

COMMITTEE REPORT

Site Address: 4 Sovereign Lane, Waterloo, PO7 5RH
Proposal: Raised ridge and loft conversion with dormer extension to the Eastern elevation.

Application Type: Full
Application No: APP/24/00395
Applicant: Mr Cabe-Spanner
Agent: JLRW Architecture
Expiry Date: 18/07/2024
Case Officer: Robert Riley
Ward: Purbrook

Reason for Committee Consideration: At the request of Councillor Diamond

Recommendation: **APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

1 **Site Description**

- 1.1 The site is located to the south of Sovereign Lane, and the surrounding area features predominantly single-storey and two storey houses, many of which have undergone alterations to the original designs. The property is a 1950s brick bungalow located in a suburban residential area characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows with similar architectural styles.
- 1.2 The building is set back from the street with a lawn, planters and a driveway large enough for 3 cars to park. The site slopes gently up towards the house and continues to raise towards the rear boundary which backs on to No. 67 St Johns Avenue. The neighbouring property to the west at No.2 has a rear extension which is visible from the street and a garage conversion. At the ends of Sovereign Lane, the corner properties at No.2 Sovereign Lane and No.17 Tanners Ridge (prominent on Sovereign Lane's streetscene) have been extended to create larger homes.

2. **Planning History**

88/51452 – Extension to garage at front, raising height of whole roof and provision of three bedrooms and bathrooms with dormers front and rear – Refused 20th July 1988.

94/51452/2 - Single storey garage extension to rear – Approved 13th February 1995.

3. **Proposal**

- 3.1 Raised ridge and loft conversion with dormer extension to the Eastern elevation.
- 3.2 The proposal would result in the raising of the main ridge from approximately 5.55 metres at the front of the property and approximately 4.9 metres to the rear, to approximately 6.9m at the front of the property and approximately 6.2 metres to the rear of the property. The main ridge line would therefore be increased by approximately 1.35m when viewed from Sovereign Lane.

- 3.3 A dormer would be added to the east elevation - it would be set up from the eaves line by approximately 0.8metres, set down from the ridge line by approximately 0.85 metres, would be set in from the rear by approximately 4 metres and would feature an approximate distance from the front elevation of approximately 1.35 metres. In addition, 7No rooflights are proposed on the western (side) elevation and 1No rooflight on the eastern (side) elevation.
- 3.4 The plans have been amended to reduce the bulk of the proposal during the application process following concerns raised regarding the original proposal's impact upon visual amenities and neighbouring properties.

4. Policy Considerations

In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the Planning Considerations section of the report.

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
DM13 Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Listed Building Grade: N/A
Conservation Area: N/A

5. Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Diamond

Original Comments:

I would like this application to be determined by the planning committee should officers be minded to approve.

There has already been considerable development on this site.

The proposed development would be over development and not in keeping with the surrounding area.

This planned development by its size alone would have detrimental impact on neighbouring properties by loss of light and privacy.

Further Comments:

R28 The development would be a bulk build.

R30 Not in keeping with the street scene

R 111 undesirable precedent could be set

All as set out in C16 of the local plan.

Officer Comment: *These are suggested reasons for refusal.*

Further Comments: (following receipt of amended plans):

I would like to object to the above planning application due to its size and proximity to the neighbouring property.

I understand that a considerable amount of development has already happened at this property so it is now overdeveloped.

I understand that the planning portal is current down, therefore I will add my reasons for refusal to the application by the end of the week.

I look forward to acknowledgment to this email.

My reasons for refusal to the above planning application.

R28 excessive bulk to the neighbouring property.

R39 bulk and height in the street scene.

R111 it will set an undesirable precedent.

R133 detrimental to the neighbouring properties.

all contrary to CS16 of the Havant local plan.

Final Comments

I would like this to go to the planning committee.

My reasons for refusal remain the same.

Councillor Antonia Harrison - No comments received.

Councillor Paul Tansom - No comments received.

HBC Ecologist

Looks fine. Roof is of concrete tiles and appears to be in sound condition. Timber cladding to front gable looks sound. UPVC soffits.

6. Publicity and Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Local Code of Corporate Governance and the Statement of Community Involvement.

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 7

Site notices: 0

Public comments - Number of representations received: Comments have been received from 42 different addresses (some third parties have commented multiple times). These comprise 26 objections and 16 expressions of support

Summarised objections – 26	Officer comments
Too tall	See section 7.
Will unacceptably overshadow	See section 7.
Will be overbearing	See section 7.
Set a bad precedent for bungalow conversions	Each application is considered on its planning merits and it is noted that other properties nearby have been altered to provide first floor accommodation.
Overlooking issues	See section 7.

