
Site Address:	86 Stakes Hill Road, Waterloooville, PO7 7LE		
Proposal:	First floor rear extension and dormers to both side elevations.		
Application No:	APP/14/00409	Expiry Date:	11/06/2014
Applicant:	Mr P Crisp	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Architectural Designs	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
Ward:	Stakes		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site relates to a detached chalet style dwelling located on the west side of Stakes Hill Road, situated within a line of similar properties. The properties are all set back from the road by approximately 10m where the front garden areas provide parking and turning. The application site is constructed of red brick with some cream painted render panels and timber cladding within the gables of the bay and dormer windows, and has a steeply pitched plain tiled roof.

The application site has already been extended in the past with a loft conversion including front dormer and single storey rear extension. The site currently has a flat roofed, full width rear extension that extends out 3.4m from the two storey gable end. There is an original pitched roof detached garage located on the northern boundary with nos 84, set back within the plot such that its front elevation aligns with the rear of the single storey extension. On this side boundary with nos 84 there is a separation distance of 2.5m to a 1.8m high close boarded fence; whilst on the southern side there is a gap of 1.5m to the side boundary with nos 88, which comprises a 2m close boarded fence.

Both adjacent properties have been the subject of complex planning histories and have now implemented extensions which affects the context and setting of the current proposal. The land is generally level.

2 Planning History

Of Application Site, no 86:

08/64181/000 - loft conversion including front dormer, single storey rear extension and roof over rear extension - Refused 24/209 - mass/bulk/position of full height doors & juliette balcony have overbearing impact + overlooking

09/64181/001 - revised application reducing rear extension by increasing hip, using dormer in rear gable & omitting juliette balcony - Permitted 13/5/09 (*NB/ What is built on site does not conform to this permission - rear gable not hip & dormer*)

Of Site to north, no 84:

13/00044 - single storey rear extension + porch - Permitted 24/9/12 (NB during course of application scheme was revised from larger, full height proposal)

13/00703 - as above - resubmitted original larger proposal - Refused 10/9/13

Appeal Dismissed 22/11/13 - Inspector noted: extension only 1m from boundary with No 82 & only 4m from habitable window in No 82s rear elevation - would diminish sunlight and daylight and outlook from No 82 would be harmed by large bulky extension so close to boundary.

13/01224 - Prior Notification of single storey extension 5m deep. Prior approval not required 2/1/14 & now implemented - design is a half way between the permission and the refusal within limits of new permitted development rights.

Of site to south, 88:

09/73991 - single storey rear extension - Permitted 19/11/09 - Implemented

APP/12/00723 - Loft conversion and velux windows - Permitted 24/9/12 - Implemented

3 Proposal

The application seeks permission to extend the first floor roof area above the existing ground floor flat roofed extension - with eaves overhang this would amount to 3.6m in depth. This would enlarge an existing bedroom. A half hipped roof is proposed on the end gable, together with 2 side hipped dormers. One of these is a 'false' dormer with no windows - it is purely to provide internal head room. The other serves a bathroom and includes an obscure glazed side window.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted 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: 2

Summary: Will be able to view into house & garden causing loss of privacy; bulky roof ext resulting in loss of light to kitchen window; dormers ugly

Comment: these issues will be 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) Mass, bulk and outlook
- (iii) Privacy
- (iv) Design
- (v) Highways

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The site lies within the urban area where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to detailed development control considerations.

(ii) Mass, bulk and outlook

7.3 The impact of the mass and bulk of the proposed extension within the context of the adjacent properties is the key consideration. It must be noted that the previous Inspector considering a rear extension with a similar full height roof at no 84 noted that in that case there was only a separation distance of 1m to the boundary and 4m to the nearest habitable window in the *rear* elevation of 82, and due to orientation the proposal would affect sunlight and daylight as well as outlook from the neighbour. In comparison the application site benefits from a greater separation distance to boundary - 2.5m to no 84 and 3.5m to the side elevation of no 88. However, the side elevation of no 84 facing the site has 4 windows, three of which are obscure glazed, but one is a main habitable window serving the kitchen. This therefore makes the nearest habitable room window closer than the adjacent appeal scenario. This window is located close to the rear of the original bungalow such that it is similarly close to the end of the roof of no 86. From within this room (currently still a builders site implementing Permission APP/13/01224) the view out is currently towards the end of the roof slope of no 86 with clear views of the sky above the flat roofed rear extension of no 86.

7.4 The proposed roof extension would block this view of the sky and since it is south of no 84, would reduce the sunlight and daylight to this window. Furthermore, it would appear as a large bulky roof mass, being overbearing and detrimental to the outlook from this window. Therefore both the loss of light and outlook would be harmful to the amenity of the occupiers of no 84 adjacent, contrary to policy CS16 e) and the Borough Design Guide, particularly paras 5.34 - 5. 51. Additionally within this roof slope facing no 84 would be a dormer containing an obscure glazed window. This would add to the bulk and mass and introduce a perception of being overlooked by the very presence of the openable window.

- 7.5 Turning to the other side, there is a 3.5m separation distance between the side elevation of no 86 to the side elevation of no 88. No 88 is staggered further back than no 86 and has also recently been extended. Within the north west corner of no 88 is a lounge having two small windows, one facing the application site and one to the rear, effectively facing this property's garage - despite its two windows, this is nevertheless a dark room and the proposed additional roof mass in such close proximity would further reduce daylight available to this room and affect outlook, to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers.

(iii) Privacy

- 7.6 With respect to privacy the view from the proposed first floor rear window is considered unlikely to cause additional direct overlooking to either adjacent garden. The presence of the pitched roof garage within the site, on the boundary with no 84 and the pitched roof garage within the rear garden of no 88, would mean the angle of vision would only enable views of the rear parts of the adjacent garden areas. This is commensurate with established views within such a residential built up area and would not lead to additional overlooking or loss of privacy.

(iv) Design

- 7.7 Whilst the proposed roof profile and end half hip is in keeping with the existing property, it is considered the proposed dormers are a poor design solution. In particular, a blank dormer, with no window at all, represents a bulky box on the side of the roof which is not visually pleasing. However, regard must be had to the fact that these dormers in themselves constitute 'permitted development' under Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended and could be implemented in isolation of the remainder of the proposal. This fallback position is a material consideration and is such that it would not be appropriate to add a further reason for refusal based on the dormer design.

(v) Highways

- 7.8 The proposal only increases the size of a bedroom - the property remains a 5 bedroom dwelling and there is ample space at the front to accommodate 3 car parking spaces, which meets the current adopted car parking standards.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the added bulk and mass of the proposed roof extension would have a detrimental effect on the residential amenity of both adjacent occupiers and the application is recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00409 for the following reason:

- 1 It is considered that the proposed rear roof extension with side dormers would, by reason of its bulk, design and proximity to adjacent properties, be overbearing and harm the visual outlook from the adjacent dwellings (No/s 84 and 88 Stakes Hill Road), to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of

these properties. Furthermore, by virtue of its mass and bulk and proximity to No. 84 Stakes Hill Road, which has habitable windows in the side elevation facing the site, the proposed rear extension would cause a loss of daylight to these windows. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and the guidance contained within the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011.