
Site Address: 6 Erica Way, Waterlooville, PO8 9BA
Proposal: Construction of front/side ground floor extension; construction of replacement roof with raised ridge incorporating dormers to side roof slopes.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/22/00633 Expiry Date: 12/08/2022
Applicant: Mr S O'carroll
Agent: Mr. P Davey Case Officer: Selina Donophy
Ward: Cowplain

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

This application site is a link attached bungalow located on the north side of Erica Way, Waterlooville. This property has a pitched roof which projects forward to the front and forms an 'L' shape. The elevations are formed from brickwork, cladding and hanging tile. Towards the front of the dwelling is hard standing forming vehicle parking space. The area is predominantly residential in character and prevailing property types comprise of bungalows.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Construction of front/side ground floor extension; construction of replacement roof with raised ridge incorporating dormers to side roof slopes.

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)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014
AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

Further to our conversation this morning I wish to RED CARD the above planning application for the following reasons.

1. The application is out of keeping with the local area, which consists of single storey buildings.
2. The incongruous design is totally at odds with the street scene and visually unacceptable.
3. The design is poor and unacceptable. (A rectangular box stuck on a roof)
4. There is considerable overlooking of neighbours
5. The garage has been blocked off so there is insufficient parking.

Should you be minded to Refuse Permission on this application then I am happy to suspend the RED CARD

Councillor Narinder Bains - Cowplain

No comment received

Councillor Neil Bowdell - Cowplain

No comment received

Environment Agency

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 8

Comment	Officer Comment
Comment received in objection - 8 Comments received in support - 0	
- Reduction in housing stock for the elderly	This is not a Havant Local Plan policy and not a material planning consideration in this instance.
- Loss of light and overlooking neighbouring properties	Please see 'Planning considerations' section of the report.
- Specifically the overlooking impact of the windows to the rear	Please see 'Planning considerations' section of the report.
- Garage door has been removed and replaced with breeze blocks	It is noted the existing elevations are wrong . This would need to be altered if planning permission were to be approved.
- Disproportionate in size to original bungalow	Please see 'Planning considerations' section of the report.
- Will not blend in with surrounding properties	Please see 'Planning considerations' section of the report.
- Will reduce the number of affordable properties for the elderly or those with disabilities	This is not a material planning consideration.
- Drawings do not show kennel to the rear	There does not appear to be any planning history on this building therefore it may have been built under permitted development rights, potentially not requiring planning permission.
- This could result in a precedent for the street	Noted.
- Noise and dust from construction	This is not a material planning consideration. Impacts of noise and dust can be controlled via separate Environmental Health legislation.
- Parking concerns	Please see 'Planning considerations' section of the report.

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.

It is noted that a shipping container is sited in the front garden area- the applicant has not confirmed what the use of this is for. The Planning Enforcement Team have been notified of this.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

- 7.3 This proposal comprises the construction of a front/side ground floor extension; construction of replacement roof with a raised ridge incorporating dormers to side roof slopes. The proposed front/side extension would fill the space between the lounge and the front bedroom, widening the front elevation by approximately 2.5 metres. This would feature a window to the front elevation and new doorway . The doorway would be removed from the side and a new window added. This would allow for the reconfiguration of the internal space, with a bathroom now located towards the front and the rear bedroom now a dining room. The plans show a garage door however this appears to have been blocked up- the applicant has not confirmed what the use of this would now be or whether the garage door would be re-added as part of this proposal.
- 7.4 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 1.5 metres with the roof built up above the proposed side extension also. Dormers are also proposed to both side roof slopes. These would have flat roofs with dimensions of approximately 11 metres width, 1.8 metres depth and 1.7 metres height. These roof extensions would provide for two bedrooms, one at the front and one at the rear with front and rear elevation windows, windows would also be located to both sides, a hallway window and windows serving two en-suite bathrooms. Proposed materials include those to match existing.
- 7.5 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. Erica Way is located on an incline in land levels from east to west and therefore the property would remain particularly visible from the east. 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 . In addition to the raised ridge, dormers to both sides of the roof slope are proposed. These dormers are long at 11 metres and whilst they are set up from the eaves, are located close to the ridge; therefore resulting in a box like appearance.
- 7.6 The raised ridge plus dormers would alter the appearance of the existing dwelling substantially with the proposed dormers adding notable mass and bulk to the roof slope. 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 :

