

---

Site Address: 88 Ferndale, Waterloooville, PO7 7PG  
Proposal: Proposed single storey flat roof rear extension, single storey side extension with a pitched roof, proposed pitched roof over the existing garages, rear patio and a proposed detached annex. Additional external alterations to include replacement windows, proposed changes of external materials and changes to the balcony to the front elevation.  
Application Type: Full Planning Permission  
Application No: APP/24/00337                      Expiry Date: 27/06/2024  
Applicant: Mr Bramble  
Agent: Sarah Roberts                      Case Officer: Robert Riley  
            Critchley Architecture and  
            Design  
Ward: Waterloo

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

---

## **1 Site Description**

- 1.1 The application site features a two-storey detached dwellinghouse, located in Waterloooville. At present the dwellinghouse is a relatively modest corner property, featuring brickwork to form the external walls and brown concrete tiles in a pitched hip design to form the roof. To the front elevation are 2No garages, and a balcony. To the front of the property is a garden and a driveway fronting onto Ferndale Road. To the rear of the property, is a reasonably wide and deep garden.
- 1.2 The application site is located in an area that could be considered both urban and residential, with the character of Ferndale Road primarily featuring reasonably sized 1.5 and two storey brickwork dwellings in evidence.

## **2 Planning History**

- 2.1 No relevant planning history.

## **3 Proposal**

- 3.1 This application proposes 9 elements to the application site:
- Proposed single storey flat roof rear extension with 4No rooflights, with a proposed approximate width of 12.3 metres (13.3 metres including canopy roof overhang), a proposed depth of approximately 6.2 metres (6.6 metres including canopy roof overhang) and a proposed maximum height of approximately 3.12 metres (approximately 3.3 including rooflights).
  - Single storey side extension with a pitched roof, with a proposed approximate width of 4.3 metres, a proposed depth of approximately 6 metres, and a proposed maximum height of 4.1 metres.
  - Proposed pitched roof over the existing garages
  - Rear patio with a proposed approximate height of 0.4 metres.
  - Proposed detached annex, with a proposed maximum approximate depth of 10.5 metres, a proposed maximum approximate width of approximately 7 metres and a proposed maximum height of approximately 3 metres.

- Replacement windows,
- Proposed changes of external materials
- Changes to the balcony to the front elevation.
- Removal of conservatory

#### **Officer note**

3.2 The proposed rear extension has been reduced in depth and moderately increased in width and the side extension has been reduced in width during the application process.

Furthermore, the agents have amended the plans to propose the front elevation to feature both white render and silver birch cladding as opposed to only white render to the front elevation during the application process.

## **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

|      |                                                                         |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CS16 | (High Quality Design)                                                   |
| CS19 | (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)                                 |
| CS21 | (Developer Requirements)                                                |
| DM13 | (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)                      |
| DM8  | (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features) |

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

## **5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

### **Councillor Gwen Robinson**

No comments received

### **Councillor Mike Sceal**

No comments received

### **Councillor Peter Wade**

No comments received

### **Developer Services, Southern Water**

Initial consultation response

Protection of Public Apparatus

It appears that the developer is intending to build close-to a public foul sewer which is crossing the site. Building over a "public sewer" is not normally permitted by Southern Water. 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 close-to 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. The conditions and application associated with the build close-to a public sewer are available at Southern Water's Get Connected service: [developerservices.southernwater.co.uk](http://developerservices.southernwater.co.uk).

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.

#### Foul and Surface Water Drainage

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service: [developerservices.southernwater.co.uk](http://developerservices.southernwater.co.uk) and please read our New Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link:  
[southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements](http://southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements)

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

- Reuse
- Infiltration
- Watercourse
- Storm Sewer
- Combined Sewer

Guidance on Building Regulations is here:  
[gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-document-h](http://gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-document-h)  
For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).  
Website: [southernwater.co.uk](http://southernwater.co.uk) or by email at:  
[SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk](mailto:SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk)

*Following further information received regarding drainage, Southern Water was reconsulted, whereby they left the following comments:*

Please see the attached extract from Southern Water records showing the

approximate position of our existing sewer assets in the vicinity of the development site. The exact position of the public assets must be determined on site by the applicant in consultation with Southern Water before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

The 150 mm diameter gravity sewer requires a clearance of 3 metres on either side of the gravity sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future maintenance access.

