

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Recommendation – No objection, subject to conditions securing –

- implementation with the specified external facing and roofing materials; and,
- Removal of shipping container once work is complete.

I visited the site on 6.8.2020, viewing the site from the back garden and the street. Having regard to the policy framework* below make the following comments.

This site is within the AONB and visible from open land to the north where a (bundled/raised) public footpath runs along the shore line to the Harbour

It was noted that the other half of this pair of semi-detached properties had extended to the rear, but whose rear boundary line was vegetated. The applicant has a very open boundary to the rear, but is so distant from the Harbour that this lengthy extension at ground floor would not really be visible.

Although new glazing is being introduced at first floor level facing the Harbour and the extension both here and at ground floor would be wider than the original dwelling, this additional massing is not considered problematic within the wider landscape, being as its height is sub-ordinate to the main roof. Glazing has been broken up using glazing bars to mitigate its impact and it is assumed that a Juliet balcony will be formed at that level.

It was noted that a shipping container had been placed in the front garden to store building materials in anticipation of securing planning permission. Could the council please condition that it be removed at the end of building work, as it is very conspicuous and detrimental to the AONB landscape.

Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East

No comment

Councillor M Wilson - Hayling West Ward

No comment

Councillor R Raines - Hayling East

No comment

County Ecologist

Original comments:

I am concerned that the development may affect bats, which are protected under UK law via the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and under EU law by the Habitats Directive, which is transposed into UK law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) (commonly referred to as the Habitats Regulations). It is my advice that permission should not be granted until sufficient information is provided to either confirm that bats are not present, or, if present, that sufficient measures are in place to ensure that impacts will be mitigated / compensated

for as appropriate.

I would however highlight that the presence of bats (or indeed any protected species) is not a block to development. The legislation is designed to enable development to proceed, provided that the impacts to the affected species have been properly addressed.

Circular 06/2005

Circular 06/2005 identifies that the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat, and therefore that it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted. The Circular however also identifies that applicants should not be required to provide information on protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood that they will be present and affected by the proposed development.

The Bat Conservation Trust has produced a 'trigger list' of sites for where a survey is likely to be required, based on building age, type, construction, location and project proposals, to help planning authorities in assessing 'reasonable likelihood' under the Circular; this list has informed the Council's Biodiversity Checklist, which has been produced to help applicants understand if there is likely to be a need to undertake bat (or other ecology) survey work. This identifies that applications that require the modification or conversion of pre-1960 buildings within 200m of woodland / water, or of pre-1914 buildings with gable ends or slate roofs, regardless of location, should be supported by a bat survey.

The application site is a semi-detached house with a hipped roof, with slate roof tiles and clay hip tiles. Examination of old maps suggests it is pre-1960, although may date from 1960-62. As noted in the Bat Conservation Trust's good practice guidelines for bat surveys, pre-1990 buildings, especially close to good foraging habitat, and with favoured features also have a high likelihood of providing roosts. The site is in a rural and coastal area, approximately 100m south east from North Common and Saltmarsh SINC..

If bats are present then works to tie in the rear extension to the existing house may result in the destruction of any roosts present at that location (for example if they are roosting behind any tiles to the rear of the house), possible damage / modification to any roosts present elsewhere, and possible killing, injury or disturbance of any bats present.

It is therefore considered that there is a reasonable likelihood that bats would be present and affected by the development and it is therefore necessary to request the applicant to provide further information on this issue.

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)

Local Planning Authorities are required to engage with the Regulations – planning permission should be granted (other concerns notwithstanding) unless the development is likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive and, if a breach is considered likely, that the development is unlikely to be granted an EPS licence from Natural England to allow the development to proceed under a derogation from the law. For the reasons given above, it is considered that the development is likely to result in a breach of the law protecting bats.