Overdevelopment	See section 7.
Largest dwelling on the street	See section 7.
More cars	Parking provision meets the Council's Parking Standards.
Devaluation of nearby properties	This is not a planning consideration.
Will remove bungalows for elderly residents of the borough	Householders can apply to alter their property and there is no adopted planning policy or national guidance to retain bungalows
Dormer is too wide	See section 7.
What does the restricted opening rear window entail?	If this application is permitted a condition would be imposed to ensure the rear first floor window (which serves a bedroom that is also served by a number of rooflights) is obscure glazed and only openable by a maximum of 10cm.
With the extra 3 bathrooms this can cause more problems with drainage	This is a building control matter not a planning matter.
Amendments do not overcome concerns	Noted.

Summarised supports – 16	Officer comments:
In keeping	Noted.
Nice design	Noted.
People should be allowed to extend their properties	Noted, however whilst development is considered acceptable in principle, the development still needs to be considered in relation to its impacts as set out in section 7.
Innovative design	Noted.
Larger extension on Timberlane was permitted	Noted, however, the application needs to be assessed on its own merits
Property behind has done something similar	This is noted and assessed in the report.
In keeping with other extensions nearby and in Purbrook	See Part 7.
Let them build	Support is noted.

Amendments are fair changes to the plans	Noted.
--	--------

Material planning considerations are addressed in Section 7.

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) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)/ Ecology
- (v) Parking

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

Roof alterations

7.3 The proposal would be readily visible in the streetscene and comprises of a loft conversion with a side dormer, rooflights and raised ridge height.

7.4 The proposal would result in the raising of the main ridge from approximately 5.55 metres at the front of the property and approximately 4.9 metres to the rear, to approximately 6.9m at the front of the property and approximately 6.2 metres to the rear of the property. The main ridge line would therefore be increased by approximately 1.35m when viewed from Sovereign Lane.

7.5 It is noted that the Sovereign Lane streetscene generally features dwellings adjacent to No.4 Sovereign Lane of a similar height and scale to that of the existing property. To the rear of the application site, however, No.69 St Johns Avenue is an example of a property with a raised ridge line and first floor accommodation.

7.6 At the junction between these two roads, numerous two storey dwellings can be observed, for example facing north-west provides views of two storey dwellings, at No.57 St John's Avenue and at No.42 St Johns Avenue. The proposed raised ridge height at the application site would be comparable to other examples viewable from the road junction to the west in the immediate context of the proposed development. It is also noted that nearby No's 42 St Johns Avenue, 43 St Johns Avenue, 57 St Johns Avenue and No.1 Tanners Ridge feature raised ridges in similar streetscenes. It is therefore considered that the increase in the ridge height and consequently increased mass and bulk would not be out of keeping with other properties in the area and would on balance have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene and wider area.

7.7 The proposal includes the provision of a dormer to the eastern side roofslope. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD regarding dormers states:
"Dormers are considered an acceptable way of providing light and ventilation to existing buildings. They 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. 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’.

- 7.8 Whilst the dormer would feature a flat roof it would be set up from the eaves line by approximately 0.8metres, set down from the ridge line by approximately 0.85 metres, would be set in from the rear by approximately 4 metres and would feature an approximate distance from the front elevation of approximately 1.35 metres. Whilst the dormer would be of a reasonable size, it would be appropriately proportioned in relation to the roof slope and would not be overly dominant or overbearing. It is noted that nearby Nos 42 and 43 St Johns Avenue feature more dominant dormers than that proposed at No.4 Sovereign Lane. It is considered that the dormer and roof alterations would have an acceptable impact upon the visual amenities of the street, and upon the character of No.4 Sovereign Lane
- 7.9 The proposed 7No rooflights on the western (side) elevation and 1No rooflight on the eastern (side) elevation are considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character of the dwelling and upon visual amenities and would be located to the side of the dwelling, whereby their visual presence would be lessened.

Materials

- 7.10 The works would feature matching materials to the existing property, which is considered acceptable.
- 7.11 The design and appearance of the proposal is on balance deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011. It is considered on balance that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.12 Properties to the front of No.4 Sovereign Lane (No’s 5 Sovereign Lane and 16 The Florins) are, due to their separation distance from the proposed works, considered to be acceptably impacted. No.2 Sovereign Lane and No.65 St Johns Avenue to the west of the application site, would feature a sufficient separation distance from the works to prevent unacceptable increases in overshadowing and the development would not result in an overbearing sense of enclosure. Regarding overlooking, the proposed front and rear windows would not lead to any direct overlooking and would not unacceptably impact these properties. The proposed 7No rooflights on the western elevation of the roof would be high level with a cill height of 1.7m from finished floor level, which would be conditioned if permission is forthcoming, as a result of which these properties would not be unacceptably overlooked. In light of this, No.2 Sovereign Lane and No.65 St John’s Avenue to the west of the application site are considered to be acceptably impacted.
- 7.13 Regarding impacts to the rear, No.67 St John’s Avenue is located to the south of the application property. The proposed rear ridge height of No.4 Sovereign Lane would be approximately 6.2m, and the proposed separation distance to No.67’s rear elevation would be between approximately 15 to approximately 16.5m. It is considered that this relationship would be acceptable with regard to overshadowing and overbearing concerns. Regarding overlooking concerns, only the rear window would face No.67. The rear window has been amended to be obscure glazed and only openable on a

