
Site Address:	8 Oaklands Grove, Waterloooville, PO8 8PS		
Proposal:	New dormer windows to south west and north east elevations to create an additional bedroom.		
Application No:	APP/14/01115	Expiry Date:	18/12/2014
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Mpario	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Davison	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	iDraw Limited		
Ward:	Hart Plain	DMC Lead Member	

Reason for Committee Consideration: At request of Cllr G Shimbart.

Does not consider that the proposal is detrimental to the street scene and, in my opinion, there would be no adverse effect on neighbouring properties. I would also like it to be the subject of a Councillors' site visit.

EHPBE Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site lies on the south side of Oaklands Grove and comprises a detached chalet style dwelling. It is one of a row of four very similar properties, all having a distinct architectural design comprising gable fronts, low eaves with very steep roof pitches. The application site includes an attached flat roof single garage to the south-west elevation. Originally each of the four similar dwellings had a small flat roofed dormer on each of their side roof slopes. Each dwelling is set back some 10m from the road in a linear fashion. Beyond these four dwellings there is a mixture of houses and bungalow designs, including dormer windows, creating a mixed character.
- 1.2 The application site already has a large dormer addition in its north-eastern roof slope, sited at the front of the house, immediately abutting the original small flat roofed dormer. This existing dormer addition has a hipped roof to minimise its bulk and the ridge aligns with the ridge of the main house. There is also an existing 'velux' window beyond the original dormer. No. 6 to the west has also added a large dormer in its north-east roofslope facing the application site - but this is sited centrally instead of the original flat roof dormer, and is pitched with a gable end so it appears larger.
- 1.3 The separation distance between these similar chalet style dwellings is quite modest - they are set quite close to one another in a line. Between the application site and No 10's attached garage is only 2m, but this widens to 4m beyond. On the other side, to No. 6, there is a separation distance of approximately 5m.
- 1.4 The site frontage is partly gravelled and provides ample space for the parking of vehicles. At the road frontage is large fir tree which partly screens the dwelling.

2 Planning History

- 2.1
 - i) 05/70225/000 - Two storey rear extension - Approved 22/03/2005.
 - ii) APP/14/00554 - New dormer windows to south west and north east elevations to create an additional bedroom - Refused under delegated powers on 23/7/14

APP/14/00554 was essentially an identical proposal to the current scheme and the refusal reason was as follows:

"The proposed dormers, by reason of their size, number and prominence would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building and character of the streetscene. Due to their bulk and the use of clear glass in one instance, they would also appear overbearing at the neighbouring properties, reducing the degree of neighbouring privacy. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and the Havant Borough Design Guide 2011."

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The current proposal is essentially a re-submission of the refused APP/14/00554. It involves adding three further dormers to the existing roofslopes. Two of the proposed dormers on rearmost part of the north-east side roofslope would be linked together to create a double dormer. These would abut the original flat roofed dormer. The design would partly match the existing front dormer in that its ridge would align with the ridge of the main house and would have a hipped roof. Two windows are proposed in this dormer, the rear most one being non-opening and obscure glazed; the other being clear glazed and opening (enabling emergency fire egress from this room).
- 3.2 On the south-west roof slope another dormer is proposed at the rear part of the roofslope, which would match the others and have a non-opening obscure glazed window. The proposal also involves reconfiguring the existing rear gable end by replacing the existing single central window with two clear glazed windows and adding timber cladding.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

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)

The Borough Design Guide SPD, Dec 2011

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None

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: None to date (publicity expiry 26/11/14)

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) Design and appearance
- (iii) Impact on residential amenity
- (iv) Other matters

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within the urban area where the principle of development, including extensions is acceptable, subject to policy and development control criteria, which are considered below.

(ii) Design and appearance

7.3 The original house and the 3 others of a similar design have a very distinct character with steep roof pitches. This results in the expanse of roof slope being a key characteristic of the design and appearance of these dwellings. Both the application site and No. 6 have already added large dormers, but each of these still leave a large expanse of the existing roof slope unaffected i.e. the original character of the host dwellings is still apparent. No.6 has replaced the original smaller dormer with a larger dormer so this roof slope still only has the one dormer. No.10 and 12 have not made any further roof alterations and their roof slopes are still intact retaining the original character.

7.4 However, the introduction of the proposed 'double' dormer on the north-east elevation, which would be seen at an angle from the street, would dominate this original roof slope with a bulky addition and would harm the original character of the dwelling itself. It is considered that this north-eastern roof slope would become so dominated by dormers that the character of the original steeply sided roof slope would be lost. The original small central dormer would become totally hemmed in and lose its spacious setting within the roof slope and the result would appear cluttered.

7.5 The introduction of a dormer on the south-west side would also affect the overall shape and profile of the building, albeit that it would be located towards the rear end of the roof, but the cumulative impact of this dormer with the others would dominate the appearance of the roof.

7.6 The Borough Design Guide recommends the dormers should be set below the ridge and in from the roof edge. In the current application the proposed dormers are tall with a vertical emphasis, spanning the height of the first floor, and although they are set in from the edge of the roof, any off-set below the ridge is so slight as to be undiscernible. Whilst

this is similar to the existing dormer on the north-east elevation, this characteristic when multiplied obscures the dominant architectural elements of the steep roof slopes and main ridge. By comparison, other dormers on properties in Oaklands Grove, all follow the advice contained within the Borough Design Guide in that they are set below the main ridges.

