DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	**Construction of a single storey rear extension and loft conversion, with rear dormer, in addition, construction of a single storey side extension to be used as a home office and for use as a dental practice for use by resident.**
LOCATION:	31 Serpentine Road, Widley, Waterlooville, PO7 5EE
REFERENCE NO:	APP/25/00689
APPLICANT:	Torkos and Kocharina
APPLICATION TYPE:	Change of use
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	11/11/2025
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	12/11/2025
WARD:	Purbrook
CASE OFFICER:	Tina Pickup

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1. Site Description

1.1 The application site relates to a post-war semi-detached two storey dwelling located on the west side of Serpentine Road. It is cream painted render beneath a fully hipped plain tile roof. It is set back from the highway some 12m, with the front forecourt area block paved for the parking of cars, accessed via a dropped kerb at the southern end of the site. There is a new boundary wall across the remainer of the frontage.

1.2 To the rear, the single storey extension shown as part of this application has already been constructed and finished in vertical timber cladding.

1.3 The site is located in a residential area which generally comprises medium density two storey terraced and semi-detached properties of a similar age and style, with some having been modernised. Serpentine Road has no parking restrictions.

2. Planning History

04/69826/000 – Two storey side extension, single storey front extension and provision of living accommodation in the loft space including a dormer window to the rear elevation. Permitted 2 November 2004 – *not implemented*

3. Proposal

3.1 Construction of a single storey rear extension and loft conversion, with rear dormer, in addition, construction of a single storey side extension to be used as a home office and for use as a dental practice for use by resident.

3.2 This application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension (which has already been constructed on site and in isolation meets the requirements to be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO 2015); a hip to gable

roof alteration including rear dormer; and a single storey side extension which would be used as a dentist surgery. As a result, the site would have a mixed residential and business use.

3.3 Limited supporting information has been provided which states that the dental business would be open Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm with 1 patient at a time with 1 member of staff. One parking space would be allocated to the dental practice.

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 Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS2 - Employment
CS16 - High Quality Design
CS17 – Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Area
CS20 – Transport and Access Strategy
DM10 – Pollution
DM13 – Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development
DM14 – Car and Cycle Parking on Development (excluding residential)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014
AL1- Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
AL2 – Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements

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

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable
Conservation Area: Not applicable

5. Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Southern Water – No Objection

Development Site is not within Southern Water's Supply Area

The development site is not located within Southern Water's statutory area for water supply services. Please contact Portsmouth Water who are the relevant statutory undertaker.

S106 Connection application

Any new connections to the public sewerage system will require a Section 106 connection application to be submitted and approved by Southern Water Services. Please note that, where there are separate systems available Southern Water will not allow surface water to connect into the public foul sewer. If this is not possible, please provide evidence that all other options have been explored Southern Water has determined that the flow rate for the above site will remain consistent, so capacity is not an issue, and no Southern Water assets will be affected. Therefore, Southern Water has no objections to this proposal.

Please note surface water should not be disposed of into a public foul sewer and must comply with the Hierarchy of H3 of the Building Regulations.
Any new connections to the public sewerage system will require a New Sewer Connection application (also known as a Section 106) to be submitted and approved by Southern Water.

if any additional sewers are discovered during construction, an investigation will be required to determine their condition, the number of properties served, and potential access methods before any further work can proceed on site.

County Highways Team

The Support Statement (25.072025-RevA) sets out that the side extension will be utilised as a dental practice. Whilst stated that patient access to the site will be managed through appointment booking, it is unclear how many patients are forecast to visit the practice. A forecast of daily trip generation is required by the Highway Authority to determine if safe and suitable access can be achieved by all users.

Whilst the Planning Authority, as local parking authority, will need to be satisfied that there is adequate parking available (having regards to Adopted Parking Policy and Standards), it is unclear at this stage whether the proposals will lead to additional off-site parking. Further information is required in this regard, including an understanding of the availability of existing parking on site.

Recommendation On the basis of the above, the Highway Authority require further information before a formal recommendation can be made.

Environmental Health

Environmental Health has no objection to the proposals, providing construction activities are managed to minimise adverse impacts to neighbours.

Due to the age of the property, it is recommended that an asbestos survey is carried out prior to any works commencing.

The following condition restricting the opening hours of the dental surgery is recommended.

Opening Hours
The approved Dental Surgery use shall not be open for customers outside of the following times: Monday to Friday between the hours of 09:00 - 17:00.

Reason: to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Please include the following informative notes, should permission be granted.