To allow the planning authority to properly engage with the Regulations, I would advise that you request the applicant to provide further information. I would suggest that the applicant contacts a suitably experienced ecologist to conduct a bat survey to an appropriate level. The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) web directory <http://www.cieem.net/members-directory> may assist in finding a local ecologist, while an on-line search will identify several local consultants. The

applicant would be advised to obtain a number of quotes, and more local organisations may prove to be more cost effective and be more familiar with the ecology of the local area. This survey is likely to comprise an initial visual survey and is likely to also require a number of visits at dusk / dawn during the summer months. All survey work should be carried out to recognised standards, as set out in the Bat Conservation Trust's good practice survey guidelines (3rd edition, 2016), unless otherwise fully justified by the ecological consultant. The survey report should include results of the inspections of the internals and externals of the affected building, including identification of any areas not accessed.

The report should also include an assessment of the impacts the development will have on bats and if required, details of mitigation measures to be followed to show that the favourable conservation status of identified species would be maintained.

If bats are present, I would also urge the applicant to be sure that their architects / contractors are aware of the need to use traditional materials for roofing membrane in this development – modern breathable membranes can be extremely harmful to bats, causing them to become entangled and die, while the bats make the membrane ineffective as they damage it. Traditional bitumen membrane should be used instead. Natural England are likely to refuse bat licence applications where modern breathable membranes are proposed. See <http://www.batsandbrms.co.uk/> for more information on the current research into this.

Once this information has been obtained, the planning authority will be in a position to consider, if bats are affected, the likelihood of the development being granted a licence.

Unfortunately it is not appropriate to defer bat surveys as a condition of a planning permission – Circular 06/2005 identifies that information on protected species must be available before a decision is made, and this is supported by Natural England's standing advice on protected species. Planning authorities are required to engage with the Habitats Regulations and without the right level of information (survey, impact assessment and appropriate, proportional avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures), this engagement is not possible.

Comments made following submission of the bat report :

The building was considered to have negligible suitability to support roosting bats. As such I would raise no concerns over this proposal.

The ecologist has made recommendations for enhancements, and I would agree with the recommendation for the installation of a bat brick as described in Section 4.2 Table 8.

Natural England Government Team

NO OBJECTION

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts and has no objection.

Other Advice

Natural England advises that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be submitted to and approved in writing by the district ecologist/biodiversity officer that identifies the steps and procedures that will be implemented to avoid or mitigate constructional impacts on species and habitats. The CEMP should address storage of construction materials/chemicals and equipment, dust suppression, waste disposal and noise/vibrational impacts.

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: 2

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Officer comment : Representations have been received from two properties and the North East Hayling Residents Association in relation to this proposal. Two of these relate to the proposal following amendments - please see 'Officer Comment' section for more detail.

Comment	Officer Comment
The total new area being built onto the house is a huge proportion of the existing building, we understood there was a new/old ratio that had to be respected? The existing farm style cottage will be destroyed and the development is out of keeping with the other properties in the road, most of which have been extended in a far more sympathetic manner. It would result in a severe impact on the amount of light reaching our own property and will severely affect our privacy, especially when in our rear garden. More specifically : Front (south elevation) The simple roof line is crude and dated, and will take light from our property, a hipped roof would be more aesthetically pleasing from the road and would allow more light to pass. Car shelter The side porch appears to come right up to our border. Our understanding is that any side extension cannot come	These comments have been made prior to amendments. Amendments have been received which have reduced the scale. Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

any closer than 1m to our mutual boundary .. we assume this applies both to the guttering and support posts as well as the roof itself. It is proposed to have a heavily built , fully pitched and tiled roof and besides being overly large and steeply pitched, will dominate our house and have a serious effect on the amount of light reaching our existing side windows and particularly those of our kitchen. North (rear) elevation- first floor The huge window will remove any privacy we have in our own garden we were under the impression that both full height windows and juliet balcony were not permitted. The precedent for this is at no 30, where exactly the same design of window and balcony was recently refused , and removed from the application. North elevation- ground floor rear elevation The proposed flat roofed ground floor extension of a full eight metres in addition to the 2 storey rear extension is a serious concern, even if it respects the 1 metre rule. The side windows in the otherwise blank wall must be non opening. As mentioned above the proposed end wall of the single floor extension (the kitchen) will reach well down the existing garden , and with the proposed full width windows/doors our enjoyment of our own garden will be severely compromised due to noise and cooking smells. Working practices We understand that much of the building will be on a self build basis and therefore is likely to take longer and be more disruptive than usual. Could we ask that a condition is inserted that no	This has been removed from the plans. The window size has been reduced. Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report. This has since been reduced . Side window has been removed. Please see above. An informative has been attached relating to working hours.
---	---