No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water. All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works. Please refer to:

<https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/st5orjvm/stand-off-distances.pdf>

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

: See Section 7(viii) below - the requested pre-commencement condition as part of the original consultation was not agreed with the applicant and the applicant's agent. However, in light of further information and a further reconsultation with Southern Water, whereby no objection was made, and no pre-commencement conditions were requested, officers are satisfied that in combination with the necessary dialogue with Southern Water, that this proposal would have an acceptable impact on the sewer network.

### **Ecologist**

All fine. Relatively modern structure with new interlocking pantiles. Works restricted to ground floor.

### **Hampshire Highways**

The side extension and matters to the dwelling alterations wouldn't be something for us to consider. There doesn't appear to be any plans which actually show the boundary feature and height of the fence line and implications this would have. My main question would be how increasing the height of the fence would impact the visibility for the vehicle access to the dwelling and would request pedestrian intervisibility splays and vehicular visibility splays in accordance with HCC TG3 to ensure this remains unobstructed.

In the absence of this information it would be difficult to say whether this would be something we would support or object to. But as you say, if they are reducing this back down to the height of the original fence and no alterations are made then we wouldn't have any comments to make.

I do however note that from looking at google maps at last April 2023 there doesn't appear to be a fence at all at this property - has a fence already been permitted through a previous planning application (not that I can find anything on the planning portal or in our records for this site) or would this have fallen under PD? If not would they need to apply for retrospective permission for the 1.8m fence line? If so comments on visibility splays above would be necessary.

**Officer comment:** *Upon further inspection of the fence it does not appear that further action is needed with regard to the fence adjacent to The Glade.*

## 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: 9

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

| Comment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Officer Comment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Objections - 4 received<br><br>2 third party consultees objected to both the original superseded plans and the amended plans.<br><br>Summary of comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Concerns over the scale and use of the annex.</li><li>"Applicants intend to tarmac the front garden"</li><li>Comments about removed trees.</li><li>Potential to be used to be rented out e.g. AirBnb</li><li>Overdevelopment</li><li>Proposed height increase of fence adjacent to The Glade in superseded plans</li></ul> | <p>Scale of annex is assessed in section 7. (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area</p> <p>The use of the annex will be conditioned if permission is forthcoming and the use has been confirmed to be for a family member.</p> <p>This has been confirmed in an email to not be a part of this application and to be done under permitted development rights or a separate planning application if undertaken.</p> <p>This is able to be done under permitted development rights.</p> <p>The annex will be conditioned if permission is forthcoming.</p> <p>Scale of the works is assessed in section 7 (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area</p> <p>This aspect of the works has subsequently been removed.</p> |

|                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maintained redbrick character of Ferndale Road</li> </ul>                                            | <p>The proposed materials have been amended to feature silver birch cladding at the ground floor level to the front elevation as opposed to only white render. This proposed palette of materials is not considered to be unduly prominent upon the Ferndale streetscene.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terracing impact</li> </ul>                                                                              | <p>This is assessed in section 7 (ii)<br/>Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area</p>                                                                                                                                                               |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excessive scale of works</li> </ul>                                                                      | <p>This is assessed in section 7 (ii)<br/>Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area</p>                                                                                                                                                               |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overshadowing from the pitched roof over 2No garages aspect of the works</li> </ul>                      | <p>This is assessed in section 7 under (iii)<br/>Effect on neighbouring properties.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic problems</li> </ul>                                                                              | <p>Hampshire highways was consulted during the application process, and presented no concerns to the work.</p>                                                                                                                                                                |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and construction disturbance</li> </ul>                                                            | <p>This is not a planning consideration.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of on site parking</li> </ul>                                                                       | <p>The applicants can fit 4 cars on their driveway which would conform to the requirements of the Havant Parking SPD.</p>                                                                                                                                                     |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the garages now being proposed to be semi converted. Lack of subsequent parking space.</li> </ul> | <p>See point above.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

## 7 **Planning Considerations**

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Use of the annex
- (v) CIL

- (vi) Parking
- (vii) Highways
- (viii) Ecology
- (viii) Southern Water

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

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

*Character, Bulk and the streetscene*

7.3 The proposed works would feature 9 elements, being; a proposed single-storey flat roof rear extension, a single-storey side extension with a pitched roof, a proposed pitched roof over the existing garages, a rear patio, a proposed detached annex, replacement windows, proposed changes of external materials, changes to the balcony to the front elevation and the removal of the existing conservatory. These changes would be readily visible upon the streetscene and would provide substantial visual changes to the existing dwelling.

