of room that will be left after the left extension is not enough to get 2 vehicles on there - therefore the cars will be parked on the road which is already over populated with cars. Drives should not be lost for

properties to have a front extension. The elevations are massively oversized - they are not dormers - the back is basically a double storey extension!

The 1st floor levels are far too big for the size of the bungalow and the area of The Square and its not in keeping with the look of The Square.

And I am still massively opposed to the black cladding - its not in keeping with the style of the properties in The Square.

If all the bungalows in the Square had this type of extension done on them then the street would be full of houses and not bungalows. Don't see why this property needs to have such a vast extension and change to it. The character and the reasons people have moved to the area is being lost due to people moving in and wanting to double the floor space of the property.

Case Officer comment : Additional

Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

Cladding now shown in grey.

<i>comments received following submission of amended plans showing cladding .</i> Im responding to the response from the applicants about the fact they have spoken to immediate neighbours on this - this massive imposing structure actually affects most of Berkeley Square. The front is seen by people entering the Square but also the people opposite but the main issues with the vast structure at the back actually affects many of Berkeley Square residents. The garden of this property backs on to and is connected both by boundary walls and overlooked by at least 8 separate properties. Other applications that have been granted in Berkeley Square for back dormers have only been for properties with no one at the back of them. I implore you to take this into account. This will affect many people in Berkeley Square. Also I would like to draw to your attention to a vast structure that has already been built by the residents at the bottom of their garden which i believe does not adhere to regulations for buildings allowed to be built free standing. I urge you to do a home visit on this property to make sure this does/does not confirm to Council building regulations.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report This matter does not relate to the current application and would need to be considered separately.
We strongly oppose this planning application especially the front extension and raised roof. If this extension is approved it will greatly reduce the light into our living room and the outlook would be awful as we have a 6ft x 4ft window on the east wall as indicated on the enclosed plan and it would make our living room dull and dingy. The black cladding will be out of keeping with the square.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

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) CIL

(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 proposal has been altered following its initial submission with the rear dormer reduced in scale and bathroom and rear bedroom layout swapped across. This proposal comprises a range of alterations including a new roof with a raised ridge height with approximately 0.4 metres height increase, the property would be extended towards the front with the new roof above resulting in a much deeper roof pitch than existing. In addition the roof would no longer be hipped and would now form full gables to both sides. The front extension would have a depth of approximately 4.5 metres coming level with what is currently the master bedroom. This space would form a lounge area served by a front bay window. The proposal also includes a rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory - it would have a similar depth with a parapet roof with a height of approximately 3.1 metres with a raised lantern rooflight.

7.4 Other elements of the proposal include 3 dormers to the front roof slope. Two of these would have hipped back roofs and the centrally sited dormer would have a full pitched roof with glazing and would form the landing. The two other dormers would form bedrooms. To the rear would be a larger, flat roof dormer with a hipped back roof. This would have three windows, one serving an ensuite and the other two serving the rear master bedroom. There would be one window to the east side elevation serving a bathroom. Materials would comprise of brickwork to match existing, grey slate tile to the roof and grey vertical cladding to the dormers. The garage roof would be altered from a flat roof to a pitched roof and a woodburning flue would also be added.

7.5 This proposal would result in a property of a much altered appearance from existing. The property would be significantly deeper with a now pitched roof and dormers to the front and rear. The properties to the east, nos 23 and 25 both have chalet style pitched roofs with flat roof dormers to the front elevations. No 50 opposite also has pitched roof dormers to the front roof slope and therefore these aspects of the proposal are reflected elsewhere in the immediate streetscene. It is noted that the pitched roof properties to the east have shallower roof pitches, however again there is a mixture in roof pitches, and styles in the immediate area and not one set pattern of development in terms of building design. The front dormers would sit back in the roof and are considered to be subservient within the roof slope. The proposal is considered to be generally in keeping with the varied building styles, heights and roof designs in the surrounding area and not deemed to result in harm to the character of the area.

7.6 The rear dormer is large in scale, although it's set down from the ridge and up from

the eaves. Whilst it is not deemed to be a wholly subservient addition to the roof, it would be located to the rear of the property where it would not be a visible feature from the street. Due to the limited impact on the streetscene, on balance this dormer is considered an acceptable addition within this context.

