
Site Address:	28 Lynwood Avenue, Waterlooville, PO8 8PZ		
Proposal:	Raise roof ridge height and addition of side dormers. (Revised application).		
Application No:	APP/21/00686	Expiry Date:	20/08/2021
Applicant:	Mr Waite		
Agent:	Mrs Hawkins	Case Officer:	Selina Donophy
	Thorns Young Architectural		
Ward:	Hart Plain		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 This application site is a detached bungalow located on the east side of Lynwood Avenue, close to the junction with Sutton Road. This dwelling has a pitched roof, with is the subject of the application, which is attached via a garage to no 26 to the south. The elevations comprise horizontal cladding to the principal elevation and cream render to the remaining elevations. The area is predominantly residential in character and in the immediate area, most properties comprise bungalows; with some degree of variety.

2 Planning History

APP/20/01094 - Raise roof ridge height and addition of dormers., REF,03/03/2021

3 Proposal

Raise roof ridge height and addition of side dormers. (Revised application).

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)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

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)
-----	-----------------------

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor David Jenner

No comment

Councillor E Shimbart - Hart Plain

No comment

Councillor P Bains - Hart Plain Ward

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: 14

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
I am writing to you in connection with a planning application ou have received ref APP/21/00686. As the owner of a property overlooked at the rear of a proposed extension intended at 28 Lynwood Avenue, I wish to appeal against its building . The revised plans available do not appear to show any height measurements, but it would seem obvious that the build will become very large and overdeveloped for the plot it sits on. It will also block out much of the sunlight both my property and garden , including my neighbours receive during the day and evening. In addition, the dormer windows intended for side and rear of the build	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

will overlook mine and neighbours property/gardens meaning loss of privacy. The surrounding area sites many bungalows built for a specific purpose and people, therefore this build is totally out of keeping with it. Please be mindful of this when deciding.	
---	--

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 is a resubmission application following the refusal and subsequent dismissal at appeal of APP/20/01094 which was for a similar proposal. The previous proposal sought to raise the ridge to 5.8 metres height (an increase of approximately 1.1 metres) . The proposed side dormers had widths of approximately 8.7 metres, depths of 2.5 metres and heights would equalling 2 metres approximately , with flat roofs.

This current proposal seeks to raise the ridge height and add two side dormers however the proposal has been reduced in scale as shall be discussed in the section below.

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

7.4 This proposal seeks to raise the ridge to a height of approximately 5.3 metres - an increase of approximately 0.6 metres from existing. The dormers proposed to both sides would have widths of approximately 6.3 metres , depths of 2.4 metres and heights of 1.8 metres with flat roofs. This space would create 3 bedrooms at first floor level - there would be one window at first floor level on the front elevation serving a bedroom, with two high level windows on the dormers either side . The two rear bedrooms would also be served by high level windows on each side dormer and windows to the rear elevation. One dormer window would not be high level (south elevation) and this would serve the stairwell.

7.5 This application is in some ways an improvement from APP/20/01094 in that there has been some reduction in the ridge height alongside the reduction in scale of the dormers, setting them back from the front elevation. Whilst this may be the case, the reduction in the ridge height has meant the dormers are set higher up towards the ridge which results in a box like appearance ,contrary to the design guidance which

states that dormers should sit subserviently in the roof slope .

7.6 The previous reason for refusal for APP/20/01094 was as follows :

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. 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.

Below are comments made by the inspector culminating in dismissal at appeal :

4. A detached dwelling on the corner of Lynwood Avenue and Sutton Road, next to the appeal property, with an asymmetric catslide roof, is an exception to the predominant building designs. However, the roof forms of the other properties and the symmetry between pairs of dwellings are distinctive features and a characteristic of Lynwood Avenue. I observed during my site visit that there has been very little alteration to the roof slopes visible from the road.

