

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Gary Hughes

No comments received.

Councillor Husky Patel

No comments received.

Councillor Ms C Howard - Purbrook Ward

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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 5

5 objections raising the following issues:

- The proposed extension has a bigger footprint than the original building
- The roof of the proposed extension is higher than the existing roof
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Overdevelopment not in keeping with the existing bungalows
- Bulky and out of character to the row of bungalows
- Overlooking
- Noise
- Insufficient parking
- Building works vehicles would make it more hazardous in the road
- These sets of bungalows are mainly elderly or disabled occupancy and designed for this nature
- Too much development
- May affect value of neighbouring properties **Officer Comment:** This is not a material planning consideration

- Would be a blot on the landscape

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.

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

7.3 The proposed rear extension would project approximately 9m towards the current garage. The design would result in the ridge line of the proposed extension being higher than the existing ridge line of the existing bungalow. It would incorporate two large side dormer windows, one of which would have a high level window and the other an ensuite window.

7.4 The Havant Borough Design Guide states, inter alia, that dormers should not dominate the roof or the existing building and that to avoid this should be the same size or preferably smaller than the windows below. It also states that generally dormers should have pitched roofs with slopes in keeping with the existing roof.

7.5 It is considered that the proposals would be visible from the road and also neighbouring properties. It would be of a scale out of proportion with the existing bungalow and appear as a large bulky alien addition. It is considered that the proposed development by virtue of 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.

7.6 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 Design Guide.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.7 As noted above, the proposed extension would project some 9m. It is considered that the proposed extension would adversely impact neighbouring properties by reason of loss of light and being overbearing. Whilst it is proposed to have a high level window in one of the dormer windows it is considered that there would still be a perception of overlooking to the neighbouring properties. This is compounded by the proposed glazed gable at first floor which would give rise to unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties.

7.8 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will appear overbearing and lead to overlooking and loss of light to neighbouring properties. As such, the proposals are

contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and the Borough Design Guide.

(iv) Parking

- 7.9 Whilst the proposals would not result in the loss of the existing garage, due to the siting of the proposed extension it would not be possible to use the garage for parking of a vehicle. However, whilst the bedrooms would increase from two to three, the parking requirement of two spaces is the same. There is adequate hardstanding at the front of the property which could accommodate parking of vehicles like the adjoining property.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed extension by reason of its siting, design and scale, would appear as an incongruous bulky addition which would dominate the host dwelling and adversely affect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties by reason of loss of light, overlooking and being over bearing. In addition, it would be 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 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/21/00403 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed extension by reason of its siting, design and scale, would appear as an incongruous bulky addition which would dominate the host dwelling and adversely affect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties by reason of loss of light, overlooking and being overbearing. In addition, it would be 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 SPD 2011.