7.4 The alteration of the front balcony would be a minor visual change, and is seen to be in keeping with the dwelling and visual amenities of the area. The replacement window aspect of the works are also considered to be in keeping with the dwelling and visual amenities. The rear patio aspect of the works would not be visible upon the streetscene and though would be of a significant scale of the rear garden is considered acceptable with regards to the dwelling. Moreover, the proposal to remove the existing conservatory is considered acceptable.

7.5 The proposal to put a pitched roof over 2No Garages would provide a hipped roof to the side of the existing dwelling, it would replace the flat roof for the 2No garages and would provide symmetry in combination with the proposed side extension and is considered to be a visual improvement over the existing flat roof design of these garages reflecting the pitched roof design of the main dwelling. With regards to this, the proposed pitched roof over the 2No garages is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the dwelling and visual amenities of the area.

7.6 This application also proposes a side extension with a pitched roof. The proposed side extension has in amended plans been reduced in width by approximately 0.7 metres from approximately 5 metres to approximately 4.3 metres. In combination with the proposed pitched roofs over the 2No garages it is considered to provide a symmetrical appearance to the dwelling and furthermore, the main dwelling with regards to its pitched roof design. With regards to the bulk that the side extension would provide, in consideration of the increased set back from the highway in amended plans and the proposed single storey nature and limited eaves height of the proposal it is considered it would appear recessive in the Ferndale Road and The Glade streetscene and can be seen to be an acceptable addition to the dwelling.

7.7 The works also propose a single-storey flat roof rear extension. The proposed flat roof rear extension in amended plans has been amended in depth from approximately 8 metres to approximately 6.2 metres, although it is noted that the amendments have increased the width of the rear extension for approximately 2/3rds of the rear of the rear extension. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states that rear extensions

should be *"sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building"*.

- 7.8 In the superseded plans, it was considered that the proposed rear extension would have been of such a significant scale; adding a significant deep addition to the dwelling, with a proposed depth of approximately 8 metres and a proposed width of approximately 10 metres which would exceed the depth of the original main dwelling, that it could not be seen to be a sympathetic addition, or subservient. Furthermore, the rear works would be visible from the streetscene of The Glade. With regard to the reduction of depth upon the dwelling, though it is noted that this rear extension would still be of a very significant scale upon the dwelling, with consideration of the reduced depth, and the two-storey nature of the existing dwelling, the proposed rear extension can be seen to be on balance subservient in nature to the dwelling. Furthermore, it is noted that the rear extension would feature a modest height of approximately 3.1 metres further increasing its subserviency to the main dwelling.
- 7.9 The works also propose a proposed detached annex. It would not be visible from Ferndale Road, however it would be visible from The Glade. With regards to the proposed scale of the annex, it is proposed to feature an approximate 55 square metre footprint and would be of a flat roof single-storey nature and feature an approximate 3 metre maximum height. The proposed annex would only feature fenestration at its northwestern and southwestern elevations and would have 3 No rooflights on the annex's roof. Regarding the proposed scale of the annex, in consideration of the single-storey nature of the annex and its proposed modest height of approximately 3 metres, it is considered by officers on balance to be able to be seen as subservient to the proposed main dwelling and not unduly prominent upon the site's curtilage. With regards to its proposed location in the rear of the garden it is not considered to create a contrived appearance with regards to the main dwelling as despite that it would feature a limited separation distance from the proposed rear extension of the main dwelling, the bulk of the annex is to the side of the rear extension, and it is not considered that the annex would be read together with the main dwelling .
- 7.10 With regards to the scale of the works that are proposed for No.88 Ferndale, it has been considered important to assess the potential of overdevelopment of the site. Though it is noted that these works would intensify the development of the application site, in consideration of the large rear amenity space at present, it is not considered that the remaining garden space would be limited enough to warrant a refusal.
- 7.11 The proposal has also been assessed for the potential of a terracing impact. With regards to this, the side extension at its proposed location is not considered to increase a terracing impact. It has been considered important to assess the potential for terracing from the works to pitch the 2 No garages. Though it is noted that it would add more bulk and that there is a very limited separation distance between the garages and the common boundary treatment, as the proposal would feature a hip pitched design, it is not considered by officers to create a further unacceptable impact of terracing between Nos 88 and 86 Ferndale.

