

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address: 24 Ferndale, Waterlooville, PO7 7PA
Proposal: Single storey rear extension with raised patio area with glass screening. Extension to existing side dormer and changes to fenestrations. Changes to external materials.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00714 Expiry Date: 14/11/2024
Applicant: Mr Andrew Richardson
Agent: Mr Danny Manns Case Officer: Robert Riley
 D.M. Designs
Ward: Waterloo

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a 1.5 storey dwelling located in Waterlooville. The property's materials feature brickwork at ground floor level and render on the front elevation at first floor level. the dwelling features a gable pitched roof with brown concrete tiles. The property features a front and rear garden. The dwelling features a dormer on the northeastern (side) elevation.
- 1.2 The application site is in an area that would be considered both urban and residential, with the character of the road, featuring a variety of materials and designs in evidence.

2 Planning History

APP/21/00457 - T5 - 1 no. Turkey Oak (T1 on plan) - Crown raise up to 4 metres removing epicormic growths up to main crown, reduce crown on north side by approx 0.5 metres and crown reduce south side of the crown by 2 metres, leaving an approx crown height of 9 metres and approx crown width of 7 metres. Subject to TPO 1064., PERM,23/07/2021

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Single storey rear extension with raised patio area with glass screening. Extension to existing side dormer with 1No rooflight, changes to fenestration and a change in external materials.

Officer comment:

- 3.2 The block plan features an outbuilding adjacent to No.26 Ferndale's rear garden which has been removed prior to the officers site visit.

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)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

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

Southern Electric plc, Network Investment Team

No comments received

Ecologist

This is mostly fine – modern well-fitted roof, soffit/fascia - although the small dormer is clad with hanging tiles. Given the small size of the dormer I think it would be OTT to request a bat survey so perhaps best to add the bat informative

Arboriculturist

I am content that the AIA is to a high standard and takes into all aspects of the tree constraints on site providing a pragmatic solution to ensure that no trees are negatively impacted on.

Should permission be granted for this application project a condition to include the AMS and TPP must be included – e.g. no development can take place on site prior to the erecting of tree protection in line with the Holt TPP and all works must comply with the Holt AMS.

I raise no objection on Arb grounds.

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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

7.3 The works would be readily visible on the streetscene with regards to the proposed extension to the side dormer.

7.4 The proposed rear raised patio area with glass screening to the rear of the proposed rear extension and proposed changes to fenestration are considered to have acceptable impacts regarding the character of the dwelling and visual amenities on the streetscene.

7.5 The proposed rear extension would extend approximately 4 metres from the existing rear elevation and would have a width of approximately 9.2 metres. The rear extension would feature an eaves height of approximately 3.3 metres for the pitched roof section and approximately an eaves height of 3.7 metres for the flat roof section it would also have a maximum height of approximately 5.7 metres. The rear extension would not be visible from the street scene and due to its single storey nature and modest depth would be considered subservient to the existing dwelling and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of its design upon the dwelling and visual amenities.

7.6 The proposed extension to the side dormer would extend the depth of the dormer from

approximately 1.5 metres at present to approximately 8 metres and would increase its height from approximately 1.5 metres to approximately 2.3 metres. It would however be set off from the eaves line by 0.45 metres and ridge line by 1.2 metres. 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"*. The proposed extension to the side dormer would be of a large scale upon the northeastern (side) elevation of the dwelling, and would not feature a pitched roof. In light of this however, officers note that Nos 18 and 20 Ferndale feature reasonably sized front dormers, and that Nos 23 and 25 Ferndale also feature front and side dormer additions. In light of this, though it is noted, that the side dormer would have a reasonable presence on the side roofplane, in consideration of nearby dwellings featuring dormer additions to their front and side roofplanes and the set off from the eaves and ridge line, on balance it is not considered an unacceptable addition to the dwelling and to have an unacceptable impact upon visual amenities.

Materials

- 7.7 The proposed external walls of the rear extension would match the existing dwellinghouse which is considered acceptable. The works propose matching roof materials or EPDM which is considered acceptable. The side dormer would feature grey cedar weatherboard cladding, in light of the mixture of external materials on the streetscene, this is considered acceptable. In light of this, these materials are considered acceptable with regards to the dwellinghouse and upon visual amenities.
- 7.8 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 on balance 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 northeastern and southwestern sides of the application site are properties at No 26 and No 22 Ferndale. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these two properties. Due to the proposed location nature and scale of the works, properties to the front and rear are considered to be acceptably impacted. The proposed changes to fenestration of the existing property and a change in external materials are considered to have acceptable impacts on neighbouring properties.

No 26 Ferndale

- 7.10 The proposed single storey rear extension would feature no side fenestration facing No.26, which is considered acceptable. There would be rear fenestration, however, this would face the rear garden, and views would also be blocked by the obscure screening serving the rear patio which will be conditioned in permission is forthcoming. There would be some level of oblique views, but as this is oblique it is considered acceptable. In light of this, this proposed rear extension is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, the rear extension would be approximately 2.2 metres from No.26 Ferndale's curtilage, in light of the proposed approximate 2.7 metre height of the proposed rear extension, officers consider that the extension would feature a sufficient separation distance in order to prevent unacceptable levels of overshadowing and the

sense of overbearing.

