
Site Address:	62 Hambledon Road, Waterloo, PO7 7UB		
Proposal:	First floor extension.		
Application No:	APP/14/00246	Expiry Date:	29/04/2014
Applicant:	Mr Iraque	Team:	Team 2
Agent:		Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site relates to a detached chalet style dwelling located on the eastern side of the residential Hambledon Road (which runs parallel to the dual carriage way), directly adjacent the roundabout with Milton Road. Number 62 is the penultimate property before the junction, with number 64 to the north being a similar designed detached chalet bungalow. To the south the adjacent property comprises a semi-detached two storey dwelling set in a more forward position on the corner of Fennel Close. To the rear of the site the other properties are detached bungalows set in modest plots.

The footprint of the property fills the width of the plot - the separation distance to the side boundaries is only about 0.5m. The property currently has first floor accommodation provided with dormer windows with clear glass to both the front and rear. The rear garden boundaries are generally 1.8 high close boarded fences. To the front there is a low boundary wall, and hard surfaced drive leading to an integral garage - there is ample parking for 3 cars on site.

The existing chalet dwelling has eaves height of 2.5m, a fully hipped roof having ridge height of 6.1m.

2 Planning History

None

3 Proposal

The proposal involves the removal of the existing lean-to conservatory to the rear and first floor extensions which would in effect change the chalet style dwelling to a two storey house. The existing fully hipped roof and dormers would be removed and a first floor added above the existing footprint of the ground floor, with the exception of the single storey gabled projection in the south west corner of the house which would remain.

This would result in an eaves height of 4.9m and a replacement shallow pitched roof having overall height of 6.8m

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies
NPPF

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS16 (High Quality Design)

DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Development Engineer - no adverse comment to this application subject to the provision of three car parking spaces and cycle facilities.

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: 4

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary: Object - to roof being altered; will affect daylight, privacy and outlook. Do not want overlooking of garden; will stop sun in afternoon; should stay a chalet bungalow; intrusive as so close to boundary.

Comment: These issues are considered below:

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) Effect on street scene
- (ii) Privacy/Overlooking
- (iii) Overshadowing/Loss of Light
- (iv) Overbearing impact on neighbour

- (i) Principle of development

The site is located within a defined urban area whereby development is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to other development control considerations

- (ii) Effect on street scene

The character of the surrounding area is mixed; Milton Road and Fennel Close are generally characterised by bungalows with fairly uniform ridge heights, providing a lower roof line to the east of the site. However Hambledon Road itself is more varied - this northern part of the road is generally bungalows and chalets, but there are examples of two storey dwellings interspersed. Immediately to the south of the site is a two storey semi detached house with its higher ridge. Therefore the proposed increase in height from 6.1m to 6.8m would provide a logical step between the two storey dwelling the south and the chalet to the north. However, the width of the proposed two storey element would almost fill the plot, and although the building line with no.60 is staggered, it would result in two large masses close together with only a limited glimpse of space between the first floors. This would contrast with the more spacious prevailing character in this part of Hambledon Road, where the predominance of bungalows and chalets retains a good degree of visible space/sky between those buildings which have a first floor element (many other buildings being bungalows). In this context the proposal would appear bulky and cramped in the streetscene.

The site is visible from the main dual carriage way Hambledon Road when travelling south round the roundabout - but the proposed increase in height would be seen against the backdrop of no. 60 to the south and would not therefore appear unduly prominent.

(ii) Privacy/Overlooking

The existing chalet dwelling has first floor bedrooms and windows with views out to the surrounding residential area. The proposed first floor addition would increase the number of first floor windows, although 3 of the 5 on the rear elevation would serve bathrooms and be obscure glazed. It is unlikely that any additional overlooking or loss of privacy would result in this established residential area where a degree of vision is already possible between plots. One small first floor window is also proposed on the south side elevation and this could provide a new direct view into the neighbours garden - should permission be granted then this would need to be conditioned to be obscure glazed and non-opening to protect residential amenity. Permitted development rights for additional first floor windows and windows at roof level would also be recommended.

(iii) Overshadowing/Loss of Light

The orientation and positioning of the site is such that the morning shadow is likely to fall across the roof of the chalet to the north, no. 64; and midday shadow into the sites own rear garden. However the later afternoon and evening shadow is likely to fall across the rear garden of no. 60 to the south. More general, indirect daylight reaches the neighbour's garden from various directions, including the north west, above the roof of the bungalow at the application site.

Because of the forward positioning of no 60 the flank wall of the existing dwelling sits behind the rear facade of no. 60 and therefore alongside their garden. The full depth of the extension, some 8.7m, would be adjacent and close to the rear garden of no. 60, which would cover over half the length of their garden. The added height so close to this boundary would give rise to significant additional overshadowing and loss of sunlight and daylight to the private amenity area of no. 60 and its rear windows, possibly including loss of

sunlight during the afternoon and evening, to an unacceptable level.

(iv) Design and overbearing impact on neighbour

Due to the siting in relation to number 60 and the proximity of the existing bungalow to the side boundaries, the proposed alterations would have a significant impact on the adjacent dwelling to the south. The existing eaves height of 2.5m sits just above the fence line dividing the properties, with hipped roof sloping away. A sense of openness and space is therefore currently enjoyed by the adjacent residents. However the proposal would result in this becoming a flank wall being 4.9m high within 0.5m of the fence line, extending some 8.7m along the length of the garden. This would undoubtedly cause a sense of enclosure being overly dominant and overbearing, detrimental to the enjoyment of the private rear amenity area of the occupiers of no. 60. It is considered that the height, mass and bulk of the proposed first floor extension in such close proximity to the southern boundary would introduce an unacceptably imposing flank wall that would be harmful to the outlook from this property and the enjoyment of the private rear garden, sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

8 **Conclusion**

The proposed increase in ridge height is considered acceptable in street scene terms, and there is unlikely to be any additional overlooking or loss of privacy as a result of the proposal. However, due to the size and mass of the proposed building, leaving little space to the boundaries, it would appear cramped in the streetscene, contrary to policy CS16.

The juxtaposition of the application site with the forward position of no. 60 adjacent, the proposed extensions would have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the adjacent residents by way of overshadowing and loss of outlook and overbearing. The height mass and bulk of the proposed side elevation, within 0.5m of the boundary, extending over half the length of the neighbours garden would be unduly dominant and overbearing, contrary to policy CS16. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00246

(A)

(B) for the following reasons

- 1 The addition of the proposed first floor extension and added eaves height in such close proximity to the south-eastern boundary with nos 60 Hambledon Road, would result in an excessive building height and bulk adjacent to the private amenity area of nos 60. This would create an unacceptable sense of

enclosure and have an overbearing effect, detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 2 Due to the orientation of the site, the proposed first floor extension in such close proximity to the south-eastern boundary with nos 60 Hambledon Road, would result in unacceptable overshadowing and loss of light to the private amenity area of nos 60. This would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent residential property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 3 The size and mass of the proposed extension, bringing first floor development close to both side boundaries, would leave little space between buildings at first floor level, which would appear cramped in the streetscene and out of keeping with the character of existing surrounding development. The proposed development would, therefore, be detrimental to the amenities of the area contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.