
Site Address:	9 Cotwell Avenue, Waterloooville, PO8 9AP		
Proposal:	Proposed rear extension and replacement roof to form first floor loft conversion		
Application No:	APP/21/01158	Expiry Date:	10/01/2022
Applicant:	Mr Mills		
Agent:	Mr Jay	Case Officer:	Julie Terzoudis
	The Planning Service		
Ward:	Cowplain		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application relates to a detached chalet-style bungalow located at 9 Cotwell Avenue in Waterloooville. The dwelling incorporates a 10m setback from the public highway with an integral single garage set on the northern side of the dwelling, served by a block paved driveway.
- 1.2 The immediate locality consists of detached single-storey dwellings of various designs and styles, set within large gardens. Several of the bungalows have undergone a variety of alterations. All dwellings along Cotwell Avenue provide for off-street parking. The street is wide and open with low walls and fences, bordered with green verge strips.

2 Planning History

No planning history exists for the site.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing conservatory and the construction of a replacement roof to form a first-floor loft conversion and rear extension.
- 3.2 The rear extension to the dwelling would extend out to a depth of 8.0m with an equivalent ridge height of 5.8m, replacing the existing conservatory which currently extends to 3.0m. Internal reconfiguration would take place on the ground floor and a roof / loft conversion would be added above.
- 3.3 The roof extension runs almost the length of the dwelling and would provide an upper-level floor area of approximately 77m² to provide space for three bedrooms, an en-suite, a separate bathroom and storage. Two large rooflights are proposed on the side northern and southern roof slopes, with four smaller rooflights set across both slopes. Four further rooflights are also proposed on the front roof slope. A Juliet balcony is proposed on the rear gable end to serve the master bedroom.
- 3.4 All the works are to be constructed with clay brickwork and white render, under grey concrete interlocking roof tiling to match those on the existing dwelling.
- 3.5 A single-storey outbuilding proposed to the rear of the site was removed from the

application due to an objection from Southern Water to the proposed location upon a public surface water sewer. The outbuilding was removed from the revised set of plans received 24 January 2022.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021
Planning Practice guidance 2016
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2019

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS15 (Flood and Erosion Risk)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

E1* (High quality design)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor A Briggs – Cowplain

No comments received.

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

No comments received.

Councillor Narinder Bains - Cowplain

No comments received.

Developer Services, Southern Water

The submitted plans indicates that the proposed outbuilding will lie over an existing public surface water sewer, which will not be acceptable to Southern Water. The exact position of the public apparatus must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

It might be possible to divert the surface water sewer, so long as this would result in no unacceptable loss of hydraulic capacity, and the work was carried out at the developer's expense to the satisfaction of Southern Water under the relevant statutory provisions.

- The 600 mm surface water sewer requires a clearance of 3.5 metres on either side of the public sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future access for maintenance.

- No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3.5 metres of the external edge of the public surface water sewer without consent from Southern Water.

- The 150 mm foul sewer requires a clearance of 3 metres on either side of the gravity

sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future access for maintenance.

- No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public foul sewer without consent from Southern Water.
- No soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 metres of public or adoptable gravity sewers.
- All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

Alternatively, the applicant may wish to amend the site layout, or combine a diversion with amendment of the site layout. If the applicant would prefer to advance these options, items above also apply.

Furthermore, it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

In order to protect drainage apparatus, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, a condition is attached to the planning permission; for example, the developer must advise the local authority (in consultation with Southern Water) of the measures which will be undertaken to divert/protect the public sewers, prior to the commencement of the development.

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

Portsmouth Water Company

We have no adverse comments to make on this application from a groundwater quality protection perspective due to the small nature and location in the groundwater catchment.

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: 14

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: Three objections were received from two representors.

Comment	Officer Comment
The revised plans do little to address the issue of gardens being overlooked - reducing the length of the extension (P0004) actually means more of the neighbouring gardens are overlooked from the first floor Juliet balcony.	No policy or designation applies to the area restricting first floor development.