- 7.11 The proposed raised patio area with glass screening would in light of a condition being added if permission is forthcoming, feature 1.8 metre obscure screening to its north only be able to provide views of the rear garden, and at most would provide a level of oblique views, in light of that these would only be oblique this is considered acceptable. Furthermore, the boundary treatment between Nos 26 and 24 is approximately 2 metres tall further, lessening views that are able to be provided. The proposed dormer extension which would feature 2No windows and a rooflight, would feature obscure glass, and would only be openable above 1.7 metres above finished floor level, in light of this, it is considered to have an acceptable impact regarding overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, in light of that the dormer would primarily impact No.26's side adjoined garage, which is not a habitable room, and that No.26's side elevation features no clear windows at first floor level (only an obscured window), it is not considered that the works would have an unacceptable impact regarding these concerns.

No 22 Ferndale

- 7.12 The proposed single storey rear extension would feature a rooflight, however, it would be at a sufficiently high cill height from finished floor level, in order to prevent overlooking. There would be rear fenestration serving the rear extension, this would face the rear garden, which is considered acceptable. There would be a level of oblique views, however as this would be oblique it is considered acceptable. In light of this, this rear extension is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. The proposed flat roof section of the rear extension is considered to be at a sufficient separation distance from No.22 to prevent unacceptable levels of overshadowing and the sense of overbearing. The proposed monopitched section of the rear extension would feature an approximate eaves height of 3.3 metres and would feature a ridge height of approximately 5.7 metres. It would also protrude approximately 2.7 metres beyond No.22's rear elevation. However, it would feature a 1.6 metre separation distance from No.22's curtilage and would feature an approximate 2.5 metre separation distance from No.22's rear elevation. In light of potential overshadowing concerns, officers have performed a 45 degree angle light test as set out in figure 5.12 of the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD. In light of this, this proposal is considered to pass this test. Furthermore, the rear extension would not face any windows on No.22's side elevation. Moreover, officers note, that, the sunlight's orientation whereby, this extension is to the north east of No.22's garden, impacts on overshadowing are likely to be felt most in the morning and considerably less throughout the rest of the day. Regarding these considerations regarding overshadowing, officers consider that this dwelling, though is impacted by this rear extension addition, its reduction of outlook towards the application site would not in itself cause demonstrably unacceptable harm to refuse the application on this basis. Regarding overbearing concerns, in consideration of the separation distance and level of protrusion beyond No.22's rear elevation, officers are of the opinion, that though there would be an increase, that it would not be so unacceptable to warrant the refusal of this planning application.
- 7.13 The proposed extension to the existing side dormer with 1No rooflight, would not face No.22 and is considered to have an acceptable impact upon this property. The proposed raised patio area with glass screening is shown on the plans and will be conditioned if permission is forthcoming to feature 1.8 metre obscure screening to its north only be able to provide views of the rear garden, and at most would provide a level of oblique views, in light of that these would only be oblique this is considered

acceptable.

- 7.14 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will 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 no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(v) Ecology

- 7.15 Due to works to the first floor of the roof, the Council's Ecologist was consulted during the application process. The Council's Ecologist stated *"This is mostly fine – modern well-fitted roof, soffit/fascia - although the small dormer is clad with hanging tiles. Given the small size of the dormer I think it would be OTT to request a bat survey so perhaps best to add the bat informative"*. In light of this, if permission is forthcoming, a bat informative will be added to warn the applicants of the risks of potentially harming bat species and in light of this comment, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(vi) Arboriculture

- 7.16 Due to a significant tree to the rear of the proposed works, the Council's Arboriculturist was consulted during the application process. The Council's Arboriculturist stated *"I am content that the AIA is to a high standard and takes into all aspects of the tree constraints on site providing a pragmatic solution to ensure that no trees are negatively impacted on. Should permission be granted for this application project a condition to include the AMS and TPP must be included – e.g. no development can take place on site prior to the erecting of tree protection in line with the Holt TPP and all works must comply with the Holt AMS. I raise no objection on Arb grounds"*.
- 7.17 In light of this, this work will be conditioned as a prior commencement condition to be in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and the Tree Protection Plan, and in light of this, is considered to accord with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(vii) Parking

- 7.18 The works would increase the occupancy of the dwellinghouse from 3 to 4 bedrooms. This would require 3 parking spaces to accord with the Havant Parking SPD, which has been shown on the plans. The works are therefore, 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.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is 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/24/00714

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:

Block Plan with parking: Uploaded 27/8/24

Location Plan: Uploaded 27/8/24

Drawing Number: Richardson 01A: EXISTING AND PROPOSED

ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS AND SITE SECTION: Uploaded 28/11/24

Document titled ARBORICULTURAL INFORMATION containing TREE SURVEY, ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND

ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT: Uploaded 28/11/24

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, 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 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted including any demolition, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no works shall be carried out until the erection of tree protection in line with the Holt Tree Protection Plan received in document titled Arboricultural Information uploaded on 28/11/24, the works shall also comply with the Holt Arboricultural Method Statement received in document titled Arboricultural Information uploaded on 28/11/24.

Reason: In order to control the construction phases to prevent harm to trees together with the character and amenities of the area and neighbouring residents having due regard to policies CS11, and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, the 2 first floor dormer windows serving an ensuite and a WC on the side elevation 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 it shall be non opening below 1.7m from FFL 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

- 6 Prior to first use of the raised patio hereby permitted, obscure screens to a height of 1.8m above finished raised patio floor level incorporating textured glass with obscuration level no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) shall be provided to the northeastern and southwestern sides of the raised patio 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.

- 7 Notwithstanding any indication shown on the approved plans and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) the roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the occupants of adjoining residential properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.