

- 3.3 The two dormer windows to the front measure approximately 2m wide, 3.1m in depth and 2.1m high with the dormer on the east set away from the common boundary with the attached neighbour No.32 by approximately 1.7m.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD (December 2011)

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD (July 2016)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS14 – Efficient Use of Resources

CS16 – High Quality Design

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

AL2 – Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements

5 Statutory & Non-Statutory Consultees

Cllr C Diamond

I object to this planning application on the grounds that it's; overdevelopment of the site; and not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Cllr G Hughes

Having seen the plans, I visited the site to better understand the street scene and the potential impact of this application. I cannot support this application. The intent is to turn a two-bedroomed bungalow into a four-bedroomed house. The size of the upper floor extension is not in keeping with other dormers in the street, which in comparison are modest. If approved, it would represent an overdevelopment of the plot and be out of keeping with the other surrounding properties, which would be detrimental to the existing street scene.

Building Control

The Building Control Team has confirmed that they have "no comments".

Environment Agency

No comments have been received.

Portsmouth Water

Portsmouth Water have reviewed the application and associated documents for APP/22/00761 and have no concerns regarding impacts to groundwater quality. Therefore, we do not recommend any planning conditions to be included on the planning permission

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: 10

Number of site notices: N/A

Statutory advertisement: N/A

Number of representations received: 9 Objections (with 10 Names) including 2 Ward Councillors.

The objections received relate to the following matters:

Impact on Privacy

- Overlooking to garden – not currently overlooked
- Overlooking to glass roofed conservatory/living area
- Loss of privacy

Officer Comment: See part 7 (iii)

Light

- Overshadowing to living area
- Detrimental impact on daylight to four of our rooms - kitchen, bathroom, toilet and bedroom

Officer Comment: See part 7 (iii)

Impact on Solar Panels

- Front dormer would block sunlight to solar panel – reducing solar energy
- Would render recently installed solar panels of little use
- Electricity skyrocketed – need as much help as possible to pay energy bills
- Panels help environment
- If one panel has shadow on it, whole system will not generate energy
- Dormer would cause shadow on panels
- Could be cloud in morning but afternoon sun – so no energy generated
- Winter sun low in sky when need to get maximum use and not be in shadow
- Energy crisis - want panels to be as efficient as possible

Officer Comment: See Part 7 (iv)

Use of Dwelling

- Informed new owners will rent out property
- Concern bedrooms could be rented individually making it multi occupancy
- Does not appear to be single family home
- Rented property not conducive to area

Officer Comment: A number of objection letters received have raised the issue of using the house as a house of multiple occupation (HMO). Currently the property is a single-family dwelling and as such the review and recommendations of this planning submission are based on this proposal. The use of a residential property as an HMO (for more than 6 people) would require planning permission and a separate application would be required and dealt with as a separate matter.

Four bed House

- More activity and noise
- Properties not sound proofed
- Can hear noise from neighbouring property

- Designed as bungalow not 4 bed house
- Dwarf our property
- Alterations and extensions from two to four bed home totally unacceptable

Officer Comment:

It is considered that the proposal would not create an unacceptable increase of noise from the property as it will continue to be used as a residential dwelling. Although the additional dormer windows would create extra rooms for occupancy it is not considered that an increase in how many people potentially live into the property would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

Character of Area

- Out of place
- Not in keeping with other properties

Officer Comments: See part 7 (ii)

Parking

- Will cause huge problems regarding parking as road narrow and a cul-de-sac
- Existing parking issues – cars and vans half parked on pavements
- Impacts elderly residential in wheelchairs struggle to get about due to parking
- Multi occupancy property with minimum four cars totally unacceptable

Officer Comment: Parking is considered in Part 7 (v)

Other Matters

- Impact on house price

Officer Comment: This is not a material planning consideration.

- Health impacts
- Construction impacts and access
- Letting out rooms to younger students, impact on residents lifestyles needing quiet location for health

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 In having due regard to the policies in the development plan, it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of Development
- (ii) Impact on Character of the Area & Appropriateness of Design
- (iii) Impact on Neighbouring Properties
- (iv) Impact on Solar Panels
- (v) Parking

- (i) Principle of Development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area as set out in Policies CS17 and AL2. As such, development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

7.3 A search of the planning history has revealed that the property's permitted development rights (PDR) are still intact. As such, in principle the hip to gable end alterations and the rear dormer could be carried out under Permitted Development depending on the additions' volume.

7.4 In this case the proposed gable end extension and large dormer to the rear would on their own have the benefit of permitted development rights and therefore it is considered that this aspect of the proposal would be acceptable given the 'fall back' position available.

(ii) Impact on Character of the Area & Appropriateness of Design

7.5 It is noted that there are dormer roof extensions of differing sizes and designs within the surrounding street. In taking this into account it is considered that the change from hipped to gable end and the dormers to the front would not appear incongruous in the street scene. Measurements of the proposed hip to gable and rear dormer show that the volume is within the allowed permitted development allowance of 50m³. Therefore, the change of hipped to gable end and the rear dormer could be built under permitted development rights. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not be an overdevelopment of the site, would not have a detrimental or adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality or be out of character in the immediate area.

7.6 The proposed front dormers have been reduced in size following representations received and are set away from the neighbouring (no.32) roof boundary by approximately 1.7m. Further to this there are other properties in the street that have front dormers of differing designs. It is considered that the gable end and front and rear dormers would not constitute an overdevelopment of the property and are not out of place/ keeping in the surrounding area and are considered acceptable in their design and siting.

