

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Single storey front extension to garage with canopy over forming porch; ground floor extension to the rear; first floor side extension with pitched roof including terrace to rear; part timber cladding and associated internal and external renovation works.
- 3.2 This is an alternative scheme to APP/22/00673 and includes more contemporary features and larger ground floor footprint and first floor element. The front extension with linking flat roofed canopy forming a porch would be timber clad. During the course of determining this application amended plans have been received changing the profile of the previous flat roofed first floor side addition to a more traditional hipped roof, and reducing slightly the single storey rear extension to pull it off the boundary.

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)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS19	(Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
DM10	(Pollution)
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)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer

Site

The application site is located on Southleigh Road, close to Warblington train station. It forms one of a pair of semi-detached properties which are of a traditional character with more historic features such as sash windows, chimney, decorative brick coursing at eaves level and clay roof tiles. To the south of the application site lies No. 10 Southleigh Road which is a Grade II listed building. This features a thatched roof and was partially rebuilt some 10 years ago due to fire damage. The main garden area for No. 10 separates the listed building from the application site.

Proposal

Erection of a new recessed front porch, a ground floor extension to the rear, and first floor, pitched roof extensions, with first floor terrace to the rear, part timber cladding at ground floor and associated internal and external renovation works.

Planning permission (APP/22/00673) was granted in 2022 for a similar scheme: 'Convert existing single storey side extension to two storey side extension, extensions to the front elevation, a balcony to the rear with an external staircase and alterations to the boundary treatment'.

Legislative and Policy Context:

When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken in consideration.

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("1990 Act") requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest when considering whether to grant listed building consent.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The need for the decision taker to attach considerable or special weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings has been reinforced through two recent high court decisions of: Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited vs. East Northamptonshire District Council et al (2014); and North Norfolk District Council vs. DCLG and Mack (2014). The above statute and its subsequent and consistent interpretation in recent high court decision emphasises the need for the policies of the NPPF to be implemented whilst always having regard to the need to give special or greater weight to the preservation of the setting of a listed building.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Conservation Area, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

NPPF

The revised NPPF (December 2023) sets out in Chapter 16, the core principles relating to development affecting Heritage Assets that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions in the following paragraphs:

195. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

200. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based

assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

201. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

202. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

203. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

205. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

206. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

207. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- (a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- (b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- (c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- (d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

208. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Local Plan

Local planning policy comprises the adopted Havant Borough Local Plan Core

Strategy 2011, along with the Allocations Plan 2014. With regards to local planning policy, the following are relevant:

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for development that:

Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

Policy CS16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states 'Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site'.

Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that conserves and enhances the historic assets of Havant. It also states that application which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets are expected to provide a Heritage Statement that:

1. Describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise and where necessary original survey, at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal.
2. Sets out the impact of the development on the heritage assets and mitigation that is proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage asset, including where possible positive opportunities to conserve and enjoy heritage assets.

Assessment

In comparison to the existing permission, the revised proposal has a slightly larger footprint which includes a ground floor garden room and instead of the side garage, has a two-storey extension instead with a garage / store at ground floor and an additional bedroom at first floor. The main element of the first-floor extension is identical to that of the previous approval. The additional first floor section would have a lower ridge height to lessen the visual impact and building bulk on the south side of the plot, closest to No. 10 Southleigh Road. At ground floor, a more contemporary design approach is proposed which includes a timber clad, wrap around flat roof extension which incorporates the front porch. The rear first floor terrace is still proposed however, the external spiral staircase is now removed.

Other than the additional first floor element now proposed, the revised scheme would not have any further impact on the adjacent heritage asset than that of the extant approved scheme. The additional first floor element increases the height of the building bulk on the shared boundary with the site of the designated heritage asset. However, the ridge height is lower than the main building bulk and the roof also hips away from the boundary to reduce the bulk.

Overall, given that the closest section of the proposed first floor extensions has been designed to minimise bulk and mass and features a hipped roof, it is concluded that the proposal would not be harmful to the significance of the designated heritage asset. Furthermore, the first-floor element of the scheme would retain a traditional design which would sit comfortably next to the site of the heritage asset, in the context of the

streetscene.

Conclusion

In summary, it is considered that the proposals would not be harmful to the significance of the designated heritage asset, meeting the test set out in Sections 66 of the T&CPA 1990 (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas).

