
Site Address: 26 Trosnant Road, Havant, PO9 3BA
Proposal:
Single storey rear and side extensions, side porch, rear raised patio and 2no. rooflights on rear roof slope.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/22/00217 Expiry Date: 16/05/2022
Applicant: Ms Elsmore
Agent: Ms L Taylor Case Officer: Lewis Ford
 Thorns - Young Ltd
Ward: Bedhampton

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is No.26 Trosnant Road, Havant, PO9 3BA. The site comprises a late-1950s / early-1960s, 1.5-storey, detached bungalow of traditional brick and tile construction supplemented by yellow render on the front elevation. The immediate locality comprises bungalows of a similar design, tenure, and type, albeit with different coloured rendered finishes. Finally, the bungalow is located between Stockheath Lane and Trosnant Road with vehicular access set back from the latter.

2 Planning History

HWU/02492/A: REFUSAL in Oct 1953 for residential development.
HWU/02967: PERM in June 1954 for residential development.
HWU/03924: PERM in Sep 1955 for 43 houses with garages.
HWU/04451: REFUSAL in Aug 1956 for 44 houses and garages.
HWU/04451/1: REFUSAL in May 1958 for 42 bungalows.
HWU/04451/2: PERM in Aug 1958 for 16 houses, 6 semi-bungalows & 14 bungalows.
HWU/04551/3: REFUSAL in Nov 1959 for the erection of 45 houses.
29436: PERM in Mar 1981 for a single storey rear extension.
APP/20/00991: OUTLINE PERM in Oct 2021 for new pipeline.
GEN/22/00161: INVALID planning enquiry for a proposed rear conservatory

3 Proposal

Single storey rear and side extensions, side porch, rear raised patio and 2no. rooflights on rear roof slope.

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

CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS19 (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
DM10 (Pollution)
DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Not applicable.

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

No comment.

Councillor D Guest

No comment.

Councillor G Robinson

No comment.

Councillor M Inkster

No comment.

Developer Services, Southern Water

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public foul and surface water sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. To make an application, please visit Southern Water's "Get Connected" service:

<https://developerservices.southernwater.co.uk/>

In situations where surface water is being considered for discharge to our network, we require the following hierarchy for surface water – reuse, infiltration, watercourse, storm sewer, and combined sewer – to be followed which is reflected in Part H3 of Building Regulations. Whilst reuse does not strictly form part of this hierarchy, Southern Water would encourage the consideration of reuse for new developments.

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

Portsmouth Water Company

The Portsmouth Water Catchment Management Team has reviewed this application from a groundwater quality protection perspective due to its location within SPZ 1c of the groundwater catchment. The Team has no subsequent adverse comments to make due to the development's small nature.

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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having due 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) Impact on the Character of the Area & Appropriateness of Design
- (iii) Impact on Neighbouring Properties
- (iv) Impact on the Local Ecological Network (LEN)
- (v) Flood Issues
- (vi) Impact on the Source Protection Zone (SPZ)
- (vii) Impact on Utilities

(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.

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

7.3 The proposed development would comprise five elements as follows:

(1) The construction of an additional rear extension for a family room; and

Planning Permission was granted under reference 29436 in March 1981 for the existing single-storey rear extension. The existing extension comprises a width and depth of approximately 7.4m (spanning the width of the original dwellinghouse) and 3.05m respectively and is currently used as a kitchen and dining room.

The proposed rear extension would extend beyond the south-western corner of the existing rear extension and would comprise a width and depth of approximately 3.2m and 3.8m respectively. As part of this, the proposed rear extension would protrude beyond the south-western side elevation by approximately 1.2m up to the boundary with No.28 Trosnant Road, whilst the depth would increase to 4.1m as it wraps around, and extends forward from, the existing rear wall along the existing south-western side elevation. In terms of height, the proposed rear extension would comprise a flat roof and have a height of approximately 3m, increasing to approximately 3.2m when considering the proposed skylight.

(2) The construction of a side extension for a utility room; and

The proposed side extension would replace an existing wooden side structure (not shown on the submitted plans) which does not benefit from planning permission and is, therefore, currently in breach of planning control. The proposed side extension would comprise a width and depth of approximately 3.4m and 0.9m respectively. Finally, the proposed new external stepped access would be screened by a replacement side gate.