### *Materials*

- 7.12 The works originally proposed for the external walls to feature white render, and slatted composite cladding for the rear extension. The white render aspect, to be used throughout the front elevation was considered to be overly striking upon the streetscene of Ferndale Road and in particular to the immediate streetscene which features primarily brickwork in evidence, though it is noted there are some rendered

properties such as No.62 Ferndale. In response to this, the plans were amended to feature silver birch composite cladding at the ground floor level of the front elevation, which is considered to be less striking than white render throughout and in consideration of this is seen to be an acceptable palette upon the streetscene. Regarding the roof materials, these would feature concrete tiles with anthracite fascia and soffit boards with EDPM proposed to flat roof areas. These roof materials are considered to be acceptable.

- 7.13 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed on balance appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy 2011). It is considered that the scheme on balance would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.14 To the southern, northern and eastern sides of the application site are properties at Nos 86 and 90 Ferndale and No.17 The Glade. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these properties. Due to sufficient separation distances and the nature of the works, properties to the front of the dwelling are considered to be acceptably impacted by the proposed work. Furthermore, the proposed changes of external materials, changes to the balcony to the front elevation and removal of conservatory aspect of the works are considered to be acceptable with regards to neighbourly impacts. The replacement window aspect of the works is also considered acceptable.

*No.86 Ferndale*

- 7.15 To the southern side of the application site is No.86 Ferndale. The side extension would not impact this dwelling, due to its proposed scale and shielding from the existing dwelling, and its impacts are considered acceptable upon No.86 Ferndale. The rear extension would feature an approximate 2.7 metres separation distance away from No.86's curtilage, due to its proposed approximate 3.1 metre height at this distance it is not considered to unacceptably increase overshadowing, furthermore, though it is of a large scale upon the rear of No.88 Ferndale, at the proposed separation distance and in consideration of the boundary treatment, this rear extension is not considered to unacceptably lead to a sense of overbearing. Regarding overlooking concerns it would feature fenestration (a door and a window) on the south-eastern elevation, however, if permission is forthcoming, these will be conditioned to feature obscure glass which has been agreed by the agent, and are considered to have an acceptable impact on No.86 Ferndale Road. The proposed pitched roof over 2No garages may increase overshadowing of No.86's curtilage, however, as these garages would feature a hip pitched design for the roof, this design is not considered to increase overshadowing unacceptably, furthermore, regarding the increase in scale of the garages it is not considered that the pitched roof addition would unacceptably increase a sense of overbearing. The detached annex aspect of the works would not feature any fenestration facing No.86 Ferndale, and is considered acceptable with regards to overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, though it is noted that this annex would feature a relatively large footprint and would feature between a 80cm to 1 metre separation distance from No.86's curtilage in consideration of the modest flat roof height of approximately 3 metres and shared boundary treatment fencing which features a 2 metre height between Nos 88 and 86 which was confirmed in an email on 28/8/24 officers do not consider that this annex would be unacceptable. Regarding the rear patio addition

though it is proposed to be approximately 40cm which would be over the permitted development allowance of 30cm, with regards to the shared boundary treatment for Nos 88 and 86 confirmed to be approximately 2 metres tall in an email on 28/8/24, the majority of the patio featuring at least a 3 metre separation distance, and patio near the southeastern elevation of the dwelling, more akin to a walkway, on balance officers have not considered that this rear patio would have an unacceptable impact upon No.86 Ferndale.

