
Site Address:	28 St Johns Avenue, Waterloooville, PO7 5PG		
Proposal:	Single storey side extension, alterations to roof to form side gable and front/ rear dormers; front extension to existing detached garage and store to form new double garage.		
Application No:	APP/14/00460	Expiry Date:	15/07/2014
Applicant:	Mrs S Searson	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr M Singleton	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

28 St Johns Avenue is a semi-detached bungalow located on the west side of the road, on the corner with Timberlane, having its detached single garage located at the end of the garden, accessed off Timberlane. The pair of semi's have fully hipped roofs of red concrete tile above red brick elevations. The immediate area is characterised by other bungalows and some chalet bungalows, all generally set back from the road with a spacious frontage setting. Being a corner plot the application site has a wider plot than its other half at 26 and is visually prominent in street scene terms. The land slopes gently down to the south-west. The rear garden has been enclosed with a 1m high close boarded fence, and some higher bamboo canes together with laurel hedging. The property has an existing single storey flat/very slightly sloping rear extension and conservatory.

2 Planning History

None at site but of relevance, next door, at no 26:

05/58791/000 - First floor side extension Refused May 2005

(The proposal involved a roof side extension, inc hip to gable, with dormer on rear roof slope and roof lights on front roof slope. The application was refused as being out of keeping with the pair, detrimental to visual appearance of the building; & cramped with nos 24).

3 Proposal

The proposed alterations include:

1/ a 5m wide by 5.5m deep single storey side extension having eaves height to match the existing bungalow, with hipped pitched roof of max height of 4.5m.

2/ change from hip to gable, with small barn hip, on original bungalow - this element calculates at 29 cubic metres and so, in its own right is permitted development - but 2 windows are proposed within the new gable end which do not meet the criteria under Class B ie they are shown as clear glass and opening and therefore this whole roof alteration does require planning permission

3/ the addition of both a front and rear dormer and 2 rear roof lights

4/ an infill extension to the existing garage/store to create a double garage, to match the existing false pitch roof profile of the existing garage

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, Dec 2012

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

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: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Summary: we were denied alterations to roofline due to affect on character of property; proposed alterations extensive & result in box on 3 sides which would stand out visually; would impact our private area; just roof light would respect privacy; no objection to garage alteration but land slopes and drainage an issue - natural flow must not be blocked; trust sheets of asbestos will be removed under correct conditions. no consideration, replaced low wall with high fence; will overlook kitchen and garden.

Comment: drainage and asbestos issues are Building Control matters

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 character in street scene
- (iii) Impact on residential amenity

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The site lies within the urban area where the principle of development is acceptable, subject to normal policy and development control criteria.

(ii) Design and character in street scene

- 7.3 The site currently forms a symmetrical, balanced, hipped semi-detached property. The proposal would un-balance its visual appearance in the street scene on this prominent corner plot. Whilst permitted development rights are such that a hip to gable change could be implemented without planning permission, the change needs planning permission in this instance by virtue of the proposed two side windows which do not meet the requirements of Class B of the General Permitted Development Order, and the dormer additions that also form part of the scheme. Therefore it is appropriate to consider the visual impact of the proposed roof alterations as part of this proposal.
- 7.4 The roof alterations include the provision of both a front and rear pitched roof dormer - the rear dormer window serves a bathroom and would be obscure glazed but fully opening. The dormers are sited such that they are aligned with the ridge of the existing bungalow, which does not strictly comply with the Borough Design Guide SPD which recommends being below the ridge line. The proposed single storey side extension has a width of 5m and would result in a front facade width of 11.6m. The side extension is not set back at all from the main building line to make the extension appear subservient; the expanse of front facade is considered disproportionate to the existing modest front elevation - the front door and existing window would be dominated by the overlong side extension. This is all contrary to the Borough Design Guide SPD.
- 7.5 On this otherwise open corner, it is considered that the combined visual bulk and mass of the roof alteration, front and rear dormers and side extension would be overly dominant to both the street scene and character of the original modest bungalow. The bungalows in Timberlane are all modest bungalows set back from the road and form a relatively uniform 'building line'. The proposed 5m extension would encroach substantially beyond this 'building line' and be a dominant feature affecting the open spacious character of the location. The slope of the land would also mean that the proposed extension would be built up compared to the lower level of the road (Timberlane) which would add to its dominance.
- 7.6 The proposed garage alterations follow the line of the existing structure and in effect just fill in a corner, on the garden side. Therefore this would have no impact on the neighbour. Since it is set back from the edge of the highway by 8m and is behind the 'building line' set by the bungalows in Timberlane, then it would similarly not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

(iii) Impact on residential amenity

- 7.7 The rear dormer would have an openable window and its very presence would lead to a sense of being overlooked by the neighbours at nos 26 who have a private sitting out patio at the rear of their garden, behind the application garage. However, consideration must be given to the fact that Class B of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended, would allow the construction of a rear dormer within the existing roofscape (subject to volume criteria). Therefore it would be inappropriate to refuse this application on loss of privacy and overlooking issues, as a very similar impact would arise through the exercise of normal permitted development rights.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed side extension, at 5m wide, combined with the proposed roof alterations and dormers, are considered overly large and dominant, detrimental to the character of this modest bungalow. The proximity of the proposed extension to the corner with Timberlane would erode the existing open space and character of the area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to the design guidance set out in the NPPF, policy CS16 of the Local Plan and the Borough Design Guide SPD.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00460 for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed side extension, at 5m wide, is considered overly large and disproportionate to the existing host bungalow. The combined visual bulk and mass of the proposed roof alteration, front and rear dormers and side extension would be overly dominant and detrimental to the visual appearance and character of the original modest semi-detached bungalow. Furthermore, due to the site's prominent corner location, the proposed development would erode the existing open space and character of the immediate area to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the adopted Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011.