(3) The construction of a raised patio; and

The proposed raised patio would be situated between the new double doors on the existing rear wall and the proposed rear extension (see above). The proposed raised patio would be raised by approximately 0.45m from ground level and would comprise a width and depth of 2.95m and 3.8m respectively producing a surface area of approximately 6.75 square metres (sqm). The raised patio would also include rails along the north-eastern side, along with steps down to the rear garden.

(4) The delivery of a side porch; and

The proposed porch would be created by setting back the existing front door by 0.5m into the existing dwellinghouse to create a sheltered and stepped porch along the north-eastern side elevation.

(5) The installation of 2no. roof lights on the rear roof slope.

The proposed 2no. roof lights (0.9m x 1m) would be installed on the existing rear roof slope of the existing rear extension. As the roof slope forms part of the existing extension's roof slope and does not form part of the "original" roof, formal planning permission is required – see criteria under **Schedule 2, Part 1, Class C** of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Notwithstanding the above, the agent has confirmed that the proposed rooflights will serve the existing kitchen and dining room with a vaulted ceiling.

- 7.4 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD explains that extensions should be smaller, subservient, sympathetic, and modest in mass and height compared to the main dwellinghouse and that gaps between buildings should be retained as part of the local pattern of development. The proposed development comprises additions (excluding the proposed porch) to the existing rear extension which was approved and built out in the early 1980s. In doing so, the proposed development would, in combination with the existing extension, create quite a large addition to the original building's footprint. More specifically, it would extend beyond the "original" rear wall by approximately 6.8m and remove / reduce the gaps between the existing building's elevations and its side boundaries. Indeed, the proposed rear extension would be built up to the existing south-western side boundary, whilst the proposed side extension would be less than 1m from the exiting north-eastern side boundary. On balance, although the above is not in accordance with the recommendations of the Design Guide SPD, the proposed development is not considered to be overwhelming within the plot size of the application site. In addition, after reviewing other examples of rear extensions in the locality, it is considered that the mass of the proposed extension would not be unacceptable, and that the rear garden would not appear cluttered once the existing shed is demolished as per the amended Block Plan.

- 7.5 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states that extensions should look to the existing dwellinghouse and its neighbours as the main reference points for appearance, materials, and detailing. The proposed rear extension, side extension and porch works would comprise brickwork to match the existing dwellinghouse which is supported by the Design Guide SPD. In terms of the proposed flat roofs, the Design Guide SPD states that flat roofs are generally not acceptable, and that proposed roofs should mirror that of the main dwellinghouse in terms of angle, eaves details and materials. However, despite the above, the Design Guide SPD goes on to state that there may be exceptions to this rule providing that the results do not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties nor the streetscene. In this instance, the proposed flat roofs would be flush and uniform with the existing eaves. It is, therefore, considered that the installation of flat roofs on the proposed rear and side extensions would not be unacceptable and would not have an adverse effect.
- 7.6 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states that new porches need to be carefully considered as they can hold a prominent position on an existing building and within the streetscene. In this instance, the proposed porch would be on the north-eastern side elevation and would be created within the existing footprint of the building by setting the front door back by 0.5m into the existing building. As the proposed porch would not protrude beyond the existing side wall, it is considered that the proposed side porch would not negatively impact the character of the area nor the streetscene.
- 7.7 Moreover, the appearance, design and mass of the proposed development would not be unacceptable in the context of the application site and its locality. Although the proposed development, in combination with the existing rear extension, would result in a large addition to the “original” dwellinghouse, it is considered on balance that the proposed development would not lead to demonstrable harm given the plot size and other examples of additions and extensions in the locality. In considering all the above, the proposed development would not be contrary to Policy CS16 in the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(iii) Impact on Neighbouring Properties

- 7.8 The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD explains that rear extensions should maintain a distance of at least 8m from the rear boundary wall and at least 20m from neighbouring properties to the rear. The proposed rear extension would be approximately 7.2m from the angled rear boundary (at its closest point) and would be around 100m from the nearest property to the rear given that the site backs onto Stockheath Lane, Hermitage Stream and open space. Given the size and shape of the existing rear garden, it is not considered that the proposed development would be overwhelming nor overbearing given the plot size of the application site.
- 7.9 In terms of gaps between properties, the proposed development would remove and reduce the gaps between the existing dwellinghouse and its south-western and north-eastern side boundaries respectively, albeit only towards the rear of the existing dwellinghouse. Although this would not be supported by the recommendations in the Design Guide SPD, the above gap reductions between the existing dwellinghouse and its neighbours would not warrant refusal given the other examples of rear extensions and householder developments within the locality.