work is to take place at weekends , so as to allow us and our neighbours respite from the noise etc.	
We wish to object to the size of the proposed extensions and especially the single story rear extension element of the proposal. It will be appreciated that we have recently extended our property and in so doing, we deliberately sought to minimise the impact upon our neighbours' properties. We wish to make it clear that we do not object to the principle of our neighbours' extending their property. However we consider that at seemingly circa 10m, the ground floor area is excessive. In preparing our extensions we were guided by the Havant Borough Council's Design Guide SPD, in particular its advice on residential extensions. It appears that our neighbours' proposals have not followed this advice and have ignored the requirements set out in paragraph 5.35, that extensions should not be bigger than the main building and should appear smaller in mass. The overall floor space being created by the various extensions will more than double the size of the existing property. This point is reiterated in paragraph 5.39 which requires that single storey extensions should also be modest in scale compared to the main building. The advice states that generally flat roofs are not acceptable for such extensions. We note that Permitted Development allows for up to a 6m extension from the original wall. At over 8m it exceeds even the permitted development for a detached property. We also believe that the extent of rear glazing at first floor level is excessive. It will lead to a greater sense of overlooking and a loss of privacy, as opposed to a traditional window design with a greater proportion of wall to window. Our main objection, however, is to the	This comment has been made prior to amendments . Amendments have been received. Please see above.

impact of our neighbours' proposals on the rear of our property. It will have a significantly adverse impact on the rear of our home, the large extent of the flank wall extending well into the rear garden, its effect upon our property would therefore be particularly oppressive. It will result in significant overshadowing especially in the mornings. The proposal potentially breaches the 45° line as set out in Para 5.43 and 5.44 by a significant extent.

Please see above and 'Planning Considerations' section of this report.

It is noted that there is to be a high-level window set into the flank wall along the common boundary. It is unclear if this is to be an opening window but if it is, then we would expect the opening window not to be over our property. We would prefer any such window to be non-opening and of obscured glazing.

This has been removed.

We have also requested from our neighbours that, as most of the work will be undertaken by the applicants themselves over the spring and summer months, due courtesy be afforded to their neighbours by agreeing not to undertake noisy works over the weekend and early evenings when we would wish to make full use of our gardens.

An informative shall be added relating to working hours .

We are grateful that the applicants have recognised that an appropriate maintenance gap is required between the planned ground and first floor walls adjacent to our property.

To summarise our concerns, whilst we have no objection to the property being extended, we consider that the size of the various extensions being proposed will be an overdevelopment, out of proportion with the original house and which will seriously adversely impact on the light and outlook from our property. We hope that the current proposals will either be withdrawn or amended. In closing we reiterate that we would be content with a much smaller scheme which did not adversely impact on our amenities.

We presented the above comments to the applicants prior to this submission, our intention being to seek an acceptable compromise. However, it was apparent that they were not prepared to discuss our concerns and took no recognition of the points we have raised. (Redacted text). Further comments made following amendments: We wish to make observations to the revised plans for this application. We recognise that the window size on the first floor north elevation has now been reduced in size, as has the ground floor extension to the rear (north). We remain concerned about the size of the ground floor south extension, as highlighted by NEHRA in their original objection, and which still appears to be larger in size than other similar front extensions on Northney Road. This therefore could potentially be inappropriate, contributing to an overdevelopment of the property. Our main concern is that the drawings are not to scale and "for planning purposes only." We would therefore expect that concise dimensions be provided to allow all parties to make a more informed comment on the plans. Until precise measurements are provided, we are minded to maintain our objection to this development. Comments made following amendments: Having since received confirmation of the scaling in the plans from the Planning Department, we no longer oppose this application but would expect that consideration to neighbours amenities be respected.	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report. NB - Revised comments received from this correspondent Drawings have been amended to remove 'for planning purposes only' labelling. Drawings are confirmed to be to scale as shown on the plans. Noted.
NORTH EAST HAYLING RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION The committee of NEHRA has considered the above application, and	

