
Site Address: 3 Grenfield Court, Emsworth, PO10 7SA
Proposal: Retrospective application for loft conversion, replace existing conservatory roof with solid insulated roof.
Application No: APP/22/00062 Expiry Date: 14/03/2022
Applicant: Mr C Watts
Agent: Case Officer: Selina Donophy
Ward: Emsworth

Recommendation: **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION IN RETROSPECT**

1 Site Description

This application site is a pitched roof , detached bungalow located on the south side of Grenfield Court, Emsworth. This property is located where the road forms a cul de sac around the green area. The property has been developed with extensions added to the side and rear and dormers added to both side roof slopes - the dormers are the subject of this planning application.

2 Planning History

03/61865/000 - Conversion of part of garage to living accommodation and garage extension to front elevation., PERM,27/03/2003
APP/21/01133 Retrospective planning application for loft conversion windows.WITHDRAWN 09.02.2022

3 Proposal

Retrospective application for loft conversion, replace existing conservatory roof with solid insulated roof.

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
E1* (High quality design)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

ENP_D1 (General Design Policy)
ENP_D2 (Height, Mass & Materials)
ENP_D3 (Layout, Form & Density)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Julie Thain-Smith

No comment

Councillor Lulu Bowerman

No comment

Councillor R Kennett

No comment

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: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
None	

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.

- 7.3 This application follows the withdrawal of a previous application which related to solely the clear glazing of some of the dormer windows as it was ascertained the dormers did not fall within permitted development limits and therefore require full planning permission.
- 7.4 It is noted that a side extension has also been built linking no 2 and 3 Grenfield Court and this has not been shown on the plans. There are also labelling errors on the plans (for example the elevation labeled 'east' is west and 'west' is east).

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

- 7.5 This application is a retrospective proposal which includes the addition of the two dormers to either side of the roof slopes and the replacement of the rear conservatory roof. The dormers retrospectively proposed to the east and west roof slopes of the property are different in depth and have flat roofs. The dormer to the east elevation has a width of approximately 8.4 metres and 1.15 metres height. The dormer to the west roof slope has dimensions of approximately 8.4 metres width and 1.8 metres height. Both dormers would come level in height to the ridge - at the time of site visit the ridge tile had been removed and therefore the dormers appeared to rise above the ridge line. The western dormer comes very close to the eaves line (approximately 25 cms raised up), whereas the eastern dormer is raised higher up from the eaves. Both dormers are located very close to the front and rear end gable walls (again by approximately 25cms). The dormers have allowed for 2 first floor bedrooms, both with en suite bathrooms and walk in wardrobes. The eastern dormer rear bedroom window would have frosted glass, with the 3 remaining windows serving the landing and front bedroom to be left with clear glass, opening windows. To the western dormer all four windows would be frosted glass.
- 7.6 The dormers, due to the raised height, width and proximity to the eaves as well as the proximity to the front and rear gable walls, appear as bulky and overbearing features to the roof slope. The dormers are judged to overwhelm the roof slope, in stark contrast to the subservient design of dormer supported by the Local Planning Authority, comprising of dormers which are set in from the sides of the roof and much smaller in scale. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 gives the following guidance in relation to dormers:

Dormers and Roof Lights

5.47 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.

5.48 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.

5.50 Applicants should also explore the possibility of gaining light through windows in gable walls and rooflights. As discussed above these may not be acceptable in all instances. Rooflights on the roof fronting a street should be avoided, these should be located to the rear. New dormers, rooflights and windows should not have an adversely negative effect on the privacy of neighbours.

The design guide also provides at figure 5.13 examples of incorrect and correct dormers.

- 7.7 Policy CS16 of the Havant Local Plan states that development will be supported which :

Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;

This proposal is not judged to reflect the character of the locality which comprises pitched roof bungalows and not large flat roof additions creating the appearance of a flat roof, two storey dwelling .

The Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan states in Policy D1 that :

All new developments and redevelopment proposals across the neighbourhood area are expected to be of high quality, in accordance with the other policies and the other provisions contained within this neighbourhood plan.

The proposal is not considered to be a high quality addition to both the host dwelling or the character of the wider area.

- 7.8 The dormers as built and proposed as part of this application are deemed contrary to all guidance outlined above . Grenfield Court consists of a group of pitched roof bungalows of the same pitched roof design. Whilst it is noted another property has been developed with dormers either side of the roof slope (no 5 Grenfield Court) this appears to have been constructed within permitted development limits, with an application approved in 2016 relating to the glazing of the dormer windows. It is not considered appropriate for these dormers to set a precedent, in addition the dormers are not as close to the edges of the roof slopes as those proposed at no 3.
- 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). The proposal is also deemed contrary to Policy D1 of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan .

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 To the east of the application site is no 2 Grenfield Court .The rear bedroom window would be obscure glazed and this is the window closest to the rear garden of no 2 . The two landing windows are not considered to be windows in prolonged use and would be set in towards the middle of the roof and therefore not offering direct views to the garden , nor down towards the ground floor of no 2 as the properties are located fairly close together . The front bedroom window would have views mainly out towards the green and front garden areas and therefore the windows are not considered to result in harmful overlooking to this property.
- 7.11 To the west of the application site is no 4 Grenfield Court which is set back to the south of no 3 and then Nos 5 and 6 Grenfield Court which are further across to the west. These windows would all be obscure glazed , with the bedroom windows labelled as fire safety opening only. These windows are not considered to result in harmful overlooking to the properties to the west.

- 7.12 Consequently, it is considered that the proposals do not lead to 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) Parking

- 7.13 This proposal would result in 5 bedrooms which is an increase in 2 bedrooms from 3 previously. As stipulated in the Havant Parking SPD as 5 bedroom property would require 3 parking spaces on site whereby a 3 bedroom property would only require 2 parking spaces on site. No parking plan has been provided however it appears that 3 vehicles could be parked on the area to the front of the property and therefore the parking allocation is considered to have been met.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The general design of this proposal, including the side dormers 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. The dormers result in mass and bulk which is not considered to be appropriate within the context of the existing property . 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 PLANNING PERMISSION IN RETROSPECT** for application APP/22/00062

(B) for the following reasons

- 1 The dormer extensions to the roof which have already been erected by reason of their design, size, height, mass and bulk dominate the original bungalow and result in additions which appear tantamount to a two storey flat roof extension in contrast to the original modest pitched roof bungalow. 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. As such the application is considered to be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011, Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2036 policy D1 and the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 126, 130 and 134.