Asbestos
Prior to any demolition, redevelopment or refurbishment works taking place an appropriate Asbestos Survey should be undertaken by an asbestos licensed/authorised company/person and any recommendations implemented. For pre-demolition assessment the asbestos survey is fully intrusive and will involve a destructive inspection, as necessary, to gain access to all areas. Where presence of asbestos is suspected the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and

Environment Agency must be notified and special waste regulations complied with; asbestos removal activities fall under the remit of the HSE.

Construction hours
To reduce the likelihood of local residents being subjected to adverse levels of noise annoyance during construction, work on site should not occur outside the following hours: -
Monday – Friday 7.30 a.m. – 6.00 p.m.
Saturday 8.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.
NO WORK ON SUNDAYS & BANK HOLIDAYS.
If work at other times is required permission should be obtained from the local planning authority

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, as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 7

Number of site notices: 1

Number of representations received: 5

Absolutely no issue with the work, Just concerns over parking, on an already packed street. I'd assume as they have a large driveway that should cover their patients, but I worry more cars (albeit for a short period) will clog the street
I have no objection to the proposed building works — including the rear extension, loft conversion, and dormer — although I note that the rear extension is already well underway prior to planning approval. I trust this will be reviewed as part of the application process. My concern relates specifically to the proposed use of part of the property as a dental practice. While the application states this is for use by the resident, it still introduces a commercial activity into a residential street. Even a small-scale operation will increase traffic and parking demand, which is already a concern on Serpentine Road. The street regularly experiences congestion, and available parking is limited. In addition, the introduction of a dental practice — however modest — risks undermining the established residential character of the area. Serpentine Road is made up entirely of private homes, and the presence of a business use could set a precedent for further commercial activity, altering the quiet, domestic nature of the street. I ask the Council to consider the following planning concerns: • Increased traffic and parking pressure • Change of use from residential to mixed commercial • Impact on the residential character and amenity of the area
I have no objection to house extensions, however the combined side and rear extension proposed here would appear to be much bigger than any other on the road. Most extensions so far appear to have been either side extensions or rear

extensions, not both. I also note that, when I walk past the property, there appears to be work already started, with a rear extension of some form already occurring.

I agree with other comments, parking on the road is very busy, and an allowance of just one patient space doesn't seem sufficient, as there is likely to be times where a patient is being treated while the next one has arrived and is waiting for their appointment. Walking past the residence I am also uncertain that 4 cars would fit on the driveway, as shown in the drawing, with patients probably choosing to park on the road rather than struggle.

Most importantly though I feel that I must object to the change of use. While there are companies registered to addresses on the road, these are contractors that work offsite. Allowing mixed commercial activities in a property on this quiet residential road could seriously impact the neighbourhood. A lot of school children walk through this area on their way to and from schools, additional congestion on the road could result in additional risk. We often see local children playing in the road in the summer, or on their bikes, this is a rare opportunity in modern towns. This should not be put at risk.
I second the request for the Council to carefully consider the impacts on;

- Increased traffic and parking pressure
- Change of use from residential to mixed commercial
- Impact on the residential character and amenity of the area

---

I have no objections to home extensions, even large ones that will stand out like in the proposed application.

Our road is narrow and not all homes have driveways - especially those on the opposite side of the road to the application - which means that there are quite a few cars parked on the road. There are young children that play on the road and I do worry about their visibility.

Whilst there are generous front gardens/driveways on the applicant's side of the road, I do not believe that there is room for four cars side-by-side (including room to manoeuvre and egress) as seen on the 'ground and first floor plan as proposed'. Is there any evidence to support this? If there is insufficient room then the patients, or residents, will have no choice but to park on the already crowded road.

It also appears to me that building works have started prior to approval of their application.

As a local Serpentine Road resident, I am extremely concerned by the addition of a dental practice to the property. Parking can already be at a premium at peak times and I believe it would be difficult to park four cars comfortably on the driveway as outlined in the application. Whilst I appreciate attempts have clearly been made to try and combat this issue by staggering appointment times, I believe this is optimistic as people will need to arrive ahead of the appointment time and any delays will cause road parking to be used.

I would also like consideration given to the additional waste as there have been drainage issues locally in the past.

Whilst I have no objections to the loft extension, I do have concerns around the rear extension. This has already begun prior to the relevant application approvals and work regularly continues late into the evening. The structure that has been built has

resulted in a loss of natural light over the garden patio area and I also have concerns about the ability of the applicant to maintain the fencing in the future given how close the extension will be to the boundary.

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 and mixed use
(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
(iii) Effect on neighbouring amenity
(iv) Highways/parking provision
(v) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

(i) Principle of development and mixed use

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria. It is however noted that the site lies within a wholly residential area and the proposal would result in a mixed residential and business use of the site. Policy CS2 supports new employment opportunities in principle, and whilst many businesses can successfully operate from homes without any adverse impacts on neighbouring properties, in this case the precise impacts of a dental practice must be considered below.

