

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Councillor A Briggs - Cowplain

No comment

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

No comment

Councillor Narinder Bains - Cowplain

No comment

Southern Water

Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public foul and surface water sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Please read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which has now been published and is available to read on our website via the following link

<https://beta.southernwater.co.uk/infrastructure-charges>

Officer comment: Please refer to informative

The disposal of surface water from this development should be in compliance with the following hierarchy of Part H3 of Building Regulations:

- a) An adequate soakaway or some other adequate infiltration system.
- b) A water course.
- c) Where neither of the above is practicable: a sewer.

The planning application form makes reference to drainage using Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

Under current legislation and guidance SUDS rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers. Therefore, the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long-term maintenance of the SUDS facilities. It is critical that the effectiveness of these systems is maintained in perpetuity. Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water system, which may result in the inundation of the foul sewerage system.

Thus, where a SUDS scheme is to be implemented, the drainage details submitted to the Local Planning Authority should:

- Specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SUDS scheme.
- Specify a timetable for implementation.
- Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

This should include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

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.

Further comments from Southern Water following Information request:

Looking at our records I believe that a Pumped Anti Flood Device was installed at 34 Spring Vale back in 2013, to combat historical flooding issues. A flood door was also installed here. Unfortunately our records don't go back much further than this, so I can't see the full history of flooding that pre-dated the installation of mitigation. The customer did mention on our records that they had a long history of flooding issues.

We have 17 recorded incidents since 2011 at this postcode (PO8 9DA), all of which appear to be related to wastewater.

Officer Comment:

Information request documentation was also received showing incidents occurring at public sewers located close to the application site. These incidents mainly related to blockages and hydraulic overload, with the most recent event dated at 2013.

It is also noted that Southern Water were formally consulted a second time in regard to this application when historical drainage and flooding issues were highlighted however no response was received.

Applicant correspondence with Southern Water states that it is unlikely that Southern Water would be investing further in mitigation measures in the vicinity and that if no connection is being made to the Southern Water sewer network they would be unlikely to object.

HBC Engineering/Drainage

The Drainage Engineer has been consulted in regard to this application and has been provided with the additional information and context of the site in relation to historic flood events. After lengthy discussions and following information provided by the applicant and Southern Water the Drainage Engineer has recommended a surface water pre-commencement condition be applied to this scheme in order to protect against potential future flood events in an area prone to flooding. This pre-commencement condition required calculations of a soak away provided following a BRE365 percolation test. As these details have been provided prior to the release of the decision for this proposal it has been judged in consultation with the Drainage Engineer that the pre-commencement condition would no longer be necessary. A compliance condition is now therefore recommended.

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 5 with 8 names.

Comment	Officer Comment
In our personal opinion, in the Revised Planning Application Proposal Plans for Extensions at 32, Spring Vale, WaterlooVille can only be deemed as being totally inadequate size wise when it comes the lack of the Land Area Allowance for accommodating the proposed 3 Vehicle Parking Property Frontage Bays, somewhat highlighted by the fact that one of the Vehicles involved is a Commercial Business sizeable Transit Van with an incorporated Company's advertising graphic designed signage display which is a distinct visual eyesore to us who happen to be the Neighbours that live directly opposite. In reality, we can personally foresee that this likely mis-calculation by the Applicants of the Land Area actually needed to accommodate their proposed 3 Parking Property Frontage Bays Problem will have to enforce the Occupiers of this said Property in question to actually having to Kerbside Street Park their Vehicle/s onto the Busy Narrow Width Roadway of Spring Vale to the degree that this possibly foreseeable problem is now likely to involve a valid objection on the grounds of the Highways Safety & Traffic aspect of this Revised Planning Application. As a direct consequence of both our genuine concerns as well as our personal observations, We accordingly strongly object to the latest submitted Revised Planning Application Proposals of 32, Spring Vale, WaterlooVille under Havant Borough Council's Planning Development Reference Number:- APP/19/00925.	The parking standards are measured on standard vehicle size of 4.8 metres length. This is not a planning consideration. The 3 spaces required by the Councils Parking Standards have been provided on the parking plan.
I am writing to you to express my concern and raise an objection to the proposed extension at 32 Spring Vale , as my property is next door but one to no 32 Spring Vale. I was surprised I didn't receive information from you concerning this development. I have several queries to ask about answers as listed on the planning application. <i>Materials</i> Roof- slate tiles would be out of character <i>Windows</i> - this proposal appears to be nothing but windows in roof and walls. They have already cut back trees in gardens adjacent to let in more light (I assume with house owners permission). <i>Drive</i> I've heard mentioned a circular access and exit for vehicles to the front of the property, this would require a dropped kerb , no mention of this on the application but ticked on the form. Rights of way no 8.	The application has been publicised in accordance with the Councils procedures. Please see 'planning considerations' section of report. This has not been suggested as part of this application. This is not a classified road therefore a drop kerb does not require planning

