

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Andrew Briggs

No comments received

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

Please be advised that I wish to RED CARD the above planning application for the following reasons.

1. This new application is virtually the same as the previous one that was withdrawn
2. The size of the dormer windows is visually offensive in planning terms and detrimental to the street scene.
3. The proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the other three similarly designed bungalows that sit on either side of the application site, and it will look incongruous, contrived and ugly in comparison.
4. The plans presented represent an overdevelopment of the site.

Councillor Neil Bowdell - Cowplain

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: 9

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 13

Summary of Objections - 12 letters of objection received in total:

Application design is similar to previous application
Out of keeping with surrounding bungalows and area
Loss of privacy and overlooking
Unattractive, overdevelopment of the site
Inappropriate Mass and Scale
Cause overshadowing to adjacent neighbouring property

Out of keeping with area, no other loft conversions.
Set precedent for similar type of development
Devaluation of property - *Not a planning consideration*
Lack of parking
Highway safety
Conflict with National and Local Policies
Not suitable within the existing sky line

Summary of support - 1 representation of Support received

Design similar to other development on Hazleton Estate
In keeping with other roof conversions in local 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

(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

Roof Alterations:

7.3 Proposed alterations to the roof include a raised ridge to allow for habitable space at first floor level. The ridge would be raised by approximately 1.3 metres. Dormers are also proposed to both side roof slopes. These would have flat roofs with dimensions of approximately 10.35 metres width, 2.5 metre depth and 2.1 metre height. The roof extensions would provide for two bedrooms, one at the front and one at the rear. The front bedroom would be served by a window proposed to the principal elevation at first floor level as well as a window within the eastern side dormer. A window within the western side dormer would serve the ensuite for the front bedroom. Between the bedrooms a stairwell with a window proposed to the eastern dormer and a bathroom proposed to the western side elevation with a window proposed within the western dormer - this would create a total of 2no. windows to each side dormer. The rear bedroom at first floor level would be served by windows within the rear gable at first floor level. The proposed materials include tiles to the roof to match those existing, cladding to the dormer elevations and gable ends.

- 7.4 The proposed raised ridge height would result in a property with a significantly altered roof pitch, height and style to those in the immediate surrounding area. The surrounding properties consist of similarly designed bungalows which have remained unaltered at roof level and form the prevailing pattern of development within the streetscene. For this reason, the raised ridge alone would disrupt this pattern of development. Furthermore, the proposed dormers are long at 10.35 metres wide and whilst they are set up from the eaves and below the ridge, they are large and dominant in scale, spanning almost the entire depth of the property with a flat roof design, resulting in a bulky form and are not considered to be subservient. Furthermore, the dormers are deemed to conflict with much of the design guidance as specified in the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD which states the following:

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.

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.

- 7.5 The alterations to the roof are therefore considered out of keeping with both the host dwelling and the properties in the surrounding area. The proposed roof alterations are deemed incongruous, they would not respect the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene and would be harmful to the visual amenity of the immediate locality and wider roofscape.
- 7.6 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy) and the Havant Borough Design Guide.

Proposed Rear/side Extension:

- 7.7 A single storey flat roof extension is proposed to the rear eastern side elevation of the property. The proposed extension would be attached to the existing flat roof garage and would have a total depth of 9.6 metres with a width of 4.8m, it would project 2m from the rear building line of the dwelling. The flat roof would have a proposed 3m height. The proposed materials include face brick work to match the existing property. The proposed extension would not be readily visible from the streetscene due to its location to the rear eastern side of the property.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 The proposed dormer windows to the eastern elevation serve a stairwell and the front bedroom (not a primary light source for the bedroom), the dormer windows to the western elevation are proposed to serve an ensuite and bathroom. Should the application have received a recommendation for planning approval these windows would be conditioned to ensure that they are and are to remain obscurely glazed. This would alleviate any overlooking and loss of privacy concerns from the dormer windows.
- 7.9 The neighbouring properties to the front would have a distance of 25 metres from the proposed roof alterations, the proposed gable window at first floor level would face onto the frontages which are already visible from the public domain.