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

Extensions

7.3 In terms of the proposed operational development i.e. proposed extensions, these are considered appropriate. A hip to gable conversion is often permitted development, although in this instance requires permission due to the combination of the proposed rear dormer which extends beyond the original roof space into the volume created by the hip to gable, exceeding the criteria set at Part 1, Class B of the GPDO.

7.4 Nevertheless the existing separation between properties and the addition of a barn hip would help soften the appearance of the roof bulk in street scene terms, and the rear dormer is set off the ridge, eaves and side to reduce its dominance in the extended rear roof slope, in accordance with the Borough Design Guide SPD.

7.5 The rear single storey extension has been completed with a flat roof, and it aligns with the existing side elevation of the dwelling. As such it is considered permitted development in accordance with Part 1, Class A of the GPDO. It does not yet link to any side extension and as such is not yet a “wrap-around” extension requiring permission.

7.6 The proposed side extension does however require permission, as it would form the “wrap-around” to the rear extension. It is however only single storey with proposed side sloping roof and linking to a front pitched roof porch with two front doors – one to the dwelling and one to the business. It would be sited close to the shared boundary with 29, but with an eaves height of only 2.3m and being sited north of 29, would be unlikely to be overbearing or enclosing or result in additional overshadowing.

7.7 Overall, in design terms, the proposed extensions are considered to be sympathetic to the appearance of the host dwelling and street scene, and considered to comply with Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and Borough Design Guide SPD.

Dental Use

7.8 However, in terms of the use of the proposed side extension to form a dental business, this would introduce an active commercial use into a quiet residential area. With daily comings and goings of patients on back-to-back appointments, there could be a steady flow of additional people and vehicular movements in the area. At a sufficiently low scale this might be acceptable and potentially controllable via condition, but no information has been forthcoming to enable that.

7.9 The plans submitted to date show both a Treatment Room and a Reception implying there would be the dentist as well as a receptionist present i.e. 2 members of staff, albeit the dentist would likely be the homeowner and occupier. Patients normally arrive before the previous patient has left, so potentially there could also be 2 patients at the site at any one time. No details are given of the length of time of appointments or number of patients that would be seen per day (if only 10-minute appointments, then 6 patients an hour for up to 7 hours a day could be up to 42 patients in a day).

7.10 A site meeting was held on 1st December 2025 to discuss the proposal where the need for an Operational Management Plan style document that sets out in more detail the daily and weekly patient numbers, trip generation, timetabling and management of appointments and patients, staff levels etc. was discussed and requested. Whilst the applicant verbally implied the operation of the dental practice would be relatively low-key, indicating 10 patients a day with 20 minute or half hour appointments, it was acknowledged that the appointments would be back-to-back with 2 patients present at a time and a receptionist. It was also suggested that a nurse would be needed, so potentially another, 3rd member of staff.

7.11 However, despite several requests since for the information to be provided formally, no information relating to the scale of the business, number of patients, likely trips, appointment times, staffing levels, etc has been forthcoming. Without this information it is not possible to ensure the scale of the operation would not be excessive and out of keeping with the quiet residential character of the area from commercial comings and goings and activity at the site. As such the proposal would be deemed out of context with its locality, contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring amenity

7.12 As noted above the proposed dental use could introduce a level of activity that would be harmful to neighbouring amenity from additional comings and goings and associated noise and disturbance. This could also result in overflow parking causing pressures to park for local residents.

7.13 Policy CS16 at clause 1. e) seeks to ensure development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through, amongst other things, noise, and policy DM10 seeks to resist development that causes noise, smell, smoke, fumes, vibration, light etc. It is considered the impact of up to 42 patients visiting a day, with associated vehicular trips, car doors slamming etc, would result in detrimental impacts on neighbouring amenity, contrary to these policies.

7.14 However in terms of the operational development and impact of the proposed extensions, it is considered these would be unlikely to result in any additional

overlooking, loss of privacy, outlook etc. Rear dormers are commonplace in the area, and the proposed dormer would not be overly intrusive. As a result it is considered that the extensions would not appear overbearing or lead to a 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).

(iv) Highways/parking provision

7.15 The existing dwelling has 3 bedrooms, requiring 2 on site parking spaces to meet the adopted Parking SPD. The proposed plans would result in a 5-bed dwelling requiring an additional space i.e. 3 on site spaces in total to meet the SPD for the residential element of the proposal. Cycle storage would be in addition but could be provided in the rear shed of the property.

7.16 The Parking SPD requires 3 spaces per consulting room for dentists, with 1 long stay cycle stand per 6 staff and 1 short stay cycle stand per consulting room. Therefore, this proposal for 1 consulting room and potentially 3 staff would require 3 spaces plus 1 long stay and 1 short stay cycle stand.