would like the following points to be taken into consideration when the case is considered by the Planning Department; 1) In our opinion the overall development proposed is excessive, when compared to the size of the existing property, and is large compared to similar extensions in the same road. 2) The proposed front extension is part of the overdevelopment, and not in keeping with the other frontages in the road. 3) We believe that the Juliette balcony on the rear (north facing) first floor is inappropriate, and out of keeping with neighbouring properties. The windows on the north elevation first floor consist of 6 full height panels, the centre pair of which are opening. In the interests of safety, we consider the opening pair should have limited opening, and that two full height panels each size is excessive, and compromises the privacy of neighbouring properties. A single panel either side would seem more in keeping. Full length windows without a Juliette balcony could present a safety hazard, without limited opening. With the full length opening doors and the flat roof outside, there does seem to be a possibility of creating an unapproved balcony above the flat roofed extension, which would create further interferences with neighbour's privacy. 4) The single story extension again seems large given the overall size of the property and plot. We presume that the kitchen will be located in this area, so extraction methods will be required, without detriment to the rear areas of the neighbouring houses. Similarly, we believe the windows in the extension which are close to neighbouring properties should be non-opening. Both mechanical and natural ventilation would seem to be required through the roof lights. 5) We note that in section 5 of the planning application, no mention is made of the side extension/car port, nor is it drawn in on all the elevations.	Amendments have been made to the plans Windows have been reduced A condition shall be added relating to use of the flat roof. Relates to plans prior to amendments The car port has since been removed from the plans.
--	---

However, this does appear on the actual plans. This new construction is very close to the neighbouring property, presumably to provide sufficient width to allow a car to be parked under it. The roof is a considerable pitched roof affair, which is not in keeping with other car ports in the road. We conclude that this roof will have a considerable weight requiring the three supporting columns.

6) It is also concerning that the main access to the property is through this car port, and if a large car is parked in the shelter, access to and exit from the house will be considerably compromised.

7) On the eastern elevation facing out on to the car port a double width, full height window has been added, where the old front door was, as has another single full height window to the north. We can appreciate the need for these windows to get light into the centre of the house, but are of the opinion that they will need to be frosted to protect the neighbour's privacy.

Further comments made following amendments :

NORTH EAST HAYLING RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

The committee of NEHRA has considered the amendments to the above application, and would like these further points to be taken into consideration when the case is considered by the Planning Department;

1) We recognise that some of our earlier points have been taken into consideration in the new documents filed.

2) The minor amendments to the size still leave us concerned about the size of the proposed changes to the property.

3) The submitted plan is not dimensioned and we would like to seek confirmation what the actual build dimensions, including height will be, which seems a reasonable request.

4) The drawing notes on the new

Please see ' Planning Considerations' section of the report.

Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

The plans are to scale - labelling has now been changed .

documents state "Do not scale from this drawing. Drawing for planning purposes only all dimensions to be checked on site prior to the commencement of any work." Without any dimensions on the drawing we think this note is meaningless. 5) We would suggest a site visit is carried out to fully comprehend the effects of these changes on neighbouring properties.	A site visit has been undertaken by the allocated case officer.
---	---

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 and the AONB
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Ecology
- (v) Parking
- (vi) CIL

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is not within the defined urban area, therefore development will only be permitted if it is consistent with the policies for the countryside set out in national policy as specified in Policy CS17. Whilst the principle of new dwellings is not supported in non-urban locations, in this case the application proposes the extension of an existing building for purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the host dwelling, and no objection is raised to this as a matter of principle as it accords with Policy AL2 of the Allocations Plan.