The issue of excessive building bulk taking light from the 2 neighbouring side windows is unchanged. (P002)	See discussion and assessment in Section 7.
Unsure as to the status of the 'hobby room'.	The outbuilding has been removed from the plans.
Unsure what the new document (P009) entitled 45-degree testing is trying to show. It does not appear to address the issue of building bulk excluding light to the side windows of the neighbouring property as it only shows rear elevations. Why are there no drawings showing the effect of pulling out the roof line to both sides on the amount of light reaching neighbouring property windows?	See discussion and assessment in Section 7.
The additions of tree representations to the neighbours gardens on the plans is puzzling. What relevance do they have? They are not accurate in scale or position.	Artists impression of relevant vegetation on the site and is not meant to be accurate or to scale.
Proposed Elevations P002 - East and South Elevations showing proposed 2m boundary fencing, proposed side access and proposed full roof line extension to new gable ends facing both adjoining properties. Currently, there is no physical boundary between [redacted] properties as the passageway is already quite narrow. The erection of a 2m boundary fence between the 2 properties, whilst permitted, will reduce the amount of light reaching the 2 windows [redacted].	The size and scale proposed for the fencing does not need planning permission in this location.
On top of this, the excessive building bulk of the proposed new roof will further impact on the amount of light [redacted]. [redacted] The proposed alterations will severely reduce the natural light available.	See discussion and assessment in Section 7.
We are also concerned that the proposed side access will give rise to greatly increased foot traffic along this passageway and will thus impact negatively on [redacted] privacy.	No planning reason to restrict a side access. No planning control for limiting / controlling the number of people or frequency on private land.
West Elevation showing new first floor gable end with glass Juliet balconette enclosing French windows.[redacted] loss of privacy.	No policy or designation applies to the area restricting first floor development. See discussion and assessment in Section 7.

[redacted] - Proposed Perspectives P003 - Perspective 1 appears to contradict the proposed screening of the new side access detailed on P002, as the new fence does not extend far enough. Exactly how far is the proposed fencing to run? If the new side access is not screened, it will impact negatively on [redacted] privacy, regarding the 2 windows it faces. - Proposed Roof P005 Perspective NE (Elevated View) also shows the proposed new fencing not reaching or screening the new side access.	Corrected on revised plans.
Proposed Outbuilding Floor & Roof Plan, Perspectives, Sections P008 and Proposed Location and Block Plans P001 - The dimensions given on P008 show an imposing building of large proportions which, in conjunction with the main proposal, give rise to what we feel is excessive building bulk. We are also concerned about the impact on surface water drainage. We already suffer from waterlogging when there is any amount of rain. Proposing to cover so much of the ground with buildings and hardscaping (in the form of the proposed patios and parking areas shown on P001) will greatly exacerbate this problem. The plan states the building is a 'hobby room'. Will this 'hobby' subject neighbours to increased noise, smells or fumes?	The outbuilding has been removed from the plans.
Householder Application for Planning Permission Document Item 6. Trees and Hedges - Applicant states that there are no trees within falling distance of the proposed development. There are 2 large trees [redacted] that would be within falling distance of the proposed outbuilding. We are also concerned that the scale of the proposal could impact the root systems of [redacted] 2 trees. Applicant states that no trees or hedges will be removed or pruned to carry out the works. The rear boundary of the property is an overgrown mature hedgerow but the proposal states, on P008 - Outbuilding Floor Plan, a 2m close board fence around the perimeter of the property. We are concerned the hedge will be removed, affecting wildlife, particularly birds and bats which we see regularly over the property.	The outbuilding has been removed from the plans.
Design and Access Statement - Amount - The proposed development increases the internal size of the building to more than double its original size. This seems excessive in relation to surrounding properties.	See discussion and assessment in Section 7.
Pedestrian and Cycle Access - This appears to suggest that the proposed side access will become the main entrance. If so, this will negatively impact on [redacted] privacy especially if the proposed boundary does not screen the proposed side access.	No planning policy restricting a side access or limiting / controlling the number of people or frequency on private land. Also, the front entrance is to be retained.

