

# Planning, Design & Access Statement

***4 Privett Road, Purbrook, Havant, PO7 5HJ.***

***Proposed erection of a front (north) extension, to form a garage and home gymnasium at ground-floor and bedroom above, with provision of a study/home office.***



Prepared by  
Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd  
on behalf of Dr R. Turner.

## 1. Introduction

This statement supports the householder planning application for the erection of an extension to the front (north) elevation of 4 Privett Road, to provide garage and home gymnasium on the ground-floor and a further bedroom above, together with the provision of a study/home office.

This statement explains the nature and extent of the proposal and how it responds to the local environment, in its built and socio-economic contexts. It has regard to key national and local planning policies relating to domestic extensions and design and should be read in conjunction with the other supporting documents.



*The approach to the application site from the west, on Privett Road.*

## 2. Context



*The approach to the site from the east, on Privett Road.*

This rectangular site of **0.055 hectare** lies on the south side of Privett Road in Purbrook, within Havant Borough Council's administrative area.

Regardless of whether one approaches from the east or west along Privett Road, public impressions of the site are blocked by frontage vegetation and the properties that face north towards the road. Only from directly outside nos.1 Privett Road (beyond, to the northwest) and 13 Privett Road (beyond, to the northeast) is it apparent that a detached chalet-bungalow stands on the land; this represents a frontage distance of

**56 metres** (8.7%) or 0.5 minute walk which, compared to the length of Privett Road as a whole (ie **665 metres**), is negligible. Views into the site from the north on Privett Road are constrained by frontage and boundary vegetation.

Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site is afforded via a timber gate near its northeast corner and an ungated driveway near the northwest corner. Clear views to the east and west along Privett Road ensure that vehicles entering and leaving the site enjoy good visibility and are themselves seen clearly by approaching drivers, riders and pedestrians. A dropped kerb and a surfaced forecourt afford access and parking for several vehicles at the front of the property. The provision of secure on-site facilities for bicycle storage would promote the use of that alternative to the private car as a



*The application site viewed from the north, on Privett Road.*

sustainable transport mode, as is recognised at paragraph 104 of the 'National Planning Policy Framework' 2021 ('NPPF') re. 'Promoting sustainable transport'.

In his 'Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth' of March 2011, Decentralisation Minister Greg Clark confirmed that the *'Government's clear expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes' except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy'*. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF reiterated that principle, by generating a presumption in favour of sustainable development and the approval without delay of proposals that accord with the development plan. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF ('Achieving well-designed places') provides for the grant of planning permission for development of good design.

Section 38 of the 'Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004' requires an application to be determined in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; an element of flexibility is provided which enables decisions to be made which may disagree with the development plan. The development plan for Purbrook comprises the 'Havant Borough Core Strategy' (2011), the 'Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations)' (2014) document and Supplementary Planning Documents. The Policies Map of the development plan shows this site within the *'Urban Area Boundary'* with no special designations; it does *not* fall within a Flood Zone.

Core Strategy Policy CS16 regarding 'High Quality Design', provides for the grant of planning permission for *'...development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax...1. Responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and...e)...does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.'* Core Strategy Policy DM9 ('Development in the Coastal Zone') generates a presumption in favour of development in the coastal zone which satisfies a number of criteria. Local Plan Policy AL1 ('Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development') asserts that *'When considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework...It will always work proactively with applicants to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area...Planning applications that accord with the policies in this local plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise'*.

Paragraph 5.36 of the 'Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document' (2011) regarding 'Front Extensions', recorded the Borough Council's recognition that; they *'...should not protrude too far forward from the main building, or be prominent in the street and should respect the common building line.'*; *'...are therefore most appropriate where the building is set well back from the street, where there is a staggered building line, or in isolated countryside locations.'*; and *'Two storey front extensions will only be acceptable where the building is set well back from the street.'* As is the case with this proposal. While not directly pertinent to this (front extension) proposal, paragraph 5.37 of the Design SPD re 'Side Extensions' suggests that *'... the extension remains subservient to the main building, so it can be read which part of the building is the original and which is a later addition.'* - which is the case here. Notably, the Design SPD is silent on the application of the *'45 degree overshadowing zone'* for front extensions to dwellings, referred to in paragraphs 5.43 regarding 'Rear Extensions'.