- 7.10 In terms of fenestration, the proposed rear extension would include sliding doors whilst the proposed side extension would include a new external stepped access. Both proposed external doors would face north-east towards No.24 Trosnant Road. Whilst on site, it was noted that No.24 Trosnant Road does not have any windows on its south-western side elevation and that the existing boundary fence between Nos 24 and 26 Trosnant Road is approximately 2m in height. As for No.28 Trosnant Road to the south-west, the proposed development is not proposing any windows nor doors which would face towards this neighbouring property. In light of the above – along with the orientation and location of the proposals - it is considered that the proposed development would not lead to an increase in overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light, nor loss of privacy.
- 7.11 Finally, the slight change in site levels means that the rear garden slopes gently downwards away from the existing dwellinghouse towards Stockheath Lane. Although the existing dwellinghouse and proposed development would be slightly higher than No.28 Trosnant Road, on balance it is considered that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact – in terms of overbearing, overshadowing, loss of light, overlooking and loss of privacy etc. – on neighbouring properties given the plot size and examples of existing rear extensions in the locality. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not be contrary to Policy CS16 in the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011. It is noted that no letters of objection have been received with respect to the proposed development.

(iv) Impact on the Local Ecological Network (LEN)

- 7.12 The proposed rear extension would be built up to the south-western side boundary and would, therefore, be adjacent to an existing tree located in the rear garden of No.28 Trosnant Road. The Council's Arboriculture Officer has been consulted but, unfortunately, has not been able to provide comments on this planning application. Notwithstanding the above, the tree is not considered to be of quality that would warrant a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). As such, the proposed rear extension is not considered to be contrary to Policy DM8 in the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011. The future of the tree is considered to be a civil matter between Nos 26 and 28 Trosnant Road.

(v) Flood Issues

- 7.13 The application site slopes downwards in an east-to-west direction towards the Hermitage Stream which is on the other side of Stockheath Lane and approximately 45m away from the proposed development. The western rear boundary of the site currently straddles Flood Zones 2 and 3, and climate change modelling has predicted that a small area in the far western corner of the rear garden will be in a future flood zone. Despite the above, the existing dwellinghouse and proposed development are in the higher sections of the site and are not in the current nor future flood zones. The proposed development would also be constructed on an existing area of hard standing. In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would not put occupiers or employees of the emergency services at any additional risk in the event of a flood. As such, the proposed development would not be contrary to Policy CS15 in the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(vi) Impact on the Source Protection Zone (SPZ)

- 7.14 The site is entirely within Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1c in the Portsmouth Water Ground Catchment. The Portsmouth Water Catchment Management Team has reviewed the proposal and has no subsequent adverse comments to make due to the proposed development's small nature. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the Source Protection Zone (SPZ).

(vii) Impact on Utilities

- 7.15 A Southern Water Foul Sewer Line and Surface Water Sewer Line can be found beyond the rear and front elevations of the site. Although it is believed that the existing dwellinghouse and proposed development would be more than 10m away from the identified Sewer Lines, Southern Water has advised that it may be possible that a sewer (now deemed to be public) could be crossing the application site. Southern Water has advised that, in the instance that any sewer is found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further work can commence on site. In acknowledging Southern Water's comments, an appropriate planning condition has been proposed – see Planning Condition No.4.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposed development would have a limited and an acceptable impact on the character of the area and neighbouring properties. The proposed development is, therefore, considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval subject to appropriate planning conditions.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00217 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:

Location Plan
Block Plan (Amended 18 May 2022)
Drg No: 6053.22.1 – Existing Floor Plans & Elevations
Drg No: 6053.22.2 – Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 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.
- 4 In the event that public sewers are found at any time when carrying out the approved development which were not previously identified, development shall STOP until details of the measures which will be undertaken to protect the public sewer have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Following approval, such measures shall be implemented on site in complete accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure the adequate protection of infrastructure having due regard to Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) Policies CS19 and DM10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.