NO OBJECTION subject to the following condition:

1. Materials samples to be provided and agreed prior to the commencement of development.

Southern Water

Plan provided showing sewer to south of existing building

The attached plan shows that the existing development lies over a foul sewer. Approval should be sought from Southern Water where an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over a public sewer. An investigation of the sewer is required to confirm its size and depth, ascertain its condition, number of properties served and potential means of access before any decision can be made as to whether it would be acceptable for Southern Water to allow building-over the sewer. The length of sewer to be built over under the terms of Part H of the Building Regulations dictates that the matter is determined by the sewerage undertaker, which in this case is Southern Water.

In order to protect drainage apparatus, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following condition is attached to the planning permission; Prior to the commencement of development, the developer must advise the local authority, in consultation with Southern Water, of measures which will be undertaken to protect the public sewers.

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.

Formal application required for any new connection to the public sewer.
Where surface water discharged to network, should follow part H3 of Building Regs and encourage reuse.

Property Services Manager

No comments received.

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: 8

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 27/10/2023

Number of representations received: 3

Comment	Officer Comment
Applicant previously approached the Club to purchase land to extend the curtilage of the site, but this was not agreed and the ransom strip is affected by this planning application.	Noted but not relevant to the determination of this application
The site analysis diagram within the D&A statement incorrectly shows the garden to include the ransom strip which forms part of the protected boundary of the Club, making the garden appear larger than it is.	Since been corrected
The application includes a single storey rear extension into the rear garden. No dimensions are given for the depth of this extension. We are concerned that the lack of dimensions could enable the applicant to build further out.	Plans are to scale and development would need to be in accordance with plans
The first floor includes a balcony terrace with a glass balustrade. The terrace will overlook the ransom strip and adjacent tennis courts. The courts, which form part of the Club's junior coaching programme, will be overlooked by the terrace and this gives cause for concern under the Club's safeguarding policy. We are further concerned that the glass may reflect sunlight at certain times of the day, particularly early in the morning, which may affect play on courts.	See section 7 below
The application does not include reference to the existing trees which are in close proximity to the proposed extension. We are concerned that the proposed extension and related works could cause damage to the trees or require removal of the trees, meaning that the Club's courts would be further overlooked. If planning approval is granted, consideration must be given to the creation of a physical barrier to prevent the proposed extension from overlooking the Club.	Proposal beyond canopy spread of TPO'd oak tree at number 10 and any other boundary trees and shrubs are beyond application site and small domestic trees only see section 7 below
The depth of the single-story extension is shown as being close to the rear boundary. When taking the glazing and	Would be within 1.2m of eastern boundary; any future application for

doors into consideration, we are concerned that this will encroach on the use of the ransom strip. For example, if the Club were to need to provide screening to the courts as part of our safeguarding of young people and vulnerable adults, the applicant may object on the grounds of loss of light. The Club's courts are floodlit to facilitate evening play. We are concerned that the applicant could, in future, object to any changes or necessary improvements in flood lighting. We are also concerned that extending the property towards the Club could give rise to excessive noise which would interfere with play on adjacent courts. We note that the extent of the proposed extension means that there will be minimal garden space left for a property of this size and this would not be in keeping with adjacent properties. This may render the property undesirable for families given the limited garden space and this may need to be taken into consideration.	screening would have to be considered on its merits; note that tree planting adjacent would not need planning permission Any future application to adjust floodlights would be considered on its merits given circumstances at the time. see section 7 below Noted - see section 7 below on overdevelopment
I have no issues with the footprint moving closer to the boundary but I am opposed to windows and terraces looking into my garden	Noted - see section 7
- directly overlooking the tennis clubs court where children are instructed every day - no mention I could see regarding the trees / foliage that present a natural barrier - the size of the proposal and proximity to the court's presents a significant noise disruption to the courts - I have not had time to evaluate this yet, but there is a concern that the sheer size of this construction could affect the natural light onto courts nearest the proposed development. Based on the above points I object to this proposal	Noted - see section 7 Outside application site and not significant enough to justify AIA Noted - see section 7 Noted - see section 7