- 7.10 Adjacent the north east boundary of the application site is No. 5 Celandine Avenue. The proposed gable window to the rear would have an approximate 37 metre distance to the rear facing elevation of this neighbouring property. Therefore, meeting the separation requirement as specified in the Havant Design Guide SPD whereby a minimum separation distance of 20 metres would be required. It is also noted that there is footpath access between the properties. It is therefore considered the proposed roof alterations would have a minimum and acceptable impact upon this neighbouring property.
- 7.11 Adjacent the north west boundary of the application site is No. 4 Erica Close. The proposed gable window to the rear would have an approximate 26 metre distance to the rear facing elevation of this neighbouring property. Therefore, meeting the separation requirement as specified in the Havant Design Guide SPD whereby a minimum separation distance of 20 metres would be required. It is also noted that there is footpath access between the properties. It is therefore considered the proposed roof alterations would have a minimum and acceptable impact upon this neighbouring property.
- 7.12 To the north west boundary of the application site is No. 2 Erica Close. There would be an approximate 15.5 metre separation from the rear of the application site to the rear elevation of No.2, the view would be considered oblique as No.2 is angled away and is considered not to result in a material loss of privacy to this neighbouring property.
- 7.13 To the east of the application site is no 8 Marjoram Crescent. The proposed roof alterations are not considered to result in unacceptable loss of light to this property, whilst there would be some increase to roof mass, the separation distance from the roof alteration would remain the same.
- 7.14 The impact from the proposed flat roof extension adjacent the shared boundary with No.8 would be considered unacceptable in terms of loss of light and outlook. The proposed extension would have an approximate 0.5 metre distance from the shared boundary with an approximate 1m distance to the side facing elevation. There are two windows located along the side facing elevation. One window serves the living room area, this window is located toward the front of the side elevation and is not a primary light source for this living room area. The other window which is located toward the rear of the side facing elevation serves a bedroom. This window is the primary and only light source for this bedroom. There is an existing 1.8m boundary fence along this section of shared boundary with No.8m the proposed extension due to its location adjacent up to and adjacent the shared boundary would further impact the only natural light source to this bedroom. This impact is therefore deemed to be harmful to the living conditions of this bedroom and would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).
- 7.15 To the west of the application site is no 12 Marjoram Crescent. The proposed roof alterations are not considered to result in unacceptable loss of light to this property, whilst there would be some increase to roof mass, the separation distance from the roof alterations would remain the same.
- 7.16 The proposed extension would have a distance of 8m from the shred boundary with No.12 with a distance of 13m to the nearest rear/side facing elevation. It is therefore considered the proposed impact from the rear extension would be minimal and acceptable

(iv) Parking

- 7.17 This proposal would result in a 5 bedroom property, with an increase in bedroom number by 2. A property with 5No. bedrooms requires 3 parking spaces on site under the Council's Parking Standards. Whilst the parking plan provided has shown a parking space within the existing garage, it is noted this space does not meet the modern space standards for a garage parking space internally. Two parking spaces have been shown within the frontage of the application site and it is clear that at least a third space could also fit within this frontage area, the parking spaces provided on the parking plan do not meet the 3 metres width required although this could be easily accommodated. With this in mind it is considered the parking requirement can be met.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The general design of this proposal, including the side dormers, raising of the roof ridge would result in an overdeveloped roof slope, which is considered to have a harmful impact upon the character of the property, street scene and the visual amenity of the immediate locality. It is not considered to be appropriate within the context of the existing property. The proposed rear/side extension is considered to create an unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of the neighbouring property to the east No. 8 Marjoram Crescent. As such, the application is contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011 and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00003 for the following reasons

The design of this proposal including the side dormers and raising of the roof ridge height would result in an overdeveloped roof slope with an unacceptable mass and bulk. This is considered to have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the existing property. The development would not respect the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene and would be harmful to the visual amenity of the immediate locality and wider roofscape. As such the application is considered to be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal by virtue of the excessive depth, proximity to the boundary and height of the proposed single storey extension would result in a loss of light adversely affecting the primary light available to a bedroom of the adjacent residential property (No.8 Marjoram Crescent). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.