(iii) Impact on Neighbouring Properties

7.7 The hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer could be constructed under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the General Permitted Development Order, therefore, the main impact to be considered is that of the front dormers.

7.8 The front dormers would face Deverell Place and there would be a gap of 20m and an intervening road between the application property and No. 16 Deverell Place. This relationship is considered acceptable.

7.9 The proposed rear dormer windows would face down the garden of the application site and to allotments beyond. Views to No. 32 and 36 would be at an angle and are considered acceptable and similar to those presented by other dormers in Deverell Place to their adjacent properties. In relation to light the build up of the hipped roof to gable would result in some additional impact on light to the side windows in No. 36 Deverell Place, however this would be limited due to the double width access between the properties and the orientation with light beyond the morning period not being impacted. It is also noted that a hip to gable alteration could be made in isolation without the need for planning permission.

7.10 Overall it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to unacceptable additional overlooking and would not have a harmful effect on the properties adjoining or within the immediate area to the application site meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(iv) Impact on Solar Panels

7.11 Concerns have been raised in relation to the impact of overshadowing/ loss of light to the solar panels located at No. 32 Deverell Place in the afternoon. The dormer closest to this roof line is now set away from the common boundary by approximately 1.7m and in considering the submitted overshadowing report, the site visit photos and the suns orientation to the property it is considered that the overshadowing/ loss of light to the solar panels at the adjoining property at No.32 would not be significantly detrimental to their purpose or sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

7.12 The applicant/ agent was asked to provide an overshadowing report in relation to the potential impacts to solar panels at No. 32 Deverell Place which provided the following comments:

TFT have been appointed to consider the roof extension proposals to 34 Deverell Place and their potential effect on sunlight availability to solar panels to 32 Deverell Place. We have therefore undertaken a 3D computer analysis with the methodology outlined in The Building Research Establishment Report "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight - A guide to good practice", 2022, 3rd edition (BRE 209 2022).

Where the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) received by a solar panel with the new development in place is less than 0.90 times the value before, a more detailed calculation of the loss of solar radiation should be undertaken."

We have therefore undertaken this initial APSH assessment to gauge whether 0.9 of former sunlight hours will be retained i.e. a reduction of 10% or less.

In addition to the holistic assessment of the overall panel area, we have subdivided the panels in to 12 separate sections to determine whether there are particular areas where sunlight reduction may be more apparent.

The results can be seen by reference to drawings and results table at Appendix A. These indicate that in the proposed condition, the panels retain annual sunlight availability of at least 0.94 to any single panel assessed and an average of 0.98 to the panels as whole. In winter, the effect is reduced further still, with individual panels retaining at least 0.97 and an average of 0.99. Therefore, no reductions of 10% or greater will be seen and no further assessments are required.

In accordance with the BRE guidelines, as 0.9 of the former APSH value has been retained, no detailed solar radiation testing is required.

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that no material reduction in sunlight will occur as a result of the proposals and the BRE guidelines are satisfied.

7.13 In addition to the overshadowing report a site visit was undertaken and photos of the site were taken of the adjoining property at No. 32. The orientation of the roof solar panels on No.32 are such that they face south to slightly south west. This maximises the amount of sunlight that reaches the panels and would clearly limit any potential overshadowing from the amended closest front dormer window. It is therefore considered that the proposed nearest dormer which is set away from the common roofline boundary by approximately 1.7m would be unlikely to have a significantly detrimental effect on the solar panels on the roof slope of No. 32.

(v) Parking

7.14 The Havant Borough Parking SPD, which supplements Policy DM13, explains that

dwellings with 4-bedrooms or more should have, at least, 3no. onsite vehicular parking spaces. The existing detached garage measures 3m by 6.5m and, therefore, meets the Parking SPD's standards for the garage to constitute a vehicular parking space. In addition, the existing driveway is 22m long and has a width of approximately 2.45m. As the Parking SPD explains that all outdoor vehicular parking spaces should measure 2.4m by 4.8m, it is considered that there is sufficient parking provision onsite to accommodate the increase in the number of bedrooms.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The site is located in the built up area where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 8.2 The proposed dormer windows and hip to gable changes are considered acceptable and are not out of keeping with other roof alterations carried out in the local area. It is also important to consider the permitted development 'fall back position' in relation to the rear dormer and hip to gable changes proposed.
- 8.3 Impacts on neighbouring properties have been considered the rear dormers would face down the garden of the application property with only angled views to neighbouring gardens. The hip to gable would in itself not require consent as a separate element and impacts to adjacent windows would be beyond a double driveway.
- 8.4 The impacts on the solar panels on the attached roof slope have been considered in detail, it is not considered that any overshadowing would be sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.
- 8.5 Finally the parking available to serve the proposed four bedrooomed dwelling would meet the requirements of the Councils Parking Standards and is considered acceptable.
- 8.6 Overall, it is considered that the scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and on the character of the area and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/22/0761 subject to the following 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:

Proposed First Floor Plan 5805-4 Rev B
Proposed Elevations 5804-5 Rev A

Cross Section 5806-6
Site Layout Plan 5805-500 Rev A
Location Plan
TFT Sunlight Availability Solar Panel Assessment

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the first floor bathroom window in the west side elevation facing the adjoining occupier at No. 36 shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and 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.
- 4 The external materials used 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.

Appendices:

- (A) – Location Plan
- (B) – Proposed Site Plan
- (C) – Proposed Elevations
- (D) – Proposed Floor Plans
- (E1) – Overshadowing Details
- (E2) – Overshadowing Report
- (F) – Solar Panel Information