The initial proposal made with this application included a larger extension to the rear and car port to the side. The rear extension was judged to be too large within the context of the property and the plot, and harmful to the amenity of neighbouring properties. This has since been reduced in size. The car port was considered by the case officer to result in an overdeveloped appearance to the front elevation, coming right up alongside the side boundary and this has since been removed from the scheme, with the addition of an extra two storey element set forward to the side. The rear, first floor windows have also been reduced in size so as to appear more in keeping with the surrounding properties.

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

7.3 This proposal comprises a two storey side and rear extension as well as single storey extensions to the front and rear. The two storey side extension would have a total depth of approximately 5.7 metres and a width of approximately 2 metres beyond the rear elevation wall. The rear two storey element would have a depth of

approximately 2.8 metres (measured from the existing two storey rear facade) . Roof slopes would be hipped from the side and the rear. This space would form a kitchen at ground floor level , with a door to the south elevation and at first floor level would be a master bedroom with windows and a juliet balcony to the rear (north) elevation and a window to the south elevation facing the highway. There are examples of rear glazing to a similar degree evident on other properties.

- 7.4 Beyond the proposed two storey extension would be a single storey extension which would have a depth of approximately 4 metres , height of approximately 2.7 metres and width of approximately 5.5 metres. This would create a sitting room featuring a raised lantern rooflight and bi-fold doors to the rear. An extension is also proposed to the front which would have a depth of approximately 2 metres, width of approximately 3.5 metres and height of approximately 2.3 metres to eaves level - this would create an enlarged lounge with doors to the front and tiling to the monopitched roof in slate to match the main roof. Alterations to fenestration are also proposed, including roof lights to the front and side elevation which would be located at high level .The existing side door would be enlarged and the first floor side elevation window currently serving a bathroom would now serve a bedroom.
- 7.5 The proposals would generally be sited towards the rear of the property, away from the highway except from the two-storey side extension and front extension. The two storey extension would be set back towards the rear of the property in a siting similar to the extension at no 27, the adjoining property. The roof slope would be set below that of the main roof, and is considered to appear subservient and not overly prominent or overbearing when viewed within the context of the host property or surrounding properties. The general pattern of development in the immediate vicinity does include side and rear extensions at two storey level, with gaps retained to the side boundaries so as not to create a terracing effect. This proposal retains such a gap to the side boundary. The front extension proposed is not considered to be notably out of keeping with the surrounding area- there are many examples of front extensions along Northney Road, a number with non-hipped roofs and this would not project significantly beyond the building line which is already somewhat varied and set back . The proposed materials include light grey render to the elevations , which is in keeping with the finish of surrounding dwellings and roof tiles would be in slate to match those on the existing roof. This is judged to be acceptable and not to cause harm to the character of the area.
- 7.6 To the rear (north) of the application site is the AONB. The Chichester Harbour Conservancy have been consulted in relation to this proposal and have upheld no objection in terms of the impact on Chichester Harbour AONB on the basis that the shipping container, currently located to the front of the site, is removed via a condition. This has been agreed by the applicant and a condition relating to its removal will be applied to any consent granted. The impact on the character and visual amenities of the AONB are considered acceptable.
- 7.7 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policies CS12 and 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.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 To the east of the application site is no 29 Northney Road- this property has a two storey extension to the side , set forward of the proposed two storey extension at no