<u>On amended plans:</u> not clear or obvious in what ways the application had been amended by the applicant. The Club remains of the opinion that the proposed extension will impact significantly on the operation of the Club, as previously. We strongly oppose this planning application.	
---	--

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) Impact on setting of Listed Building
- (iii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iv) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (v) Amenity for future occupiers/overdevelopment
- (vi) Impact on trees
- (vii) Parking
- (viii) Drainage

(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) Impact on setting of Listed Building

7.3 Since the site lies adjacent a Listed Building then Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant and requires the LPA to have regard to the desirability of preserving the Listed Building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. As originally submitted the incongruous contemporary flat roofed boxy side addition within 1m of the boundary with the Listed Building was considered to be jarring and have a harmful impact on the setting of the Listed Building. However the revised design with traditional hipped end sits more comfortably on the boundary and is more respectful of the roof profile of the Listed Building. The 15m separation also helps to minimise any adverse impacts to the Listed Building, as well as the large TPO'd oak tree which helps soften the intervening area.

7.4 The Councils Conservation Officer has assessed the revised plans and raises no objection, noting the minimised bulk and hipped roof profile would not be harmful to the significance of the heritage asset. Material samples are requested.

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

7.5 Regard must be had to the extant permission and the main first floor side addition is only marginally higher than previously approved and of same length. This amended proposal now includes a further 2.6m wide first floor side addition with traditional hipped roof - this is further recessed back and down from the main side extension to help achieve further subserviency in design. Whilst the overall side extension is long, the fact that its set back from the front facade significantly helps to ensure it would not

appear overly dominant in street scene terms.

- 7.6 The main symmetry of the original cottages would be retained, and although the side extension would be considerably larger than number 14's, the 4m set back preserves the character of the main gable cottage. The ground floor garage and linking canopy porch would add a contemporary element to the visual appearance of the dwelling, together with use of slate tiles for the extension. Given the mixed nature of the area with examples of other contemporary materials directly opposite the site, then this would not be inappropriate or out of keeping with the wider area or result in any harm to the setting of the adjacent Listed Building.
- 7.7 Overall, the design and appearance of the proposal in street scene terms is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and wider area, and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iv) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 Number 10 to the south is a thatched Listed Building having its main garden space to its north between the house and shared boundary with the application site. There is a slightly raised sitting out area in the north east corner of the garden of number 10 with some hedging on the boundary providing some limited screening. As originally submitted the additional first floor side element was flat roofed and contemporary in design, having a height of 5m within 1m of the shared boundary, with single storey utility being 3m high within 0.5m of the boundary. This mass and bulk was considered to have a boxy, jarring and overbearing effect on the private amenity space of number 10 to the south.
- 7.9 Therefore amended plans have been submitted pulling the utility room away from the boundary by 0.91m and lowering marginally to 2.9m; and using a traditional hip roof to the first floor addition. The eaves line would match the remainder of the side extension at 4.5m and use of the hipped roof would result in a much softer impact to and outlook from number 10. There is no doubt that the side extensions will be still apparent from within number 10's garden space, having some impact on the use of the garden, but the orientation is such that no overshadowing would result and there are no side windows proposed (which can be conditioned). The proposed first floor rear terrace does not extend across the whole of the single storey flat roof and is set off the shared boundary by some 3.5m with 1.7m high obscure glazed screens to the south. The extensions would have a separation of some 15m from the actual dwelling and therefore limited impact on outlook from the house itself. Overall it is considered that any actual harm from overshadowing or overlooking/loss of privacy would be minimal to the occupiers of number 10.
- 7.10 With respect to any impacts to the east, the adjacent tennis club has courts close to the site, with intervening HBC owned strip of land and underused wedge of land. The proposed rear terrace would have 1.7m obscure glazed screen to both its north and south sides and 1.1m high glazing to the east. This would enclose the outdoor space but still enable views across to the east and over the courts. It is this that the club object to and request a barrier to prevent overlooking.
- 7.11 Regard must be had to the fact that the extant permission APP/22/00673 also approved a rear balcony with external spiral staircase accessing it, and this was conditioned with screening to the north and south only, similarly enabling views out to

the east. Whilst this was set further off the eastern boundary, it would have a similar impact to the tennis club. It is also noted that most of the properties in Woodpecker Close have first floor sitting out areas above their garages with no screening enabling similar direct views over the tennis courts. It is therefore considered unreasonable to resist this proposed first floor terrace without an easterly privacy screen, which would not result in any additional overlooking of the courts above that approved under APP/22/00673.