5. The appeal property is one of the lower bungalows and is characteristic of that design in the Avenue. The raising of the height of the ridge of the roof by approximately 1.1 m would result in a steeper roof pitch. Although the dormers have been raised above the eaves line, they would still be large relative to the roof in height, depth and length. They would dominate the roof rather than being subservient in the manner of the existing dormers visible on properties on Lynwood Avenue. They would thus be contrary to the guidance on dormers in the Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

6. The dormers would significantly increase the bulk of the host property resulting in the loss of its characteristic form. They would also upset the symmetry with its attached neighbour, and the dormer on the southern roof slope would diminish the gap between the two at roof level. Consequently, the extended dwelling would be at odds with the majority of the other dwellings in the Avenue. The dormers would be clearly visible from Lynwood Avenue when passing and approaching from either direction, particularly from the south-west due to a bend in the road.

The character of the streetscene has not changed since the appeal decision and the application property forms part of a pair of traditional pitched roof bungalows - further examples of which are located in the immediate vicinity . It is also judged that the dormers as proposed still remain large relative to the roof in height, depth and length resulting in loss of its characteristic form. The property is located within a prominent location in the streetscene and therefore would be highly visible from the public realm. The resubmission scheme is not deemed to mitigate against the previous reasons for refusal , it is also deemed contrary to Policy E1 of the submission Local Plan which states that Planning permission will be granted for development that :

- a. Is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work, visit and enjoy;*
- b. Demonstrates that neighbourhood plans, local design statements, and the design elements of conservation area appraisals which identify local character and distinctiveness have been taken into account;*
- c. Demonstrates that it:*

- i. Responds to, and draws inspiration from its local context and where appropriate, forges a new sense of place through design;*
- ii. Considers characteristics such as height, massing, existing building lines, plot widths and depths and proportions of building features such as windows and doors;*
- iii. Identifies and positively responds to existing natural and built features including listed buildings, conservation areas and other heritage assets within or close to the development;*
- iv. Makes a positive contribution to the overall appearance of the street scene and wider area by use of good quality materials of appropriate scale, profile, finish, colour and durability;*
- v. Produces a positive relationship with and between existing and proposed buildings, streets and spaces;*
- vi. Avoids over-dominance and does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through overshadowing, massing, the loss of privacy, outlook, overlooking, and through odour, noise or disturbance;*

- 7.7 Whilst there are examples of dormers on surrounding properties, these are generally smaller, set into the roof slope and do not alter the appearance to the dwelling to the same degree this proposal would. Policy CS16 of the current local plan - 'High Quality Design' is deemed to be breached as it is considered that the proposal would be harmful to the existing streetscene and the visual amenity of the immediate locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 To the north of the site is no 35 Sutton Road which is a two storey property with a conservatory to the side elevation at ground floor level. The dormer proposed to this side elevation roof slope would have 3 windows, however, these are not judged to result in unacceptable harmful overlooking back towards no 35 as the proposed windows would be set at high level, with eave heights 1.7 metres above finished floor level.
- 7.9 To the south of the application site is no 26 Lynwood Avenue a pitched roof bungalow set on a level position with no 28. The front and rear dormer windows would both be set at high level on this side with eave heights 1.7 metres above finished floor level. The middle dormer window serving the stairwell would be left at full height, however this window would have views over the roof slope of no 26, not resulting in any direct overlooking.
- 7.10 To the rear of the site is no 2 Bridefield Close - there is approximately 25 metres back to back separation distance between these properties, which exceeds the minimum 24 metres distance for a 2 storey to single storey relationship as specified in the Havant Borough Design Guide. The impact of the additional rear elevation first floor windows is therefore considered acceptable in this instance.
- 7.11 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

- 7.12 The proposal would result in 3 bedrooms at the property- this would require 2 parking spaces on site as stipulated in the Havant Borough Parking SPD. Whilst there would be an increase by 1 bedroom, the requirement for parking allocation between a 2

bedroom property an a 3 bedroom property remains unchanged, therefore the on site parking is judged to be acceptable.

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. 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/21/00686

for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed provision of two side dormers and raised ridge would result in a contrived and incongruous design which would have a harmful impact on the existing property, detracting from the character of the street scene and the visual amenity of the immediate locality. It is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.