We had a look at the original drawings when they were first issued and we were not too pleased with what was proposed, ie the Juliet balcony, as when we moved here we liked the privacy of the garden from our neighbours. Now there is a new set of drawings we feel we need to a comment on the latest proposals.	No policy or designation applies to the area restricting first floor development. See discussion and assessment in Section 7.
Having looked at the updated drawings dated 22nd December for 9 Cotwell Avenue Waterlooville we can see that the proposed extension has been reduced by approximately one metre. Having reduced the extension by that amount the view into the neighbours properties has increased from the Juliet balcony.	No policy or designation applies to the area restricting first floor development. See discussion and assessment in Section 7.
What effect will the extension have to the natural sunlight as at the moment the sun goes over our gardens just to the south and the extension may reduce this as the sun gets lower later in the year.	Shadowing analysis is shown on the plans and the impact is acceptable. See discussion and assessment in Section 7.
We are also concerned what effect the extension will have on the drainage as the drawings show they are increasing the amount of en-suite, bathrooms, toilets etc, from one to four	Drainage and water disposals for the site is dealt with through Part H at the Building Regulations application stage.
We would also like to ask how the new owner/builder proposes to remove any unwanted and all the new materials from and too the back garden.	Noted.
We would also like to know what the "hobby room" at the bottom of the garden will be used for and will it have any effect on the neighbours ie noise "parties", work shop, smells, fumes and any effect on the drainage that is underground in that area and it is said that when the hobby room is built that no trees or hedge rows will be disturbed. we would like to know how it is possible to build the hobby room in the position shown on the drawings without cutting down the tress/hedgerows between the garden and the carpark on the other side of the hedges.	The outbuilding has been removed from the plans.

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) Highways safety and parking
- (v) CIL requirements

(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.
- 7.3 Revisions were made to the proposed development through the assessment to reduce the bulk and mass. The outbuilding originally proposed was also removed from the plans due to its proposed proximity to surface water infrastructure.

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

- 7.4 The proposed alterations to the dwelling would remove the hipped roof form currently presenting to the streetscene, altering the appearance of the roof to a gabled form, with the lower garage roof element retained. The character impact is limited by the fact that the dwelling itself affords a generous 10m setback from the public highway and most of the proposed roof bulk is set to the rear of the dwelling.
- 7.5 The existing character of Cotwell Avenue comprises wholly of chalet style bungalows. The roof design and orientation of the dwellings within the street are mixed, with several bungalows having undergone roof extensions and alterations over the years. The eclectic mix of bungalow designs ensure that the proposed roof design would not appear incongruous within the streetscene.
- 7.6 The proposed extensions to the roof and the rear of the dwelling are of a considerable scale and mass that would significantly alter the character of the currently compact dwelling. Revisions were made to the extent of the rear extension, reducing the depth from 8.0m to 7.0m to reduce the overall mass of the structure.
- 7.7 Although the proposed rear extension of the dwelling incorporates a roof height equivalent to that of the existing dwelling, the depth reduction, and the setback from the front of the dwelling, in conjunction with the separation gaps between the neighbouring dwellings, ensures that the alterations would not be so significant in scale and mass as to be harmful to the original character of the dwelling, or the neighbouring dwellings.
- 7.8 The proposed materials are to match those on the host dwelling supporting the integration of the scale of development into the main dwelling. The proposed works provide an efficient extension to the property to accommodate the needs of a growing family, whilst referencing and remaining sympathetic to the existing character of the dwelling.
- 7.9 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, 2011). 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

- 7.10 The proposed extension was initially proposed to extend out in-line with the roof pitch of the main dwelling at a height of 5.8m, to a depth of 8.0 metres. After an initial assessment it was considered that the mass and scale of the extension as proposed

would result in a considerable addition to the rear of the dwelling which would likely appear overly bulky and overbearing to the adjoining neighbouring properties at No. 7 and No. 11.

