

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

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

Submission Version Havant Local Plan
E1* (High quality design)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Gwen Robinson

No comment

Councillor Mike Sceal

No comment

Councillor Peter Wade

No comment

Developer Services, Southern Water

Please find the attached extract from Southern Water records showing the approximate position of a public sewer in the immediate vicinity of the site. The exact position of the public sewers must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

Please note:

- The 225 mm diameter gravity 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 maintenance access.

- No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water.

- No soakaway, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 metres of a public sewer.

- All existing infrastructures should be protected during the course of construction works.

Please refer to: southernwater.co.uk/media/3011/stand-off-distances.pdf

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.

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

To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk and please read our New Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link:

southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

In situations where surface water is being considered for discharge to our network, we require the below hierarchy for surface water to be followed which is reflected in part H3 of the Building Regulations. Whilst reuse does not strictly form part of this hierarchy, Southern Water would encourage the consideration of reuse for new developments.

- Reuse
- Infiltration
- Watercourse
- Storm sewer
- Combined Sewer

Guidance on Building Regulations is here:

gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-document-h

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

Website: southernwater.co.uk or by email at:

SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk

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: 64

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

Comment	Officer Comment
Dear Miss Donophy, You have already given them planning permission with restrictions, now what ? Why are they asking for more ?Do you NOT listen to what the residents are saying ? That we do not want an ugly building put on the corner of this road. I for one am already fed up with lorries coming into Armstrong Close and the constant mess in the road and on the pavement.	Objection noted. It is acknowledged that construction activity can cause disruption to adjoining properties, however this is a temporary

They do NOT clear up and anybody on a wheelchair such as my neighbours cannot go on the pavement. They have to go on the road. Their address is Charlesworth Drive, not Armstrong Close. And as it was you who gave planning permission please tell your clients who live there to clean up the mess before somebody has an accident/ Would you like the bill if I get a puncture in my tyres. As you are responsible for giving planning permission I also suggest that you tell them to deliver their goods to their address in Charlesworth Drive and NOT Armstrong Close. The building is OVERSIZED already but I no doubt YOU will give them what they want as you don't live here and have to look at the eyesore. I am totally against any more planning applications.	impact and is not a material planning consideration. Any undue noise and disturbance would be a matter controlled under separate Environmental Health legislation. Please see 'Planning Considerations' section below.
I wish to reiterate my comments and objections as given on my appeal for the planning APP/21/00179 that relates to the same property and which I use again for these objections. As I stated before i am objecting to this planning and it has now been proved that the residents of 35 Charlesworth are still pursuing their goal of building an enormous/ out of character property. All residents have complained including myself which appears to have been ignored. I would again stress that the work vans are limiting access into Armstrong Close which is not acceptable especially if a fire engine was needed in an emergency. There has been days when the mess has just been left on the public's highway and not properly cleared up. This is a bungalow estate and the proposed build is not in keeping with the estate - it is not a housing estate. The proposed changes will dominate many of the surrounding properties and impact on these residents including myself, directly on our human rights. I chose to live on a bungalow estate for	Please see response above.

my peaceful enjoyment and this is being removed with the development of 35 Charlesworth Drive. I stated my concern before that granting planning permission will lead to repeated applications until the occupants of 35 Charlesworth Drive have got what they want - this appears to be exactly what is happening. I feel that the council has to take into account the objections of the many residents which should override all else and the planning is refused.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section below.
It is unbelievable that the couple is still pushing back after everything they initially got. It is an insult not only to Havant Borough Council but also to the 44 people that contested the plans. They are making a mockery of the whole system, the house, no doubt will be changed on the inside to be exactly as they originally proposed. Why on earth do two people need three toilets downstairs... not to mention the 2 upstairs, these are going to be made into self-contained rooms. Many residents are still talking about this development and two locals have put their house up for sale because of the precedent it sets. The reason you now have fewer comments opposing these plans is there is very much a "what's the point" attitude. The council didn't listen to the 44 previous comments, leaving the community questioning if they were even read. - I feel unfortunately there is very little chance these few comments are going to be considered either and It has left me wondering just how many would have made a difference or were the plans always going to be passed regardless. The images they have provided to illustrate why they should be allowed their original ridiculously large dormers are completely different to what they are proposing. All of those existing dormers are built within the footprint of the original property. Theirs plan to come up considerably past the neighbouring property. Maybe the couple would like to update their plans	Comments have been noted .

to have the longer dormers they want in the original bungalow space like the rest of the examples they have provided. Why they would even want to live there now is completely beyond me. Everything we wrote in our original documents still stands and we hope will be considered such as Loss of light and overshadowing, Loss of Privacy, traffic and parking issues (if) (once) this property becomes a business/HMO/Carehome, the sheer sizes and design of the overdevelopment etc...	
Object & Reject! How can these people have the nerve to apply again with the original obnoxious plans to develop this site? Over 50 rejections before & I hope there'll be a ton more. They won't live in it, they'll build, sell & move on. The residents have spoken angrily before & we speak again the plans are ignorant, obnoxious & plain rude! Is there something wrong at the council too? If it was on your doorstep you wouldn't want it either. If the council approve these plans then someone is getting paid for not doing their job correctly. The plans block light left, right & centre, it's ugly & completely out of character with the local surroundings. OBJECT AND REJECT!!!	Objection noted.