7.17 The development as a whole would therefore require 6 spaces plus cycle storage to meet the adopted Parking SPD. However, only 4 on-site spaces are shown on the submitted plans and no cycle parking. No supporting parking survey has been submitted to demonstrate on-street capacity for the overflow within the local area, as required by paragraphs 4.32 and 4.33 of the Parking SPD.

7.18 Many of the properties in Serpentine Road have dropped kerbs and therefore on-street parking is limited. Anecdotal evidence from third party letters is that the area is often parked up and congested. The proposed use could add to pressures to park on the highway from the overflow demand, leading to highway amenity concerns.

7.19 It is further noted that the proposed 4 spaces are shown laid out against the northern boundary and the front boundary wall is not shown on the plans, neither are any pedestrian inter-visibility splays. However, the site frontage is only 9.6m wide, so this would only leave an aisle width of 4.8m, which is considered insufficient to turn on site and manoeuvre, and does not meet the adopted Parking SPD suggested aisle width of 6m (para 4.08). Therefore, the suggested parking layout is not considered appropriate and could lead to reversing into and out of the site and further pressures to park on the highway. This in turn could lead to conflict with passing pedestrians and vehicles.

7.20 An alternative parking layout to achieve the 6 spaces on site was discussed, as it might be possible by demolishing the front wall and having a continuous dropped kerb serving 2 rows of 3 spaces. The residential spaces could be closest to the house and be blocked in by the dental spaces, ensuring the patient and staff spaces were always available during the day. But no amended plans have been forthcoming with this alternative parking layout.

7.21 It is also noted that HCC Highways requested a forecast of daily trip generation to determine if safe and suitable access can be achieved by all users. This has also not been forthcoming despite several requests.

7.22 Overall it is considered that the lack of on-site parking, insufficient on-site manoeuvring, no cycle parking provision, no pedestrian intervisibility splays, and no trip generation information is such that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the vehicular trips and parking associated with the proposed dental use can be

satisfactorily provided on site without overflow harm to highway safety and amenity. This is contrary to policies CS20 and DM14 of the HBLP (Core Strategy), and the adopted Parking SPD.

(v) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

7.23 With respect to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), this is a legal requirement for planning permission introduced for small sites such as this on 2nd April 2024. To qualify for the de-minimis exemption of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024, 'the development must not impact an onsite priority habitat (defined as a habitat specified in a published list); secondly, the development must impact no more than 25 square metres of onsite habitat with a biodiversity value greater than zero, and no more than five metres in length of onsite linear habitat.'

7.24 In this instance the site is already hard surfaced and the development would not result in the loss of any priority habitat or habitat over 25sqm and so the de-minimis exemption can be agreed.

8. Conclusion

8.1 It is considered that the proposed operational development for residential purposes 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.

8.2 However, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed change of use of part of the site to form a dental surgery could be operated at a scale that would not cause harm to the character of the area, neighbouring amenity and highway safety and amenity, from the additional comings and goings and parking consequences. As such the proposed use is considered contrary to policies CS16, CS20, DM10 and DM14 of the HBLP (Core Strategy), as well as the adopted Parking SPD and is recommended for refusal.

---

9. RECOMMENDATION:

That the Interim Head of Planning be authorised to Refuse for application APP/25/00689

Reasons for Refusal:

1. Insufficient information has been provided relating to the scale and management of the proposed dental business e.g. number and frequency of patients, appointment times and scheduling, and staffing levels. It has not therefore been adequately demonstrated that the proposed dental use could operate from the site, without causing harm to the residential character of the area or having an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours, from the commercial comings and goings, noise and disturbance associated with the use. The proposal is therefore considered out of context with its locality, contrary to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy, March 2011, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Inadequate on-site car and cycle parking and manoeuvring is provided for the proposed mixed-use development, and no daily trip generation information or pedestrian intervisibility splays have been provided. It has not therefore been demonstrated that the proposed dental use could operate from the site without resulting in overflow parking to the highway resulting in harm to both highway safety and amenity, contrary to policies CS20 and DM14 of the Havant Borough Core

Strategy, March 2011, the adopted Parking SPD 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives:

In accordance with paragraphs 38-50 of the NPPF Havant Borough Council (HBC) takes a positive and proactive approach and works with applicants/agents on development proposals in a manner focused on solutions by:

Offering a pre-application advice service, and

Updating you of any issues that may arise in the processing of your application and where possible suggesting solutions, and,

In this instance:

You were updated about issues during and after the site visit, but no additional information was forthcoming.

Your application is therefore considered unacceptable for the reasons set out in this Decision Notice.