#### *No.90 Ferndale*

- 7.16 To the northern side of the application site, is No.90 Ferndale. The single-storey flat roof rear extension, single-storey side extension with a pitched roof and proposed pitched roof over 2No garages aspects of the works would be at distances whereby overshadowing and overbearing impacts would be acceptable. The rear extension and side extension would feature windows and doors facing No.90 Ferndale, however, on the side extension this would be a high level window facing No.90, which is considered acceptable. The rear extension would feature 2 doors with high level windows above facing No.90, however this would face boundary treatment and any views provided would be of No.90's front elevation, which is visible from the public realm, in light of this, the extensions to the dwelling are considered acceptable. The annex would be at a distance whereby overshadowing and overbearing impacts would be acceptable. Regarding overlooking concerns, the annex would feature fenestration however this would face No.88's rear garden or face boundary treatment by the highway and otherwise only provide views, that are visible from the public realm. In light of this, the annex is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.90 Ferndale. The rear patio is considered acceptable as though it may permit views of No.90's front elevation, these views would be visible from the public realm and it is not considered to unacceptably increase overlooking.

#### *No.17 The Glade*

- 7.17 To the eastern side of the application site, is No.17 The Glade. The proposed single-storey flat roof rear extension, single-storey side extension with a pitched roof and proposed pitched roof over the existing garages aspects of the works would be at sufficient separation distances from 17 The Glade to prevent unacceptable impacts regarding overshadowing and the sense of overbearing. There would be fenestration to the rear of these extensions but this fenestration would face No.88 Ferndale's rear garden or boundary treatment at the rear of the garden and regarding these concerns is considered acceptable. The rear patio would be acceptable regarding overbearing and overshadowing concerns, however it has been considered important to assess the impact of overlooking with regard to No.17 The Glade. The rear patio would be approximately 40cm tall, which is above the permitted development allowance of 30cm. However there is fencing that is approximately 1.8 metres tall which would provide a level of shielding, furthermore, the annex would shield views of No.17's side elevation and would prevent views from the patio of No.17's private rear amenity space. In light of this, as the only views provided would be of No.17's front amenity space which is visible from the public realm, officers do not consider that the patio would have an unacceptable impact upon No.17.
- 7.18 Regarding the impact of the proposed detached annex upon No.17 The Glade, it is noted that the fenestration of this annex would face No.88 Ferndale's garden and no fenestration would face No.17 The Glade, in light of this, this annex is considered acceptable in regards to overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, this annex is noted to be proposed to be in close proximity to

No.17's curtilage. Furthermore, there are windows on the side elevation of 17 The Glade, however these appear to be obscure and would be acceptably impacted. In light of this, officers do note however there is the common boundary fence, which is approximately 1.8 metres tall between Nos 17 The Glade and 88 Ferndale, furthermore, officers do note the annex would have a modest height of approximately 3 metres. In light of this, officers are of the opinion that this annex would have a limited and acceptable impact with regard to overshadowing, and though would increase a sense of overbearing, this increase would be limited with regard to the modest height of the annex.

- 7.19 Consequently, it is considered on balance that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy 2011).

(iv) Use of the annex

- 7.20 The use of the proposed annex would be to provide accommodation for family use for the occupants of the main dwelling. The planning agent confirmed the family link between the occupants of the main house and the proposed annex being proposed to be used for the sole use of the mother / mother-in-law of the owners and their family relatives, which would allow support and a degree of independence for the occupants of the annex. On this basis the proposal would be considered ancillary to the main use of the site.
- 7.21 With regards to the proposed room uses of the annex. The annex was measured to feature an approximate 55 square metre chargeable area. Within the 55sqm useable space of the annex, there would be a living room, a bedroom, a shower room an entrance and a kitchenette. The annex would therefore still rely on the host building as there would be no laundry, no boundary demarcation and furthermore, that utilities would be shared with the main house. Therefore, it is considered that the use would be ancillary to the main house.
- 7.22 Furthermore, the annex would be able to be accessed via, and located within the shared garden of the main dwellinghouse and thus is deemed to have a physical close functional link to the house. A condition regarding the use of the annex to remain ancillary to the main dwellinghouse has been recommended if permission is forthcoming.

