
Site Address:	Dolphins, 8 Brent Court, Emsworth, PO10 7JA		
Proposal:	Rear dormer with cladding and matching cladding to upper walls to all elevations (part retrospective).		
Application No:	APP/21/00940	Expiry Date:	29/11/2021
Applicant:	Mrs S Arnett		
Agent:	Mr B Butcher	Case Officer:	Graham Speller
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION IN RETROSPECT**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located at the end of a cul de sac and is occupied by a two storey detached dwellinghouse.
- 1.2 The dwellinghouse has recently been extended in the roof and works are ongoing.
- 1.3 The surrounding area is residential in character.

2 Planning History

02/57365/007 - Reduce height of lawson cypress trees forming part of area A1 of TPO 945., PERM,06/11/2002
02/57365/006 - Tree pruning, UNK,
97/57365/004 - Fell 12 Lawson Cypress along southern part of garden (part of Area A1 on TPO 945), REF,22/05/1997
97/57365/005 - Fell 2 Lawson Cypress trees and 5 Western Red Cedars on southern boundary covered by A1 of TPO 945, PERM,08/09/1997
95/57365/001 - Proposed works to Cypress and Western Red Cedar trees covered by TPO 945., PERM,16/02/1995
95/57365/003 - Retrospective application for erection of chimney to north side of dwelling., PERM,09/06/1995
92/57365/000 - Fell three Cypress trees reduce height of 3 other Cypress trees and raise crown on 1 Cypress tree to 3 metres all part of Area A1 covered by TPO 945, PERM,17/07/1992
08/57365/008 - Reduce height of Lawson Cypress trees forming part of Area A1 of TPO 945., PERM,25/02/2008
APP/16/01101 - Fell 3No. Conifers; crown reduce by 1.5-2m 11No. Conifers; crown reduce by 1-1.5m 16No. Leylandi. All trees within Area 1 Subject to TPO 0945., PERM,02/12/2016
APP/17/00083 - Replacement of hung tiles on rear elevation with white render., PERM,11/04/2017
APP/17/00662 - Fell 4No. Cypress (3 trees and 1 tree with three trunks). Subject to A1 of TPO 0945., PERM,19/07/2017
APP/18/00398 - Fell 3No. Chamaecyparis Lawsoniana Cypress located behind the garage. Subject to A1 of TPO 0945., PERM,29/05/2018

APP/18/00626 - Fell 1No. Cypress tree (No.15). Crown reduce 15No. Leylandii (Nos. 1-12 and Nos. 16 to 18) by 1 metre. Crown reduce 2No. Cypress trees (Nos. 13 & 14) by 1.5 metres. All trees within Area A1, subject to TPO 0945 and numbered as shown on the plan submitted with the application form., PERM,27/07/2018

APP/19/00645 - Removal of hedging (13No. Leylandi (No. 13-25) & 2No. Cypress (No. 11&12), subject to TPO 0945., PERM,07/08/2019

APP/21/00591 - Fell 1 cypress, 1 conifer reduce height 1.5-2 metres, 1 conifer reduce by 1 metre backing onto Maismore Gardens boundary., INV,

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Rear dormer with cladding and matching cladding to upper walls to all elevations (part retrospective).

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

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)

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

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)

E18 (Trees, hedgerows and woodland)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

ENP_D1 (General Design Policy)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Havant Borough Council

I have no comment, this application does not affect trees.

Councillor Julie Thain-Smith

No comments received.

Councillor Lulu Bowerman

No comments received.

Councillor R Kennett

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: 12

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 11

10 letters of representation from 9 households raising the following issues:

- No objection to the dormer but windows look odd
- Grey cladding would look better in a cream colour
- Been built without consultation with or regard to the effect on neighbours
- Light grey cladding is completely out of character with surrounding properties
- Cladding makes an already intrusive development more visually intrusive
- Permission was sought to remove trees when neighbours were unaware of plans to add a second storey to the property with the purpose of gaining a sea view
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- May be in breach of covenants
- Spoils enjoyment of garden and home
- In breach of permitted development
- Adding cladding to all four first floor elevations of the property will exacerbate the negative visual impact
- Cladding goes against the vernacular of the existing house and similar surrounding buildings
- Highlights the scale of the roof extension by its incongruous appearance
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Unattractive and overbearing appearance
- Adversely affects the residential amenity of many of the neighbouring properties
- Loss of existing tree cover is detrimental to local amenity
- Red hung tiles should be fitted in place of the grey plastic
- Consider it an eyesore
- Spoils the look of the Emsworth skyline
- Dominating second floor dormer
- Out of character of the immediate 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) Other matters