- 7.5 *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.*

As stated above the proposed dormers result in a box like appearance and are not sympathetic or subservient in appearance to the host dwelling.

The Havant Borough Design Guide also states :

- 7.7 *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.*

These dormers are large in scale, spanning almost the entire depth of the property in a design which is not considered to be subservient, they also include substantial amounts of glazing.

- 7.8 The alterations to the roof are considered out of keeping with both the host dwelling and the properties in the surrounding area. Whilst it is noted some properties located north west of the application site along Hazleton Way have had alterations at roof level, the streetscene is considered to be different to that of Erica Way where there is a clear pattern of development in heights and property types/ styles. The proposal is deemed incongruous with the surrounding streetscene.
- 7.9 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).

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 To the north west of the application site is No. 8 Erica Way which is the linked property. The side dormer bedroom window would allow for increased views down into the rear garden of No. 8 and would offer some views back towards the gardens located along Hazleton Way. This window is considered to result in harmful overlooking to this immediate neighbouring property. The remaining side window to the dormer would be a hallway window and would be sited further towards the front with less harmful views. Whilst there would be an increase in roof bulk and height , this is not considered to result in loss of light to no 8 as the properties are separated by both driveways and there are minimal windows on this side.
- 7.11 To the south east of the application site is no 4 Erica Way. The rear dormer window on this side would result in overlooking down towards the rear garden of no 4 - this has been identified as unacceptable as this would have views down to private amenity spaces. The proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable loss of light to this property, whilst there would be some increase to roof mass, these properties are already sited very close side by side and the roof would continue to be hipped away from this side elevation wall.
- 7.12 To the south west (front) of the application property are Nos. 1-5 Erica Way .A new front elevation window would be proposed at first floor level. There is over 20 metres separation distance between the application property and No. 3 which meets the separation requirements as specified in the Havant Design Guide SPD whereby a minimum separation distance would be 20 metres.

- 7.13 To the rear (north/ north east) are Nos. 7 and 9 Erica Close. There are very short separation distances between the rear of no 6 and the rear of these properties. There would be approximately 10 metres between the rear of No. 6 and No. 9 although the view would be less direct as no 9 is angled away. There would be approximately 16 metres between No. 6 and No. 7 which does not meet the minimum separation distance for a back to back relationship as set out in the Havant Design Guide SPD. The rear window proposed is deemed to offer views into the rear of both properties and, due to the close proximity, this is not considered to be acceptable. This impact is deemed to be harmful and contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.14 This proposal would result in a 4 bedroom property, with an increase in bedroom number by 1. A property of this bedroom number requires 3 parking spaces on site under the Councils Parking Standards. Whilst the plans show a parking space in the garage, it is noted this has been blocked up and this does not meet modern space standards for a garage parking space internally. Two parking spaces could fit down the side of the property and it may be that a third space could also fit down the side as there appears to be 14.8 metres depth from the garage to the front boundary which would meet the 3 x 4.8 metres length requirements. After visiting the site it was visible that a car could also be parked across the front of the property although a parking plan has not been provided. 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 and 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. In addition the rear windows and side dormer windows are judged to result in additional harmful overlooking to rear and adjacent properties. 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 Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00633 for the following reasons

- 1 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 street scene and the visual amenity of the immediate locality. In addition the rear window and side dormer windows are judged to result in additional harmful overlooking and consequent loss of privacy to rear and adjacent properties. 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.