- 7.7 In the immediate area it is noted that materials mainly comprise of brown concrete roof tile and brick and render to the elevations - whilst the brickwork would remain, a grey slate roof tile is proposed, similar in appearance to no 50 on the other side of the road. Whilst a grey slate roof would be different in appearance to the prevailing material palette in the streetscene, it is not considered to result in harm to the character of the area, noting the existence of this material already in use in the road. The proposed grey cladding would only be used on the dormers and therefore would not be a visually prominent element of the front elevation - there would be more cladding used on the rear dormer however the rear elevation would not be highly visible from the public realm.
- 7.8 The design and appearance of the proposal is 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). 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

- 7.9 To the east of the application site is no 23 Berkeley Square. This property has two windows on the side elevation facing back towards no 21 at first floor level which both serve bedrooms. It is noted these rooms are dual aspect with dormer windows to the front and rear elevations also serving these rooms. The ground floor side elevation windows are already impacted in terms of outlook and light by the existing building line of no 21. This ground floor lounge window is also dual aspect, served by another window to the front elevation. Towards the rear the proposed extension would be similar in depth to the existing conservatory and whilst there would be an increase in height, something similar could be constructed without planning permission under permitted development. The side elevation bathroom window would be top opening and obscure glazed, secured via condition.
- 7.10 To the west of the application site is no 19 Berkeley Square. This is a detached bungalow which has been extended over the years and has a garden area now mainly towards the front and side of the dwelling. Between the rear elevation and the rear curtilage of the site is a small private patio area. To the side of no 19 runs a driveway with a garage in the north east corner which sits adjacent to the garage at no 21. The roof extensions proposed would result in an increase in roof bulk and would evidently be highly visible from the patio area however would be separated by the two garages and, again whilst resulting the loss of some morning light especially during the winter months when the sun is lower in the sky this already occurs to some degree with the existing roof of no 21. Noting above some impact on loss of light and impact on outlook, the roof would be separated by a reasonable degree so as not to result in overbearing impact and the patio area would still receive adequate light for the impact to be deemed acceptable. The pitched roof proposed to the garage roof would add a 1.8 metre height increase of the roof at ridge height however this would be set off by the garage at no 19 and would be set lower than the main roof at no 21 so the impact of the garage and main roof alterations are not deemed harmful enough to justify a refusal for the reasons outlined above.
- 7.11 There are also no windows on the rear elevation of no 19 and only one window facing

no 21 which is set further back . There is a lounge window on the side elevation of no 19 facing back towards the application site which would have outlooks directly on to the proposed front extension. The impact on this window has been assessed and this window is dual aspect , also served by a window to the front elevation. There is a reasonable set off distance of approximately 6 metres between the side elevation of no 19 and the side elevation of the front extension proposed at no 21. As this room would receive light from both the east and the south it is deemed there would not be a harmful reduction in light received by this room.

7.12 To the rear of the site are the rear gardens of no's 13-17 to the west and to the north the rear garden of no 3 Berkeley Square. In regards to impact on no 3 there would be over 40 metres separation distance between these properties which exceeds the minimum back to back distance as stipulated in the Havant Design SPD in order to mitigate against overlooking. The relationship with the properties to the west is not a back to back relationship and any views would be towards the rear gardens .The bathroom window would now be sited on the west most side of the property which would be obscure glazed and therefore the views from the rear bedroom windows would be set off the west side boundary and would be more indirect. There are also existing dormers on the rear elevations of the properties to the east offering views back towards the rear. Whilst the extensions would evidently be a visible feature from the rear gardens of surrounding properties, any overlooking impact is not considered to be materially harmful to result in a justification for refusal. The extensions would be sited at the rear of the gardens of properties to the west so would not result in harmful overshadowing.

7.13 The proposed wood burning flue would not come above the ridge line and therefore could be added without planning permission. Despite this Environmental Health have provided an informative relating to pollution - please see the attached informative.

7.14 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking 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).

(iv) Parking

7.15 The proposal would result in a 3 bedroom property which requires 2 on site parking spaces as stipulated in the Havant Parking SPD. The existing front garden would be block paved to allow for these 2 parking spaces which would meet the parking allocation criteria.

(v) CIL

7.16 This proposal would result in 177m² additional floorspace which would result in a CIL liability sum of £14,762.14 . The applicant has submitted a claim of self build relief.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00319

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:

06 Amended proposed elevations uploaded on the 20.07.2022
02 Amended ground floor uploaded on the 20.07.2022
03 Amended proposed first floor uploaded on the 20.07.2022
04 Amended proposed roof uploaded on the 20.07.2022
07 Amended streetscene uploaded on the 20.07.2022
06 Site and Location Plan uploaded 20.04.2022
Marley modern roof tile uploaded on the 14.07.2022

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the extensions hereby permitted 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.
- 4 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the hereby approved elevations, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable. Materials shall comprise of those stipulated and as shown on the approved elevations and shall include :
Roof tile- Marley modern roof tile in grey
Cladding - Composite cladding in grey..
Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
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.
- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the bathroom window in the first floor on the side elevation facing east shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and 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.