
Site Address:	29 Dunsbury Way, Havant, PO9 5BA		
Proposal:	Construction of two storey rear extension and provision of parking.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00551	Expiry Date:	21/11/2024
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Welch		
Agent:	Mr Durrant	Case Officer:	Robert Riley
	PDC Ltd		
Ward:	Leigh Park Central and West Leigh		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site lies on the west side of Dunsbury Way which runs north-south through Leigh Park. Park Parade, and the Stockheath road roundabout are nearby and the development in which the site sits comprises four long regular two storey terrace blocks each separated from the next by a path giving access to the rear. Each block is sub divided into four individual dwellings, number 29 is a three bedroom dwelling in the fourth and most northerly of the four blocks. Number 29 is of traditional brick built construction with a rear flat roof projection straddling the rear southernmost boundary. An alleyway separates the ground floor boundary wall on the north side which, shared with the neighbouring property, gives access to long rear gardens. Vehicular access to garages and rear gardens is via a spur drive off Blackdown Crescent.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant planning history

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Construction of two storey rear extension and provision of parking. The first floor aspect of the rear extension would feature a width of 4.152 metres a depth of 3.487 metres and a proposed maximum height of 3.4 metres (approximate 6 metre height including ground floor level), The proposed single storey aspect of the rear extension would feature an approximate width of approximately 5.9 metres a depth of 5.460 metres and a proposed maximum approximate height of 2.6 metres.

Officer note

- 3.2 During the application process, the proposed two storey element of the works has been reduced in height, roof pitch and its angle, width and depth, and Certificate B has been served on the neighbouring property.
- 3.3 The works state there would be a 2 storey rear extension to the rear of the dwelling, however, there are 2 elements to this, being the two storey rear extension element, and a single storey element, whilst it could be described as a two storey, and single storey rear extension, when looking at the drawings the extension is able to be seen to incorporate both elements in the "two storey rear extension " description, and the

subsequent impacts are able to be readily assessed.

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

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
-----	--

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Tree Team

The Orange Tree is not considered a constraint to development – any overhanging branches / canopy or roots can be cut back to the boundary under Tort Law if required.

Councillor Jason Horton

No comments received

Councillor Munazza Faiz

No comments received

Councillor Sharon Collings

No comments received

Portsmouth Water Company

Please find attached the plan(s) showing the approximate position of water mains at the requested location.

Service connections are not shown but it should be assumed that all premises are supplied from the water distribution network. Other connections not related to properties, such as field supplies, may also exist so we would suggest a visual/CAT scan/Ground Radar survey is undertaken prior to any hand or mechanical excavation.

Safe digging practices in accordance with HSE publication HSG47 “Avoiding Danger from Underground Services” must be used to verify and establish the actual position of

the mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used. This documentation is available at <http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/priced/hsg47.pdf>

Copies of guidance notes: Working near distribution apparatus and Guidance for working near or over a Trunk Water Main are enclosed. Please read carefully as the conditions will apply to any work you undertake in the vicinity of Portsmouth Water assets.

It is important to ensure that a copy of the above guidance is provided to those undertaking any work which may affect our apparatus.

Please note Portsmouth water has no responsibility for any underground drainage or sewerage infrastructure. Enquiries regarding these assets should be directed to the relevant authority/company.

Ecologist

Looks OK. No justification for further information.

Scottish Gas Network

Please find an extract from our mains records for your proposed work area, any SGN assets are described in the map legend. On some occasions blank maps may be sent to you, this is due to your proposed work being in a no gas area but within our operational boundaries.

This mains record only shows the pipes owned by SGN in our role as a Licensed Gas Transporter (GT). Please note that privately owned gas pipes or pipes owned by other GTs may be present in this area and information regarding those pipes needs to be requested from the owners. If we know of any other pipes in the area we will note them on the plans as a shaded area and/or a series of x's.

The information shown on this plan is given without obligation or warranty and the accuracy cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes, valves, siphons, stub connections etc. are not shown but their presence should be anticipated. Your attention is drawn to the information and disclaimer on these plans. The information included on the plan is only valid for 28 days.

On the mains record you may see the low/medium/intermediate pressure gas main near your site. There should be no mechanical excavations taking place above or within 0.5m of a low/medium pressure system or above or within 3.0m of an intermediate pressure system. You should, where required confirm the position using hand dug trial holes.

A colour copy of these plans and the gas safety advice booklet enclosed should be passed to the senior person on site in order to prevent damage to our plant and potential direct or consequential costs to your organisation.

Safe digging practices in accordance with HSE publication HSG47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services" must be used to verify and establish the actual position of the mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used. It is your responsibility to ensure that this information is provided to all relevant people (direct labour or contractors) working for you on or near gas pipes.

It must be stressed that both direct and consequential damage to gas plant can be

dangerous for your employees and the general public and repairs to any such damage will incur a charge to you or the organisation carrying out work on your behalf. Your works should be carried out in such a manner that we are able to gain access to our apparatus throughout the duration of your operations.