- 7.12 The tennis club also comment on noise from both the construction and use of the terrace having the potential to affect play; overshadowing of courts; a need for a barrier to prevent overlooking; and also reflection from the glazing. Any construction noise and disturbance would be short term and standard Informatives can be applied regarding hours of work etc. The terrace would be accessed off a bedroom and as such less likely to be used for regular dining, entertaining etc. The noise from use of a small terrace at an existing single family dwelling would be unlikely to result in disturbance sufficient to resist this application, but Environmental Health could investigate any future noise nuisance complaints. The first floor extension would be some 11m from the courts and being due west would only have very limited affect on shadow to the courts in the late evenings. And similarly any glare would be distanced from the courts and unlikely to adversely impact play sufficient to resist this application.
- 7.13 With respect to the impact on the attached cottage number 14, this property has a rear extension including a ground floor secondary window facing south, serving the living room. When approving APP/22/00673 care was taken to ensure no loss of light or privacy would result to this adjacent property. This revised proposal has a larger ground floor footprint but the depth of the first floor is the same with no windows facing north. The first floor terrace does however sit further east by virtue of being above the enlarged ground floor footprint, and includes a 1.7m high privacy screen to the north . Nevertheless the overall bulk and mass of the ground floor with terrace above respects the 45 degree line and the terrace is similarly sited as the previous external spiral stairs. Overall the difference in impact to number 14 would be minimal.
- 7.14 Overall it is considered that the proposal will 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).

(v) Amenity for future occupiers/overdevelopment

- 7.15 Third party comments note the minimal garden space for future occupiers as being out of keeping with other properties nearby. The site has a very short rear garden and the extensions would reduce this to just 4m to 5m in parts. However the width of the garden is about 14m and by virtue of the tennis club to the east the garden enjoys an open aspect and outlook - it is not hemmed in by development. Whilst of atypical proportions and layout, it is considered that the garden does provide useable amenity space for future occupiers, which would be further enhanced with the introduction of the first floor terrace as additional siting out options.
- 7.16 It is also noted that there are other properties nearby with minimal garden spaces, including 7 and 9 Woodpecker Close, and the attached cottage 14 Southleigh Road. Overall it is considered that sufficient amenity space would be available for future occupiers commensurate with the character of the area, such that the proposal would not be considered an overdevelopment of the site.

(vi) Impact on trees

- 7.17 The proposed extensions are sufficiently distanced from the TPO'd oak tree to the south to have no impact on it. Third party comments note potential damage to other trees providing screening but these are minor trees and bushes that are not TPO'd and on land outside the application site. The foundations of the proposed extensions are unlikely to affect them.

(vii) Parking

- 7.18 The proposed extension and internal reconfiguring would result in a 3 bed dwelling - two parking spaces can be accommodated on the front driveway which would meet the Parking SPD standards.

(viii) Drainage

- 7.19 There appears to be a foul sewer serving just the application site under the existing garage. Southern Water have noted that their approval is required to build over a public sewer and in order to protect their apparatus have requested a pre-commencement condition. The agent is aware of this issue and has agreed to such a condition.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the street scene and the neighbouring properties. It would preserve the setting of the adjacent listed building, have no adverse impact on adjacent trees and provide adequate car parking provision. With a condition to secure sewer protection measures, the proposal is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00804

(A) 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:

Site Location, Block, Proposed Plans, Sections & Elevations - Drawing Number 22136 - 02 - *on Council's website dated 29/01/2024*

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and a full specification of the render, timber cladding and roof tiles to be used externally on the hereby approved extension have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 Prior to the hereby approved first floor terrace being brought into use, the 1.7m high obscure glazed screens for the north and south sides, as shown on Drawing Number 22136-02 on the Councils website dated 29/01/204, shall be installed in the approved position with degree of obscuration no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and thereafter retained and maintained in that position in perpetuity.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring 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 development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the measures which will be undertaken to protect the public sewer crossing the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Southern Water). The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the adequate protection of infrastructure having due regard to Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 policies CS19 and DM10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order, no additional windows / doors or other openings shall be constructed within the south elevation without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.