(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 The works have already been implemented and the development was being constructed under 'permitted development' with the rear dormer window roof extension nearing completion. However, due to the materials not matching the roof of the existing dwelling the applicant was advised that planning permission for the development was now required. It is noted that it is intended to clad the first floor elevation in the same cladding as that on the dormer window roof extension, however, that is not the current situation.

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

7.4 As noted in the planning history, planning permission was granted to render part of the existing property at the rear. This current application proposes cladding to the first floor on all elevations, in addition to cladding the rear dormer roof extension. As such, once the works have been carried out, the external appearance of the dormer roof extension would match that of the first floor and assimilate better.

7.5 Whilst the objections to the proposed cladding are noted, there are other properties nearby that have a rendered finish at first floor level. It is therefore considered that the proposed use of cladding would be acceptable in terms of impact on the character of the locality and visual amenities of the street scene. It is also the case that the property is set back from the road and would not appear prominent within the street scene.

7.6 The Havant Design Guide SPD states, inter alia, that dormers 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. It also states that dormers should not dominate the roof or the existing building.

7.7 Whilst the rear dormer roof extension is not below the existing ridge line, it is considered that the design is preferable to a flat roof design. It is considered that it does not dominate the roof and whilst visible from neighbouring properties and the wider area, it is not considered to result in harm to the character of the locality.

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 A number of representations raise a concern regarding overlooking and loss of privacy, particularly as tree screening has been removed.
- 7.10 The Design Guide states, inter alia, that new dormers, rooflights and windows should not have an adversely negative effect on the privacy of neighbours.
- 7.11 The nearest property that may be affected is number 67, however, that property is set at an angle relative to the property on the application site and there is an intervening garage, albeit single storey. There would be a distance of approximately 9.7m to the rear (south eastern) boundary of the property on the application site. The distance between the property on the application site and the main dwellinghouse of No 67 would be approximately 21m.
- 7.12 As noted above, the development was being constructed under permitted development and is a material planning consideration as a genuine 'fall back' position. Notwithstanding, the development now falls to be considered by the local planning authority due to the use of non matching external materials.
- 7.13 In terms of the loss of boundary trees and the reduction in privacy, as noted in the planning history above, this was with the benefit of TPO consent as they were not considered to have any public amenity value.
- 7.14 It is acknowledged that the rear dormer roof extension could give rise to a perception of being overlooked and that some overlooking could occur, particularly to No 67. However, there was already a degree of overlooking from the first floor windows of the dwellinghouse on the application site and whilst this would be increased by the dormer window roof extension, some degree of overlooking is not untypical in urban locations and, on balance, not considered to be so significant to refuse the application.
- 7.15 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear significantly overbearing or lead to significant overlooking 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).

(iv) Other matters

- 7.16 Under the Delegated Scheme of Approval, due to the number of representations received this application was referred to Ward Councillors. However, the application was not requested to be referred to the Planning Committee for determination and therefore the application can be determined under Officer delegated Powers.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours, the character of the area and the visual amenities of the street scene and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION IN RETROSPECT** for application APP/21/00940 subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

SHEET 1 OF 3 - LOCATION AND BLOCK PLAN AND PRE DEVELOPMENT GROUND FLOOR

SHEET 2A OF 3 - PROPOSED (AND AS BUILT) PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

SHEET 4 OF 4 - PROPOSED (AS BUILT) 2ND FLOOR PLAN

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 2 The development shall not be erected other than in the following materials or such other materials as have been approved in writing by the borough council:

Walls: Marley Cedral cement boarding – colour Grey Code: C05

Roof: Tiles/felt

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.