

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)
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 Gillian Harris

No comment received

Councillor Imogen Payter

No comment received

Councillor Phil Munday - St Faiths

No comment 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: 10

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
The proposed development will have an impact on the degree of light coming into my kitchen window and also will remove the current view. The only incoming light remaining will be at the very top of the kitchen window. There are no other windows in the room to allow light in. The proposed development will have an impact on the degree of light coming into my kitchen window and also will remove the current view. The only incoming light remaining will be at the very top of the kitchen window. There are no other windows in the room to allow light in. <i>This consultee later commented</i> I have since spoken to my neighbour and the architect concerned and the impact on my view and light has been minimised as much as possible and in light of this, I do not wish to prevent the development from going ahead.	The impact upon light sources has been assessed during the application process. Planning officers have assessed the kitchen window against the 25 degree angle test set out in <i>Figure 5.2: Daylight checking for new buildings adjacent to existing homes</i> of the Havant Design Guide SPD. Officers note that it breaches this rule, but that it is the roof itself that breaches the guidance, with regard to the guidance as it is noted the breach is very modest, officers are satisfied that the side extension's impact upon light sources would be acceptable on balance. Noted.
<i>In response to the amended plans, this consultee commented</i> Although we can see the value of the single-storey extension, we strongly object to the full-width dormer overlooking the whole of the rear of our property. We feel this would significantly impact the privacy to our bedrooms and garden. We fear that this would also reduce the amount of light to our property.	Due to an approximate 42 metre separation distance from the dormer to this property, it is considered that this is sufficient distance; exceeding the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD's standards to prevent overlooking of this property and that it would not overshadow this property.

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 Spaces
- (v) Ecology

(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, scale and bulk of the works and the streetscene

- 7.3 The works would be readily visible on the streetscene in regards to the single storey side extension, replacement porch, 3No rooflights and at certain vantage points the rear dormer would be visible. The replacement porch would be of a modest scale and would have limited and acceptable visual changes upon the dwelling due to its scale. The proposal to install rooflights despite being discouraged on a dwelling's front elevation in the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD are considered to be acceptable and not unduly harm the character of the street, furthermore, there is a permitted development fallback position. The changes in fenestration are considered acceptable and modest upon the dwelling. Furthermore, the removal of the garage is considered acceptable upon this dwelling.
- 7.4 The loft conversion featuring a rear dormer would feature a substantial dormer to be constructed on the rear elevation on the second floor. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states that " 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.* The guide also states that " *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 wide width and monopitched roof would result in a dormer with a substantial bulk and mass that would dominate the rear roofslope and would be contrary to the guidance contained within the SPD, albeit it is set up from the eaves line of the host dwelling by approximately 0.4 metres and would be set lower than the ridge height of the host dwelling. However, the dormer would only be readily visible upon the streetscene at limited vantage points. Furthermore, there is a permitted development fallback position under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B. With regards to this, the proposed dormer is considered acceptable.
- 7.6 The proposed side extension would be readily visible upon the streetscene. The potential for creating a terracing effect has been assessed during this application process. Due to the modest width and that it would be single storey, it is considered that the impacts upon the streetscene would be acceptable. Furthermore it was reduced in depth with the amended plans.

Materials

- 7.7 The works would feature matching windows to the existing dwellinghouse. It would also feature a single ply roof to the dormer roof and a slate roof for the proposed single storey extension. The external walls would be constructed with the same materials for the proposed single storey extension and the dormer would feature weatherboard cladding to form its external walls, These materials are considered acceptable with regards to the main dwelling and the streetscene.

- 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 northern, southern and eastern sides of the application site are Nos 5 and 9 Orchard Road and No.5 Lower Grove, due to proximity it has been considered important to assess the impact on these properties.

No.5 Orchard Road

- 7.10 To the northern side of the application site is No.5 Orchard Road. The changes to fenestration, removal of the garage, 3No rooflights to the front elevation and the side extension are considered to have an acceptable impact upon this dwelling due to their locations. The replacement front porch, is considered to have an acceptable impact upon this dwelling, due to its small modest scale upon the front elevation of No.7. The rear dormer, is considered to have an acceptable impact upon this dwelling, as the fenestration would face out onto No.7's rear garden and would only permit oblique views of No.5's rear garden. The rear extension is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.5, as it would be single storey and would only project approximately a metre beyond No.5's rear extension and would not face any windows on the rear extension.

No.9 Orchard Road

- 7.11 To the southern side of the application site is No.5 Orchard Road. The proposed rooflights, and removal of the garage are considered to have acceptable impacts upon this property. The proposed changes to fenestration on the southern elevation, due to a clear window replacing an existing clear window on the hallway, would be considered acceptable and that there would be no additional overlooking. The replacement front porch, is considered to have an acceptable impact with regards to the proposed modest scale and would not overshadow or overlook No.9. The dormer would have an acceptable impact as it would face No.7's rear garden and could only permit oblique views of No.9's rear garden. The rear extension, would not project further than No.9's rear elevation and would be single storey, with regards to this, it is considered that the rear extension would not be considered overbearing upon this property. Furthermore, the rear extension is not proposed to provide fenestration on the southern elevation so would not be considered to increase overlooking. The side extension, is considered to reduce the separation distance between the 2 dwellings, though officers do note that the side extension was reduced in depth in the amended plans, thereby reducing the scale upon No.9's northern elevation. With regards to the decreased separation distance, importance has been placed upon the impacts on No.9's kitchen window. With regards to this due to the reduced separation distance, it was considered that overshadowing of this room's light sources should be assessed. Officers have assessed the impacts upon light sources of this window against *Figure 5.2: Daylight checking for new buildings adjacent to existing homes of the Havant Design Guide SPD*. Officers note that though the roof itself breaches the test, that the breach is considered modest enough that officers are satisfied that the impacts of the side extension upon light sources of this window would be limited enough and therefore acceptable on balance.

No.5 Lower Grove

- 7.12 To the eastern side of the application site is No.5 Lower Grove. Regarding the nature of the works, it has been considered important to assess the potential of overlooking relating to the proposed dormer. Due to an approximate separation distance of 42 metres from this dwelling, it has been considered that as this significantly exceeds the 24 metre separation distance set out by the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD from a 2nd floor window to a first floor window, that the impacts would be considered acceptable on this property.
- 7.13 Consequently, it is considered on balance 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). It is noted one letter of objection was received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Parking spaces

- 7.14 The proposed works would increase the occupancy of the dwellinghouse from 3 bedrooms to 4 bedrooms. It would additionally remove a garage. The increase in occupancy would require 3 parking spaces which has been shown on the plans and is considered acceptable and to conform with the parking SPD.

(v) Ecology

- 7.15 Due to the proposals to the roof, the ecologist has recommended an informative is added if permission is forthcoming warning about the risk about harming bats.

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 on balance 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/24/00093 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: -05 Revision B :AMENDED Proposed ELEVATIONS
Drawing Number: -04 Revision C :AMENDED Proposed FLOOR PLAN
Drawing Number: -01 Revision B :AMENDED Proposed PLANS SHOWING
SITE/LOCATION/PARKING
Drawing Number: -05 Revision C :LIGHT SOURCES
Drawing Number: 02: EXISTING FLOOR PLANS
Drawing Number: 03: EXISTING ELEVATIONS

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.