Scottish and Southern Electricity

We have sent you the plans of our network records within the area requested. You will shortly receive responses each of the following; any High Voltage Mains cables and Low Voltage Mains cables.

Attached to this email is the 'Guide to Interpreting' which includes the legends for the plans on pages 7-9.

If a Service Cable is not shown on our maps sent, and you require the Cable to be Traced, please contact the General Enquiries Department on 0800 048 3516 (option 3) or via email, ge@ssen.co.uk

If you need further information on our network in this area or a quotation for any required works, please contact the Connections & Engineering Department on 0800 048 3516 or via email, connections@sse.com

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: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
To whom this may concern, Following discussions and views of the plans, we [Redacted] have no objections or concerns of the proposed plans for the rear extension. [Redacted]	No objections noted

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) Ecology
- (v) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (vi) Arboriculture
- (vii) 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

Character bulk and the streetscene

- 7.3 In relation to the host dwelling, the proposed 2-storey rear extension would though present itself as a significant addition, but would not be readily visible on the streetscene. It would feature a pitched hip roof set below the main ridge line and would feature a smaller footprint than the main dwelling and thus could be seen as a subservient addition. In light of this, though it is noted to be a significant addition of mass and bulk to the rear, on balance it is seen as subservient to the main dwelling, and would have a limited and acceptable impact on the visual amenities of the area.
- 7.4 The proposed single storey rear extension would feature a flat roof. Having regard to light its proposed modest height, single storey nature and that it would not be visible upon the streetscene, it is considered acceptable regarding the character of the dwelling and visual amenities.
- 7.5 The proposed provision of parking aspect of the works to the rear including providing a new rear access gate, is considered to be acceptable regarding the character of the dwelling and visual amenities.
- 7.6 The roof of the extension would be at a pitch of approximately 33 degrees, as opposed to the slightly steeper pitch featured on the principal roof of the dwelling. However, the ridge height of the proposal would be lower than that of the main dwelling and, given that the property is mid-terrace and the extension to the rear, the differing roof slopes would not appear significantly incongruous.
- 7.7 The works would provide a bedroom for a disabled occupant providing home safety adaptations. The applicant's particular needs are relevant to Policy CS16 (4) in this regard: *'All development should demonstrate that its design...Is inclusive by considering the needs of those with disabilities, ensuring safe and convenient access for all...'*
- 7.8 Given its siting the proposal would not be visible within the street scene. The detailed design of the proposal including its first floor element is, on balance considered to result in an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the terrace and wider area.

Materials

- 7.9 The proposed roof materials and windows would match the existing dwellinghouse which is considered acceptable. The external walls would feature brickwork which is considered acceptable and would also feature render for the single storey extension. The render in an email was stated to be a "*natural/off white colour*", this is considered acceptable and would not be readily visible on the streetscene.
- 7.10 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

- 7.11 To the northwestern, southeastern and western sides of the application site are properties at Nos 31 and 27 Dunsbury Way and Nos 36 and 38 Ellisfield Road. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these 4 properties. Properties to the front of the application site, due to the nature scale and location of the works are considered to be acceptably impacted. Due to the additional proposed first floor side window being agreed by the agent to be obscure and high level opening, properties to the southeast of No.27 are considered to be acceptably impacted by this window. The provision of parking to the rear aspect of the works including providing a new rear access gate is considered to have acceptable neighbourly impacts.

No.31 Dunsbury Way

- 7.12 Regarding overlooking impacts, at the first floor level, there would be no side windows facing No.31, which is considered acceptable. There would be fenestration on the rear elevations of the single storey and 2-storey extension. At the ground floor level, this would face the rear garden of No.29 and boundary treatments, and impacts are considered to be acceptable. At the first floor level, fenestration would face the rear garden, it would permit some oblique views of No.31 but this would be no more significant than afforded by the existing bedroom window (being removed) and this first floor rear window is considered to have an acceptable impact regarding overlooking.
- 7.13 Regarding overbearing concerns, the rear extensions would have a significant presence for No.31's rear garden and amenity space. Amended plans reducing the depth and width of the proposed 2 storey aspect of the works have been submitted during the consideration of the application, the two-storey element of the rear extensions would feature a maximum 2 metre separation distance from No.31's curtilage, however there is a shared pathway on No.31's curtilage facing where the majority of the two storey extension would face. The two storey rear extension element would be approximately 2.5 metres to No.31's rear conservatory. It is noted that although there would be an increase in mass and bulk, on balance this is not seen to be so significant that it would warrant the refusal of this application. This is in part a product of the unusual set off afforded by the passage between the properties at ground floor level. Furthermore, there has been no comment received in opposition to an overbearing impact from the proposed 2-storey rear extension element of the works.
- 7.14 Regarding overshadowing concerns, the two storey aspect of the rear extensions is shown on the plans to not impact any rear windows unacceptably, however, it is

shown that some of the rear garden would be impacted by the 2 storey element. Given the orientation of the application property there would be some impact on direct sunlight from the two storey element, however this would be limited by the relatively limited depth of the two storey element (3.487m), the lower ridge height than the host dwelling and the hipped and pitching away roof form. With regards to these considerations, whilst it is noted that there would be some impact from this proposal, this is not given the detailed design and positioning considered unacceptable and would not warrant a refusal of planning permission. The single storey aspect would feature a 2.6 metre approximate maximum height and feature an approximate 2.2 metre separation distance from No.31's rear garden at this distance and in consideration of the proposed maximum height, officers consider that impacts would be limited enough to be acceptable on balance on No.31's rear garden and amenity space.