- 7.11 The scheme was redesigned to reduce the bulk and scale, including the removal of the ground floor study, first floor storage and relocation of the stairs to reduce the extension depth by a metre. This altered the depth of the extension to 7.0m from the existing rear elevation wall, an additional 4.0 metres beyond the extent of the existing conservatory to be demolished.
- 7.12 Representations were received which raised several concerns with overshadowing, overbearing, loss of light and overlooking. A 45-degree plan was submitted to allow the analysis of the extent of overshadowing which would result from the alterations to the nearest habitable room windows within the neighbouring dwellings at No. 7 and No. 11 Cotwell Avenue.
- 7.13 With regard to No. 11 to the northeast of the site, the proposed extension would encroach into the 45-degree shadowing zone taken from the nearest habitable room window. However, the position of an existing detached garage and block wall within the neighbouring rear garden already contribute to a level of overshadowing for the neighbouring dwelling on the site. The proposed extensions would not result in a significant increase to the level of overshadowing over and above that which already exists for No. 11.
- 7.14 The same assessment was undertaken for the dwelling at No. 7 Cotwell Avenue. Although there was also a slight encroachment into the 45-degree zone of a metre, the nearest rear window serves a non-principal room and is obscured glazed. Most activity would take place in the rear conservatory which is set over 6.0 metres from the proposed extension. The neighbouring site is also set to the south-west enjoying access to a high level of sunlight. It is also noted that the mature tree set within the neighbouring site close to the dwelling would contribute to existing overshadowing experienced by the neighbouring occupiers. The above points conclude that the extent of overshadowing introduced from the scale of the proposed extension would not be considered particularly more harmful than that already received to the rear of No. 7.
- 7.15 The eaves of the proposed extension are low at 2.2m in height and the proposed gabled roof is pitching away from the side boundaries. The dwellings are detached providing adequate setbacks limiting any impacts to an acceptable level. Although the proposed increase of built form is of a considerable scale and would introduce significant mass and bulk to the rear of the property, the shading impacts to the neighbouring properties are not considered to be significantly harmful enough to warrant planning refusal.
- 7.16 A proposed close-boarded boundary fencing at 2.0m in height would also cast relative shadowing toward the side elevations of the dwelling at No. 7. It is acknowledged there would be a limited reduction in natural light levels, although shading from the host dwelling itself likely already covers this extent. However, the fence can be constructed without any planning approval and therefore no further comment will be made.
- 7.17 Concerns were raised regarding overlooking from the side door and proposed lower ground window. A level of overlooking is expected from neighbouring side elevations and most principal windows are located on the front and rear of dwellings for this reason. The proposed window would serve a utility room, which along with the side

entrance would be considered to be used fleetingly, and therefore no significant privacy concerns are raised.

- 7.18 Concerns were also raised regarding overlooking from the proposed upper-level rear window and Juliet balcony which would alter the existing high level of privacy enjoyed by the neighbouring occupiers. It is fully acknowledged that there would be a level of overlooking which is not currently characteristic of the immediate locality.
- 7.19 However, the site does not fall within a designated area and is not protected by any specific planning policy preventing upper-level alterations and subsequent windows for the necessary levels of natural light. Planning policy aims to minimise views were possible but not eradicate them altogether. Many bungalows are extended within the roof, and it is common to transition an area of single storey dwellings over time. The rear window would provide direct views across the subject garden, and the views to the neighbouring gardens would be angled and oblique. The level of harm from the overlooking introduced from a bedroom window, which is predominantly utilised at night, is not considered to be harmful enough to significantly impact the privacy levels of the neighbouring occupiers.
- 7.20 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not be significantly overbearing or lead to a level of overlooking that would be sufficiently harmful enough to refuse planning approval. The development would have a 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).

(iv) Highways safety and parking

- 7.21 The existing dwelling is a two-bedroomed property with three external car parking spaces on the existing driveway, and one internal parking space within the integral garage. Havant's Car Parking SPD 2016 stipulates a requirement for three on-site parking spaces for a dwelling with 4+ bedrooms, which is already achieved on the site and is to be retained. No parking or highways concerns are raised.

(v) CIL requirements

- 7.22 The proposed development would exceed the threshold triggering CIL liability with a net gain of gross internal floor area of 133.75 sq.m. It is noted that the applicant has applied for a residential extension exemption from the payment of CIL.

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/21/01158, 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:

Existing Location & Block Plans Drw. No. E001 - received 27 Oct 2021

Existing Elevations Drw. No. E002 - received 27 Oct 2021

Existing Photo Views Drw. No. E003 - received 27 Oct 2021

Existing Floor and Roof Plans Drw. No. E004 - received 27 Oct 2021

Proposed Location & Block Plans Drw. No. P001 - received 24 Jan 2022

Proposed Elevations Drw. No. P002 - received 24 Jan 2022

Proposed Perspectives Drw. No. P003 - received 24 Jan 2022

Proposed Floor Plans Drw. No. P004 - received 24 Jan 2022

Proposed Roof Plans Drw. No. P005 - received 24 Jan 2022

Proposed Cross Sections & Internal Perspectives Drw. No. P006 - received 24 Jan 2022

45-degree Testing Plan Drw. No. P009 - received 24 Jan 2022

Design and access Statement - received 27 Oct 2021

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used 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.