- 7.7 In summary the number, size and bulk of dormer windows proposed is considered to be excessive, dominating the existing roofslope, being harmful to the character of both the host dwelling and the group of similar buildings of which it forms a part. Furthermore, given the limited space between the house and its neighbours, the bulky additions on both sides would result in a congested and cramped appearance, detrimental to the spacious setting of the street scene and the group of similar buildings of which number 8 Oaklands Grove is part. Whilst there is a mature tree on the roadside immediately in front of the application site, this does not screen the oblique angled views into the site and of the roofslope from further along Oaklands Grove.

(iii) Impact on residential amenity

- 7.8 Both immediate neighbours have had rear extensions so the rear facades of the 3 properties are approximately aligned, although No. 6's addition is single storey only. Due to the tight relationship with the adjacent properties the separation distance is minimal. Therefore the potential overbearing and overlooking effect of the dormers on the immediate neighbours is a material consideration. Considering the north-eastern elevation, regard must be had to the fact there is already a clear glazed, opening rooflight window, serving bedroom 2, providing views down to the side elevation of No 10. The proposed double dormer includes replacing this rooflight with a clear glazed opening window at the northerly end of the dormer. On balance it is considered that the actual degree of overlooking and loss of privacy to the occupiers of No 10, would not be increased from the change of velux to dormer. The standing position within bedroom 2 and views out towards No 10, would not be materially different to the existing scenario on site.

- 7.9 Since the proposed plans now show fixed glazing and obscure glass to the side dormer windows serving bedrooms 3 and 4, it is considered that the actual overlooking and privacy issues have been satisfactorily overcome. Therefore there is no longer any loss of privacy or overlooking objection to the impact the proposal could have on the amenity of neighbours.

- 7.10 However the overbearing effect from the prominence and visual perception of the dormers has not changed from the previous application. Given the close proximity to the side boundaries, the bulk of the dormers is considered to be particularly visible and would be overbearing to the occupiers of both adjacent properties. Therefore the objection on overbearing grounds remains.

(iv) Other matters

- 7.11 As mentioned at 2.1 above, an almost identical scheme was refused under delegated powers in July 2014. The difference currently proposed relates to the actual fenestration details i.e. the size, obscurity and opening of the windows, which have now been made smaller with fixed panes of obscure glass (except the window serving bedroom 2 which remains opening and clear glazed). The size, mass and bulk of the actual dormers is identical.

- 7.12 However, following the previous refusal, Officers did enter into negotiations with the applicant's agent in an attempt to find a compromise design. Alternative schemes were

submitted informally, reducing the height of the dormers i.e. taking them off the ridge as advocated in the Borough Design Guide. The repeated advice by Officers was that the 'double' dormer was too large and bulky and needed 'breaking up' or half of it being omitted altogether. The issue of overlooking was also continually raised with requests for the side dormer windows to be obscure glazed. As can be seen from Appendix F the agent has provided a 'storyboard' of the design process showing the progress of alternatives that were discussed. Appendix G includes a final option submitted informally.

- 7.13 It remains the Officer's view that the 'double' dormer is too large for the roof slope and that the options which were suggested by the architect during negotiations did not sufficiently reduce the bulk and effect on the character of the host dwelling. The third option (annotated as option 3 within Appendix F) is still not ideal. Whilst the overall development is less bulky, it nevertheless results in 4 separate dormers all of different designs and proportions on one roofslope which does not represent a good cohesive design solution. The final option submitted for comment, see Appendix G, did successfully break up the conjoined dormer and propose narrower dormers set down from the ridge. The obvious compromise of removing the northerly half of the double dormer and simply leaving the rooflight serving bedroom 2, was never submitted as an option.
- 7.14 Since an acceptable compromise was not found that suited the applicant and met the Borough Design Guide, this original proposal has now been resubmitted with the support of a 'red card' from Councillor G Shimbart. The minor changes to window details and use of fixed, obscure glass in the side dormers serving the proposed bedrooms 3 and 4, represents an improvement to the perception of overlooking by neighbours, but are not in themselves sufficient to change Officers' views. It is the fundamental built form of the proposed dormers in terms of their size, bulk and dominance on the roofslope and the harmful effect this has to both the character of the dwelling itself and the group in which it is located, that Officers consider to be contrary to the Borough Design Guide and Policy CS16.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The informally submitted options do demonstrate that there are better design solutions for the application site and Officers are strongly of the view that the current proposal is not the optimum solution. It is considered that the size, number and design of the proposed dormers will detract from the distinct architectural style of both the host dwelling and its neighbours. The overall appearance would be harmful to this part of the streetscene and would be overbearing upon neighbours. As such the proposal is again recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/01115 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed dormers, by reason of their design and size, number and prominence would dominate the roofslope and have a detrimental effect on the distinct architectural appearance of the existing dwelling and character of the streetscene. Due to the close proximity to the neighbouring dwellings, the bulk of the proposed dormers would also appear overbearing to the neighbours, detrimental to their residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the

National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and the Havant Borough Design Guide 2011.

Appendices:

- (A) OS Location Plan;**
- (B) 1:500 Proposed Block Plan;**
- (C) Existing Elevations**
- (D) Proposed Layout and Roof Plan**
- (E) Proposed Elevations**
- (F) 'Storyboard' of alternative designs considered**
- (G) Final informal option**