The Borough Council's 'Parking Supplementary Planning Document' (2019) calls for a minimum of 2 parking spaces to serve a three-bedroomed dwelling. Table 1 ('Minimum gross internal floor areas and storage (m<sup>2</sup>)') of the DCLG's 'Technical housing standards – nationally

described space standard' (2015) requires a two-storey, three-bedroomed dwelling to have a gross internal area ('GIA') of at least **70m<sup>2</sup>**.

The frontage of this western part of Privett Road is characterised by detached family dwellings in a variety of formats, styles and plot sizes (see aerial photograph on cover page) that, notably, includes chalet-bungalows with gabled-roofed elements on the road frontage and flat-roofed dormers in the side (east and west) roof-planes eg no.23 Privett Road, that stands 74 metres to the east of the application site. While it is unclear from the Borough Council's website which permission/s relate to the side dormers of no.23 Privett Road, they have provided a useful comparison for this proposal.



No.23 Privett Road, that stands to the east of the application site.



The side (east) elevation of no.2 Privett Road, next-door to the west of the application site.

No.2 Privett Road (next-door, to the west of the application site) is a detached chalet-bungalow with two ground-floor windows in the east elevation and a side entrance door; the (north) narrow/slit window is obscure-glazed and provides a secondary function to the third bedroom, as it too is served by a large window in the north elevation; a wider (central) window and obscure-glazed door provide a secondary function to a kitchen, which is also served by a large south-facing window. The existing dwelling stands **5.6-7 metres** to the south of Privett Road.

Next-door-to-the-east stands no.6 Privett Road – it is a detached house with a large two-storey element at its northwest corner, with a void/porch beneath (in similar vein to a shallow carport) and a large ground-floor window and entrance door (which serve a hallway, which is a non-habitable room) in the west elevation, **2 metres** away from the common (east) boundary; the dwelling stands **7.6 metres** to the south of Privett Road. The view is held that little weight can be attributed to the neighbouring east and west windows.



The side (west) elevation of no.6 Privett Road, next-door to the east.

The application site is a detached three-bedroomed chalet-bungalow with a gross internal area ('GIA') of **137.32m<sup>2</sup>**, that is finished in red brick and white render, beneath a pitched roof of brown concrete interlocking tiles, with a large flat-roofed dormer in the front (north) roof plane. The site slopes northwards down towards Privett Road. The site is contained on its east boundary by a fence of horizontal boards, while tall vegetation defines the west boundary. The existing dwelling stands **12.3 metres** to the south of Privett Road ie

well behind its neighbours to the east and west. The applicant's family comprises Mr Turner, his partner and their two teenage children. Additional floorspace is required to achieve another bedroom, home gymnasium, garage and study/home office, for this growing family.



The front elevation of the earlier appeal proposal.

Appeal APP/X1735/D/21/3279425 (HBC ref: APP/21/00513) was dismissed by Inspector Tivey last October for the erection of a substantial 1.5-storey gable-roofed extension (with a resultant GIA of **222.83m<sup>2</sup>**) to the front (north) elevation of the property (comprising a gym and garage at ground-floor, with a bedroom above), with flat-roofed dormers to the east and west roof planes. The ridge-height of the extension would have resembled that of the existing property.

In his decision notice, Inspector Tivey recorded that:

*'3. The appeal site relates to a one-and-a-half storey dwelling set within a street whereby there is a mix of bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey houses, many of which have undergone alterations and extensions over time.;*

*'2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 2 and 6 Privett Road, with specific reference to outlook and light.';*

*'6. The proposed front extension would be of a considerable depth, the overall bulk and massing of which would be compounded by the changing ground levels down from the rear of the site towards the road. Whilst I accept no.6 itself is a rather imposing feature within the road, nonetheless the proposed front extension, by virtue of its overall scale, combined with the flat roof dormers to each side, would give rise to a bulky design that would be out of keeping with the host building and the visual amenities of the locality.';*

*'8. I accept that the appeal dwelling as it currently sits within its plot is recessive in relation to both adjacent dwellings and I note that the Council do not raise an objection to the principle of extending the dwelling...';*

*'1...windows on the facing elevations of nos 2 and 6 Privett Road. By virtue of its depth, the proposed extension would significantly restrict the outlook from these windows, notwithstanding that I accept that due to orientation, the sunlight received by them would be limited.';*

*'3. Overall, I consider that the proposed development, by virtue of its depth would have a detrimental impact upon the outlook from and the light available to the occupiers of 2 and 6 Privett Road and from this basis the proposal conflicts with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 which, in addition to that referred to previously, stipulates that planning permission will only be granted if a development is designed to a high standard and does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours.'* (emphasis added).

