
Site Address:	33 Alameda Road, Waterlooville, PO7 5HD		
Proposal:	Roof extension over existing flat roof single storey extension, with front dormer and rear Juliet balcony.		
Application No:	APP/15/00044	Expiry Date:	25/03/2015
Applicant:	Mr A Watson	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr D Treagus	Case Officer:	Stephen Andrews
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is made up of a detached bungalow with vehicular access to side with detached garage at the rear. There is additional on site parking to the front. The dwelling has been extended to the rear, with second garage/store within the rear garden. There is a conservatory style addition to the rear also.

The rear garden is enclosed by a mix of brick and block walling, timber fencing and hedging.

The area is residential in character with dwellings along this section of Alameda Road made up predominantly of detached bungalows, many of which have some form of roof accommodation. Immediately to the rear of the site are the two storey dwellings within Greenacre Gardens; it is also noteworthy that the rear wall of the existing dwelling lies directly adjacent to the rear boundary of the dwelling at 7 Greenacre Gardens.

2 Planning History

26177/1 - Single storey rear extension. Approved - 27/04/1981.

3 Proposal

Planning permission is sought to create a gable end from the hipped roof at the rear of the existing dwelling (with barn hipped top) and to provide a rear Juliet balcony at first floor level. (NB The 'existing plans' submitted with the application indicate that the rear part of the dwelling has a flat roof, when in fact this is hipped).

The development would also see accommodation provided within the existing roof space with the insertion of a front facing dormer window, two roof lights in the side (south) roof slope and one roof light in the north side roof slope.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS16 (High Quality Design)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Development Engineer - Highways - No objection

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within the urban area of Waterlooville where further development is considered to be acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

In respect of the impact of the development on character and appearance it is considered that the main changes in this regard relate to the insertion of the front dormer window. It was noted on the officer site visit that there were numerous examples of front dormer windows within Alameda Road and that they all varied in scale and appearance.

The proposed dormer window is a modest single dormer that would be positioned centrally within the existing hipped roof form of the dwelling. The dormer is considered to be well designed and would be a modest addition within the street scene. Having regard to the prevailing character it is not considered that its inclusion

would be out of keeping or visually intrusive.

The new rear gable end may be glimpsed from the street scenes of Alameda Road at the front and Greenacre Gardens at the rear. However, the modest change in roof form is not considered to be to a degree that would harm the general character and appearance of the area.

It is therefore considered that the design and appearance of the proposed additions would accord with the relevant criteria of policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy and with the general objectives of the NPPF.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

In respect of the front dormer window the general outlook would be over Alameda Road. Although the dormer window would allow views towards the dwellings on the opposite side of the road the separation distances involved would ensure that this would not result in unacceptable levels of overlooking or loss of privacy. Further the proposal would be no more harmful than views currently obtained from standing on the footpath in front of these neighbouring dwellings opposite.

It is therefore considered that the front dormer window would not be unacceptably harmful to residential amenity.

Although it is not overly clear from the submitted plans the two rooflights shown in the southern side elevation would serve two bath rooms, whilst the roof light in the northern side elevation would provide light to the stair well. On this basis it is considered that provided the bathroom windows were obscurely glazed there would be no significant harm by way of overlooking or loss of privacy from these windows and neighbour amenity would be protected.

In respect of the creation of a rear gable it is not considered that this amendment to the roof form would on its own be harmful to neighbour amenity in terms of scale and bulk. The general separation distances between neighbours and positioning and scale of existing outbuildings would ensure that there would be no increased harm by way of overbearing effect, overshadowing or loss of light.

The proposed first floor full height doors and juliet balcony, however, are considered to introduce a form of development that would allow a significant increase in overlooking, loss of privacy and the perception of being overlooked. This would be particularly applicable to the two semi-detached dwellings to the west of the site, within Greenacre Gardens (numbers 7 and 8).

There is a separation distance of some 11m from the rear of the application dwelling and 7 Greenacre Gardens, with number 8 being just over 11m - significantly less than the 20m separation recommended in the Borough Design Guide SPD (para 5.41 refers). The rear gardens and rear elevations of these dwellings are relatively open and as such the ability to view over these neighbours at first floor level would be overt and thus unacceptably harmful.

In addition to the overlooking and loss of privacy to 7 and 8 Greenacre Gardens it is considered that the ability to stand out and look over other adjoining neighbours' gardens would also be possible. The lack of meaningful screening and close proximity of dwellings would serve to compound this identified harm.

The proposed first floor full height doors and juliet balcony in the rear elevation of the extended dwelling would therefore result in unacceptable levels of overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings as well as increasing the perception of being overlooked. This part of the development would therefore conflict with Policy CS16, criteria 1 (e) of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, and Paragraph 5.41 of the Borough Design Guide SPD.

As part of the officer assessment, consideration has been given to the removal of the juliet balcony and creation of a window in the first floor rear elevation instead. Whilst this may reduce some of the impact to some adjoining neighbours, the harm identified above to 7 and 8 Greenacre Gardens was considered to still remain. As such this amendment has not been pursued.

Whilst it is noted that no objections have been received from neighbouring dwellings, this does not mean that the harm does not exist. The assessment in respect of identified harm falls to the local planning authority and must still be made irrespective of letters not received or either objecting or supporting a proposal.

8 Conclusion

Having regard to the above information it is considered that the development as proposed would result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenities of adjoining neighbours by reason of unacceptable levels of overlooking and loss of privacy as well as the perception of being overlooked. The development would therefore conflict with Policy CS16, criteria 1 (e) of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, and paragraph 5.41 of the Borough Design Guide SPD and as such is put forward with a recommendation to refuse.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/15/00044 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed first floor full height doors with Juliet balcony in the rear elevation of the extended dwelling would result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenities of adjoining neighbours by reason of unacceptable levels of overlooking and loss of privacy as well as the perception of being overlooked. The development would therefore conflict with Policy CS16, criteria 1 (e) of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, and paragraph 5.41 of the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011.