28 . On the side elevation, set back behind the two storey extension at no 29 there are two ground floor windows facing west and one facing north serving a kitchen and dining room. The proposed two storey extension would retain a gap of approximately 0.7 metres to the boundary and there would be a total separation distance of approximately 3.9 metres between the properties as the building line is set back on the side of no 29. The roof line would be set lower than that of the existing roof, therefore reducing any perception of massing on this side and although the building line would be brought closer to these windows, the kitchen is served by multiple windows and the dining room would be dual aspect with windows to the rear. The separation distance is judged to be adequate to mitigate against any overbearing impact. The proposed first floor bedroom 3 window (previously a bathroom window) would be located centrally opposite the blank wall of the first floor side extension at no 29 . There are no windows forward of this at first floor level at no 29, to the rear there is an obscured bathroom window and to the rear of that, a bedroom window . There is judged to be a reasonable distance between these two windows so as not to result in any direct overlooking. A full height doorway is also proposed to the side elevation facing towards no 29. Although this is , in effect a full height window, it is judged that impact is not greatly increased as the other side elevation window on this elevation would be removed and there is a boundary treatment between the properties in the form of a fence with an approximate height of 1.8 metres. On balance, impact of this is not judged to result in any increased harmful overlooking.

- 7.9 To the west of the application site is no 27 Northney Road which forms the other half of the semi-detached pair. This proposal would include the removal of the existing rear conservatory at no 28, with the two storey extension coming level with the two storey rear elevation at no 27. No 27 has a single storey extension beyond this with a lean to roof and doors to the rear . The proposed single storey extension would project beyond this . Whilst this would slightly infringe upon the 45 degree line, taken from the mid point of the rear doors at no 27, this is not judged to cause substantial infringement to sunlight so as to substantiate a refusal. The windows and juliet balcony to the rear are not judged to result in any harmful direct overlooking back towards the rear. The front extension proposed would not infringe upon the 45 degree line and is set off the boundary - this is not judged to cause any significant impact to the south facing front bay window at no 27.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking 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) Ecology

7. 11 The County Ecologist has been consulted in relation to this proposal and has requested a bat report due to the potential presence of bats at the property. A bat report has since been provided and the County Ecologist has been re-consulted. The County Ecologist now raises no objection to the proposal, however requesting that a bat box is installed as described in Section 4.2 Table 8 of the submitted bat report. A condition is recommended to secure the bat box which has been applied a CEMP report is also required stipulating storage and mitigation measures which shall be adhered to throughout construction- this has also been conditioned.

(v) Parking .

- 7.12 As a result of this proposal, bedroom number at the property would increase from 2

bedrooms to 3 bedrooms. The Havant Parking SPD stipulates that both 2 and 3 bedroom properties require 2 on site parking spaces, therefore no additional parking spaces are required on site.

(vi) CIL

7. 13 This property would result in less than 100m² additional floorspace and therefore is not CIL liable.

(vii) Flood risk

- 7.14 This site is within Flood Zone 2 and partly 3 a flood risk assessment has been received which stipulates that flood risk mitigation measures will be implemented.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00581

(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:

Preliminary Roost Assessment Survey dated 30.11.20
259.6 Amended proposed floor plans and elevations
Block plan received on the 13.10.2020
Render colour confirmation email received on the 08.10.2020
Flood risk assessment received on the 28.07.2020

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 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.
Roof tiles shall be slate to match those on the existing roof with the elevations to be in render unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due

regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 At no time shall the flat roof of the single storey rear extension element of the scheme hereby permitted be used as a balcony without prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority.
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.
- 5 Within one month of the first use of the extensions hereby permitted or within 12 months of the date of this decision notice, whichever is soonest, the shipping container located to the front of the site shall be permanently removed from the land.
Reason: In the interests of the character and 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.
- 6 Prior to the first use of the extension hereby permitted an integrated bat brick shall have been provided in the new extension high up at eaves level. The box shall not be above or next to a window to reduce artificial light spill, and shall not be near any security lights or sensors. The box shall thereafter be maintained and retained as installed.
Reason: In the interests of biodiversity and protected species having due regard to policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not commence unless and until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include the steps and procedures that will be implemented to avoid or mitigate construction impacts on protected species and habitats. The CEMP as a minimum shall provide details of:
- Storage of Construction materials/chemical and equipment
 - Parking of construction vehicles
 - Measures to ensure dust suppression
 - Construction waste disposal
 - Measures to minimise noise and vibration impacts to protected species and habitats.

The construction phase shall be carried out fully in accordance with the CEMP as approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of protected species and habitats having due regard to policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