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 and access
- (v) CIL

- (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 is a re-submission application following the previous application referenced APP/21/00179 which was granted permission earlier this year . This current application is a re-submission of the original plans submitted under APP/21/00179 . Case Officer concerns were raised at the time due to the large rear dormer which was deemed to be overly dominant in scale, resulting in unacceptable mass and bulk on the roof slope and creating the appearance of a full second storey. This was discussed with the applicants at the time and the plans were amended , splitting the dormer into two smaller dormers and reducing these in scale. Following the changes, these dormers were considered to be acceptable in appearance within the context of the host property and the streetscene.

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

- 7.4 This proposal , as a resubmission application, has the same description as the previous application APP/21/00179, however features a larger rear dormer than that approved under APP/21/00179. As stated in the report for APP/21/00179 the alterations including the raising of the ridge by 0.5 metres. front extension, rear extensions and front dormer are judged to be acceptable alterations. The proposed rear dormer is the subject of change and would have dimensions of approximately 11 metres width , 2 metres height and 4.4 metres depth . It would result in an enlarged bathroom and additional window serving the bathroom to replace the previously approved rooflight.
- 7.5 The applicant has submitted a document with this application which shows other dormers in the surrounding area however many of the examples shown are situated in roads a reasonable distance away from the application site , 73 Haslar Crescent is sited two roads away and was constructed prior to current design guidance , Andrew Crescent also is not deemed to be the immediate streetscene and has a different precedent for dormers than Charlesworth Drive - as does Esther Drive. It is noted that there are examples of dormers nearby , although many of these are much smaller in size than that proposed and the sites are different in context to this application site- this property is being developed in many aspects , with the raising of the ridge, hip to gable roof extension, dormers to the front elevation and extensions to the front and rear and therefore these additions all add to the mass and bulk of the property as a whole. When read in conjunction with these other elements of the proposal, the rear dormer is deemed to be too dominant and in contrast to the Havant Borough Design Guidance which states the following :

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.
(Havant Borough Design Guide para 5.48, page 48)

- 7.6 Whilst sited to the rear of the dwelling, the proposed dormer would be partially visible from Charlesworth Drive due to the corner plot location and would be evidently visible from Armstrong Close , as the rear of no 35 Charlesworth Drive faces back towards the front elevations of properties along Armstrong Close. The overall dormer roof extension would appear bulky and appear dominant when viewed from the locality. It is considered that the proposed dormer by virtue of its siting, scale and bulk would have an unacceptable and dominant impact on the character of the host dwelling, the character of the locality and visual amenities of the street scene.

- 7.7 The design and appearance of the proposal is not considered to be acceptable, and therefore contrary to Policy CS16 (High Quality Design) of the HBLP (Core strategy) and the Havant Borough Design Guide.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 The comments made in reference to APP/21/00179 are deemed to still apply in this instance as the dormer would not come closer to the side of no 33 . The bathroom window is not deemed to result in additional harm to the amenity of surrounding properties.
- 7.9 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or 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 and access

- 7.10 A parking and access plan has been provided with this application which shows two parking spaces allocated towards the front of the site and one to the rear of the site following the demolition of the existing garage. In relation to the previous application ,concerns had been raised relating to parking issues along Charlesworth Drive however this proposal would result in an increase in on site parking subsequently reducing pressure on surrounding on street parking. The proposal includes 3 bedrooms - the Havant Borough Parking SPD requires a 3 bedroom property to have 2 parking spaces on site and this meets these requirements. In addition, the bedroom number would not be increasing from existing, therefore there is no requirement for any increased parking allocation. The Highways Officer had been consulted in relation to the access in the previous application and upheld no objection to the proposals.

(v) CIL

- 7.11 This application would include less than 100sq metres additional floorspace and is therefore not CIL liable.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The rear dormer as proposed would appear as an overly bulky and dominant addition resulting 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. 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/21/00825

(B) for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed dormer roof extension by reason of its siting, design and scale, would appear an incongruous and prominent addition which would dominate the host dwelling, detrimental to the character of the locality and the visual amenities of the street scene. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the adopted Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011.