No.27 Dunsbury Way

- 7.15 Regarding overlooking impacts, at the first floor level, there would be a side window serving a bedroom facing No.27, this has been agreed by the agent to be obscure glazed and high level opening only and is considered to be acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. There would be fenestration on the rear elevations of the single storey and 2-storey extension to the rear. At the ground floor level, this would face the rear garden of No.29 and would otherwise boundary treatment, and impacts are considered to be acceptable. At the first floor level, fenestration would face the rear garden, it would permit some oblique views of No.27 but due to the tight nature of the nearby properties there would be a level of overlooking expected from any new rear first floor windows, and this first floor rear window is considered to have an acceptable impact regarding overlooking.
- 7.16 Regarding overbearing concerns, the rear extensions would have a significant presence for No.27's rear garden and amenity space. However, there is an existing rear outshoot to No.27 in proximity to where the 2-storey rear extensions would be positioned for No.29, in light of this, although it is noted that there would be an additional mass and bulk, on balance, with regards to the spatial dimensions of the 2-storey rear extension in particular, it is not considered so unacceptable to warrant the refusal of the application.
- 7.17 Regarding overshadowing concerns, the two storey aspect of the rear extensions would not extend further than the one storey rear outshoot for No.27 and its overshadowing impacts are shown on the amended elevations, whereby it is shown it would impact the roof of the outshoot, in light of this, the two storey aspect of the works is not considered to unacceptably impact No.27 and its impact can be seen as acceptable. In terms of sunlight the extensions orientation to the north of No.27 would reduce impacts on sunlight. The single storey aspect of the rear extensions would not extend further than No.27's outshoot, which it is proposed to be attached to, in light of this, the single storey aspect of the 2 storey rear extensions is also considered to have an acceptable impact regarding overshadowing.

Nos 38 and 36 Ellisfield Road

- 7.18 These properties curtilages would feature a 26.5 metre and 31 metre minimum separation distance respectively from the proposed ground floor extension and an approximate 27.5 metre and 32 metre separation distance from the two storey element, at this siting overbearing and overshadowing impacts would be considered acceptable. The extensions would feature rear fenestration facing Nos 38, and 36

Ellisfield Road, however, the ground floor fenestration would face the rear garden of No.29 Dunsbury Way and would have acceptable impacts, and the first floor rear fenestration would feature a 38 metre and 45 metre separation distance from ground floor fenestration at Nos 38 and 36 Ellisfield Road respectively, at this distance overlooking impacts would not be unacceptable. In light of this, these properties are considered to be acceptably impacted.

- 7.19 Consequently, it is considered on balance that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and on balance 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). It is noted one letter of support was received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Ecology

- 7.20 Due to large scale works to the roof, the Council's Ecologist was consulted during the application process. Regarding this, the Council's Ecologist stated "Looks OK. No justification for further information". In light of this, this proposal is considered to be unlikely to have an impact on protected bat species and is considered to accord with policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011) and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(v) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(vi) Arboriculture

- 7.22 Due to a nearby tree in No.31's garden, the Council's Arboriculturist was consulted during the application process. The Council's Arboriculturist stated "*The Orange Tree is not considered a constraint to development – any overhanging branches / canopy or roots can be cut back to the boundary under Tort Law if required*". In light of this, this proposal is considered to accord with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(vii) Parking

- 7.23 In relation to parking the proposal would result in an increase in bedrooms from 3 to 4. Under the Council's Parking SPD this would require three parking spaces and these are shown to the rear of the property.

8 Conclusion

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

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application

APP/24/00551

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:

Drawing Number: PDC/24/07/216/ 05 A :AMENDED EXISTING & PROPOSED SITE PLANS: Uploaded 3/10/24

Drawing Number: PDC/24/07/216/ 04 B :AMENDED PROPOSED ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 3/10/24

Drawing Number: PDC/24/07/216/ 04 B :AMENDED PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS: Uploaded 3/10/24

LOCATION PLAN dated 16/07/24

Design and Access Statement PDC Design and Development July 2024

Email dated 16th October from Mr Welch re render colour

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, the south-eastern (side) window serving a bedroom on the first floor on the plans hereby approved shall be high level opening at a minimum of 1.7 metres above finished floor level only and fixed shut below 1.7m and fitted with 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

- 5 The car parking, and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the bedroom extension being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose. The parking shall include porous surfacing unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the

National Planning Policy Framework.