It is evident that a lesser proposal and a supporting sunlight/daylight assessment, would address the concerns recorded by Inspector Tivey and that the erection of an extension to the front elevation of the subject dwelling would make more efficient use of this underused urban site in a manner that accords with the mixed character of its surroundings and not compromise any key sustainable development principles of national or local planning policy.

### 3. Consultation

In light of the aforementioned case, no consultations have been undertaken with Officers of the Borough Council or neighbours.

### 4. Amount, Layout, Scale & Appearance

In light of the favourable presumption set down in the development plan and the mixed character of the area, it is proposed that a reduced 1.5-storey extension (with a resultant GIA of **210.04m<sup>2</sup>**) be constructed in the front (north) elevation of the subject dwelling, to achieve an integral garage and home gym on the ground-floor, with a further bedroom above, together with a study home office, afforded by the present smaller rear, southwest bedroom.

The proposed extension is so sited as to respect and reiterate the front building-line of the residences to the east and west of the application site. Mutual privacy for neighbours and occupants of the new (first-floor) bedrooms would be assured by the provision of high-level windows to the east and west faces of the intended (side) dormers. It is proposed that native shrubs and hedges be planted along the north, east and west boundaries of the site, to soften the appearance of the development.

In their 'Daylight and Sunlight Assessment' of November 2022 (copy enclosed), Herrington Consulting recorded that '*...the development will not result in a notable reduction in the amount of either daylight or sunlight enjoyed by the neighbouring buildings.*'. The proposal would not be materially harmful to neighbouring residences at nos.2 and 6 Privett Road.

In this configuration and finished in red brick and white render with a pitched roof of brown concrete interlocking tiles, the proposed extension would make more efficient use of this site in a manner that accords with the character of the host building and its surroundings and would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbours.

### 5. Access

To improve access to the site, it is proposed that the width of the entrance and dropped kerb be increased to the east. Compliant with the Borough Council's parking SPD, provision would be afforded for **three** parking spaces – two on the frontage hardstand and another in the garage, which would also provide secure bicycle storage accommodation.

The site enjoys unhindered access to Privett Road, so no difficulties are anticipated for emergency services reaching the dwelling or amenity areas. Further, the proposal would not cause danger or inconvenience to users of the public highway.

### 6. Trees & Ecology

No trees or protected species would be harmed by this proposal.

### 7. Site Waste Management

Where possible brick, block and concrete will be crushed and retained on-site for re-use as hardcore and timber will be salvaged. Inert waste material would be disposed of to a licensed Hampshire County Council site and any other waste will be segregated into skips and removed by licensed collectors.

## **8. Working Practice**

To protect the amenities of neighbours, the operation of construction machinery on the site will be restricted to 8.00am-6.00pm Monday-Friday, 8.30am-1.00pm on Saturday, with no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays. All materials and plant would be kept within the curtilage of the application site.

## **9. Crime & Anti-social behaviour**

No special measures are considered necessary for the prevention of crime or anti-social behaviour.

## **10. Community Infrastructure Levy**

It is understood that, as the proposal would result in a GIA of less than 100m<sup>2</sup> (ie **72.72m<sup>2</sup>**), the Borough Council would not impose a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in this instance.

## **11. Conclusion**

It is submitted that the requirements of the development plan are *satisfied* by this proposal since it: would not detract from the existing street-scene; would be in keeping with the (mixed) character of its surroundings; is of a high standard of design; incorporates materials and design elements sympathetic to local character; provides safe access for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic; provides satisfactory cycle and car parking; respects privacy, outlook and sunlight; and takes into account the prospect of criminal activity and anti-social behaviour.

Development of this site in the manner proposed would achieve more efficient use of this urban land without harm to the character or appearance of the locality or the amenities of neighbours. It is contended that this proposal comprises an acceptable form of development that accords with the development plan and no other material considerations suggest otherwise.

**Niall Tutton BSc (Hons), MA**  
*Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd*  
6 December 2022