

Havant Borough Council
Planning Department
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Sent by email: planning.development@havant.gov.uk

Dear Planning,

APP/25/00718 – Demolish original rear lean-to. Ground floor rear extension with balcony above. Proposed porch canopy and replacement external materials. Alterations to existing dormer on front roof slope and construction of new dormer window on rear facing roof slope. 95A St Thomas Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 0EU

We write to formally **object** to this application.

Number 95a sits parallel to the road with a hipped roof to the front and rear, and side gables. Within the front hipped roof slope is a modest centrally located dormer window whilst in the north gable is a single window to bedroom 4. The car port and garage are constructed up to our shared boundary.

[REDACTED] is proposing to drastically extend their modest chalet-style bungalow to a large, effectively two-storey dwelling, to the detriment of the character of the property and area but more [REDACTED] resulting in an overbearing and unneighbourly development.

Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant part of the Development Plan is *The Core Strategy (2011)*. The main policy of relevance in this case, is Policy CS16 (High Quality Design). Additionally, the Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document is a material consideration.

Part of the proposal, which is not included in the development description, is the demolition of the existing car port and reconstruction of the garage, including increasing the height of the garage [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] This may be a modest change to the existing garage when taken in isolation however, when taken in combination with the larger aspects of the application, it will result in cumulative bulk [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] What is absent from the application is details of the proposed replacement boundary treatment following the removal of the carport. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

the proposed new porch over the front door will obstruct access to the garage and therefore, what is the purpose of this building, as it clearly cannot be used for parking of vehicles yet, the plans submitted do not indicate what its purpose is.

Externally, the applicant is proposing the use of vertical cedar cladding to the side gables, rear elevation and dormer windows faces and cheeks, together with the use of slate for the main roof. These materials will appear stark and are uncharacteristic in this location.

In order to accommodate all of the proposed works at ground floor, the applicant is extending the depth of the ground floor by an additional 3.1m, and we note that these works are already in progress.

Again, whilst this ground floor extension [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and adds more bulk to the rear of this otherwise modest dwelling. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The applicant is proposing to enlarge the two existing bedrooms within the roof to provide large suites, each with their own ensuite and seating areas; whilst the master bedroom will also have the benefit of a separate walk in dressing room. Additionally, it is proposed to provide an office/ music room with a full height window. To achieve all of this additional living accommodation, it is necessary for them to not only increase the front dormer window but also provide a new full width rear dormer window. This description as a 'full width dormer' is rather disingenuous, as the dormer window is effectively creating a full first floor. Further, the applicant proposes a full width balcony leading from the master bedroom suite creating an external an elevated seating and entertainment space of circa 16sqm.

Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy, against which this development should be assessed, is unambiguous that development will only be permitted where ***"The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking"***.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The applicant has included a privacy screen to the balcony, but this is a tokenistic gesture [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] This is
contrary to Policy CS16 and therefore, the application should be refused.

Additionally, due to the combined length of the rear dormer window and projecting privacy screen together with the positioning of this extension [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] certainly appears to breach the 25degree rule of thumb applied to assessing impacts of new development on existing dwellings. This results in development which is inappropriate and contrary to Policy CS16.

Moreover, Policy CS16 goes on to state that development should respect local context and ***"Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors"***.

The incorporation of a full width dormer window with rear balcony is not informed by local characteristics or proportions and results in a large bulk and mass of development at first floor which would dominate our outlook and be overbearing and unneighbourly. The use of cedar cladding and slate tiles do not form part of the established character of this area. Again, the proposal fails to accord with Policy CS16 and should be refused.

As already identified, the Council's Design Guide SPD is a material consideration in the assessment of this application and states that dormer windows ***"should be designed to sit back into the roof, back from the front line of the wall below, in from the verge and below the existing ridge line"*** and, more importantly ***"Dormers should not dominate the roof or the existing building. To help avoid this they should be the same size or preferably smaller than the windows below. Generally, the dormers should have pitched roofs, with slopes in keeping with the existing roof"***. It is very clear that the proposed development fails to accord with the Design Guide SPD with both the front and rear dormer windows dominating the respective roof slopes. The reliance on such large dormer windows to provide the first-floor accommodation is evidence of overdevelopment. With very limited exceptions,

the use of dormer windows in the vicinity of the application site are for small, modest sized dormer windows which are set down in the roof slope. The proposed roof alterations would be entirely discordant with the established character of the area.

Separately, the application form under section entitled "Trees and Hedges", the applicant has stated that there are no trees within falling distance of the proposed development. This is incorrect

[REDACTED]

Cumulatively, this development is an overdevelopment of the site resulting in harm to the character of the existing dwelling and the area, by reason of the excessive size of the roof extension and dominance of dormer windows together with the choice of materials.

[REDACTED]

Overall, the proposed development is discordant with Policy CS16 of The Core Strategy and the Design Guide SPD and should be refused. There are no material considerations which have been presented to suggest that the development should not be determined otherwise in accordance with the Development Plan as per the requirements of Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. We trust therefore that this application will be refused.

[REDACTED]

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]