restrictor, which would be conditioned to only be openable by 10cm if permission is forthcoming. This would ensure that overlooking concerns can be appropriately addressed and overcome. Overall, the impact on No. 67 is considered to be limited and acceptable.

- 7.14 The impact of the development upon No.6 Sovereign Lane has been carefully assessed due to the proximity of the works to this property. This has resulted in alterations to the original scheme to address initial concerns.
- 7.15 The 7No rooflights on the western elevation would not impact this property. The proposed rear first floor window and additional front fenestration would acceptably impact this property as direct overlooking would be avoided due to their orientation. Regarding the proposed fenestration on the eastern elevation, there would be 4No windows on the eastern elevation of the dormer - these have all been shown to be obscure glazed. These windows will be conditioned to be obscured and fixed shut under 1.7 metres from finished floor level if permission is forthcoming. Subject to an appropriate condition these windows are considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.6 Sovereign Lane. There would be 1 No. rooflight on the eastern elevation, which has been shown to feature a cill height of 1.7 metres from finished floor height which will be conditioned if permission is forthcoming, and in light of this, this rooflight is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.6 Sovereign Lane. The proposal is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact regarding overlooking concerns of this property.
- 7.16 Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, it is noted that No.6 is set off the common boundary by approximately 5.5m. The proposed dormer would be located in a position such that it would be closest to the driveway and garage of No.6. This separation is helpful in significantly reducing any overbearing impacts. Regarding No.6's side windows, it is noted that a side clear window would be affected, which is noted to serve a study. On balance it is considered that due to the separation distance from the proposed ridge raising and dormer that it would be acceptably impacted.
- 7.17 It is noted to the south of the northernmost western side window in No.6, that there is a door, this serves a hallway/entrance to the dwelling and it is considered to be acceptably impacted. To the south of the door is a side window and conservatory with clear fenestration. The proposed dormer has been amended/reduced in width during the application process such it would lie forward of this fenestration, as a result of which the dormer as proposed is considered to acceptably impact this fenestration. The proposed ridge height increase on balance is considered to have an acceptable impact on this fenestration, owing to the separation distance between these properties. On balance it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact or lead to unacceptable overshadowing such as to warrant the refusal of this planning application.
- 7.18 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to an unacceptable loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011.

(iv) **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)/ Ecology**

- 7.14 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

- 7.15 Due to the extensive works to the roof, the Council's Ecologist has been consulted during the application process. As set out in section 5 no concerns have been raised. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in relation to potential impacts to protected bat species and it is considered that the proposal accords with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(v) **Parking**

- 7.16 The application site would increase the number of bedrooms of the dwelling from 3 to 4 bedrooms. This requires 3 parking spaces to be shown on site to accord with the Havant Borough Council Parking SPD 2016. The plans show that 3 parking spaces are able to be provided on site and this proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the Havant Parking SPD and is considered acceptable in this regard.

8 **Conclusions**

- 8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is considered appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area. On balance the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Development Manager be authorised to Grant Permission for application APP/24/00395 subject to the following conditions (subject to such changes and/or additions that the Development Manager considers necessary to impose prior to the issuing of the decision):

Conditions:

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing Number: 23022 100 B: Amended Location and Block Plan: Date uploaded 10/09/2025

Drawing Number: 23022 102 D: Amended Existing and Proposed Elevations: Date uploaded 10/09/2025

Drawing Number: 23022 101 A: Amended Existing and Proposed Plans: Date uploaded 10/09/2025

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

3. The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the 4No side dormer windows in the first floor on the eastern elevation shall only be openable at a minimum of 1.7m above finished floor level and shall feature textured glass with an obscuration level of no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the rear window in the first floor on the southern elevation shall feature textured glass with an obscuration level of no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall feature a fixed restrictor openable by no more than 100mm and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the 8No rooflight windows in the first floor on the western and eastern elevation shall feature a cill height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appendices:

- (A) Site Location Plan
- (B) Location and Block Plan
- (C) Existing Ground Floor and Roof Plan
- (D) Proposed Ground Floor
- (E) Proposed First Floor and Roof Plan
- (F) Existing Elevations
- (G) Proposed Front and Rear Elevations
- (H) Proposed Side Elevations