(v) CIL

- 7.23 The works are CIL liable but the applicant has submitted an application for self build annex relief. The works would have CIL liability of £7483.93. The Draft Liability Notice has been sent to the agent.

(vi) Parking

- 7.24 No.88 Ferndale would increase in occupancy from a 3 to a 5 bedroom dwelling. This would increase the requirement from 2 to 3 parking spaces in accordance with the Havant Parking SPD which is able to be provided on the applicants driveway which measures approximately 5.2 metres in width with an approximate 10 metre depth which would be able to provide parking for 4 cars and is considered to meet the requirements of the SPD on site. Therefore, it is considered that the works would not

have an adverse impact upon parking in the locality and this proposal is considered to accord with the Havant Parking SPD and Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011)

(vii) Highways

- 7.25 In light of potential works that may impact the Highway, Hampshire Highways was consulted. In light of the proposed height increase of the fence aspect of the works being removed from this application, Hampshire Highways commented " *if they are reducing this back down to the height of the original fence and no alterations are made then we wouldn't have any comments to make*". In light of this this application is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact upon the highway.

(viii) Ecology

- 7.26 The ecologist was consulted during the application process. The ecologist stated "*All fine. Relatively modern structure with new interlocking pantiles. Works restricted to ground floor*". With regards to this and the scale and nature of the works, this proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

(viii) Southern Water

- 7.27 Due to close proximity to a sewer line, Southern Water was consulted during the application process. They initially stated " *It appears that the developer is intending to build close-to a public foul sewer which is crossing the site. Building over a "public sewer" is not normally permitted by Southern Water. 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 close-to the sewer*".

- 7.28 They also stated "*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*".

- 7.29 In light of this, communication between the agents and the officer was undertaken. The applicant and agent did not agree to the pre-commencement condition originally requested by Southern Water, however, further information was received regarding the location of the drain and an amendment to the siting of the extension nearest to it. In light of this, Southern Water was reconsulted during the application process whereby they left the following comments

*"Please see the attached extract from Southern Water records showing the approximate position of our existing sewer assets in the vicinity of the development site. The exact position of the public assets must be determined on site by the applicant in consultation with Southern Water before the layout of the proposed development is finalised. The 150 mm diameter gravity sewer requires a clearance of 3 metres on either side of the gravity sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future maintenance access. No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water. All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works"*.

- 7.30 In light of this with Southern Water not providing an objection or requesting a pre-commencement condition, officers are now of the opinion that this proposal would have an acceptable impact upon the sewage network and this is considered acceptable.

## **8 Conclusion**

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

---

## **9 RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00337 subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

**Reason:** To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing Number: 24021 201 : EXISTING FLOOR PLANS: Uploaded 2/5/24

Drawing Number: 24021 301: EXISTING SOUTH WEST AND SOUTH EAST ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 2/5/24

Drawing Number: 24021 302: EXISTING NORTH WEST AND NORTH EAST ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 2/5/24

Drawing Number: 24021 402 D: AMENDED FIRST FLOOR PLAN: Uploaded 17/7/24

Drawing Number: 24021 405 B: AMENDED PROPOSED ANNEX PLANS: Uploaded 17/7/24

Drawing Number: 24021 401 i: AMENDED PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN: Uploaded 17/7/24

Drawing Number: 24021 501 H: AMENDED PROPOSED SOUTHEASTERN AND SOUTHWESTERN ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 17/7/24

Drawing Number: 24021 101 B: LOCATION PLAN AND AMENDED PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 17/7/24

Drawing Number: 24021 502 H: PROPOSED AMENDED NORTHWESTERN AND NORTHEASTERN ELEVATIONS: Uploaded 17/7/24

**Reason:** - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, prior to being brought into use the window and door serving the kitchen area of the rear extension in the southeastern elevation on the plans hereby approved shall be fitted with textured glass,

which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent), and shall be retained as such thereafter.

**Reason:** In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework

- 4 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

**Reason:** In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 The annex accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes ancillary to the occupation and enjoyment of the existing dwelling and shall not be used as a separate unit of accommodation.

**Reason:** The unit of accommodation is not in a satisfactory position and has insufficient on-site parking to be occupied separately from the main dwelling and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.