<i>Flood Risk</i>- within 20 metres of underground spring Foul Sewerage- we've had problems with this over the years- will this increase this risk? <i>Extension</i>- the applicant is a builder, I believe he will build this extension , when laying a new patio noise from cutting slabs carried on till late evening. I hate to think what this build will do for us local residents. I do not see why if a person wants a bigger property they don't purchase this in the beginning instead of moving into a family sized bungalow and then extend. If you give approval I hope there will be inspections at regular intervals to make sure regulations are adhered to.	permission. Flood risk is assessed in part 7 Noise issues would need to be raised with Environmental Health if they occur. This is not a planning consideration. If concerns were raised that the development was not in accordance with the approved details these would be investigated.
Concerns in regards to overlooking from the master bedroom suite affecting my privacy. <i>Comments following amendment:</i> With reference to new proposed extension to the above, it would appear no consideration has been given to our previous objection of loss of PRIVACY on original plans The glazed gable end is more of a concern, as the design is out of keeping with the surrounding buildings, bungalows, hence still invades our privacy, and of course a large window of this design is difficult to accommodate curtains or blinds. We are also concerned that the property will become approx. 40% larger, with this in mind, will the extra storm water be connected to the existing storm drain as our property, lies lower than 32, Springvale, thus meaning possibility of extra water flowing towards our property. The drainage is also a big concern, explaining the previous history of flooding, which was eventually resolved by Southern Water at great expense	Please see 'planning considerations' section of this report. Drainage issues considered in part 7
We have several concerns relating to the extension proposed. One is the potential flooding. Where is all the additional water going to go once the new build is up? The current drainage in the road to the front is inadequate at times of heavy rainfall and the sheer size of the extension will only add to the problem. The design, size and overall height of the new build will not be in keeping with the surrounding properties on the estate.	Please see 'planning considerations' section of report.

We purchased our bungalow with the expectation that we could enjoy the privacy, light and view afforded at the back. A tree has already been cut back severely at the request of no.32 to enable more light to their garden along with alleviating concerns that their new patio was lifting due to the tree roots. The view has already been compromised but the proposed extension and windows planned will dramatically change the outlook, light and privacy we currently enjoy, not only in the garden but also to the side of our property.	See part 7. The site and those adjoining were not subject to Tree Preservation Orders.
Please find my concerns and issues as stated below which I hope clarifies my overall views on this possible development. - Environmental Concerns - Design, Appearance, Layout , Privacy , Daylight and Outlook Summary <i>Environmental Concerns:</i> A new patio has recently been built taking a large section of garden and natural drainage away. I am not aware if it has some sort of drainage and assume it would go into a prepared soak away , or existing or approved drainage pipes. The area involved runs directly along my boundary , which of late has become untenable with heavy water , which until recently , in past years was never to that extent. With water naturally soaking its way through surrounding gardens this adds to my concerns of flooding on my property. Southern Water has spent approx over £100k on Flood Defense for my property due to constant flooding as well as other properties. New pipe work extending from the front of my property , extending through to the boundary at the end of my garden, then going into what I can only describe as a storm drain so my flooding is taken away quickly. Flood barriers stop water running into my home from the road , when drains overload water flows into my property. A flood door for the kitchen and a water pump were installed by SW to divert sewage and water away from my home . A new non- return valve installed in no 36 to stop over flow of surface water which naturally comes from Hazleton Way , then Furze Way then into existing drains inside and adjacent to this property and no 38. My home has been flooded with surface water and raw sewage multiple times over the years & twice entering my home , this has caused subsistence to my property. All these issues go back to the 1960's when the properties were first built . Under the guidance of David Baliss, SW manager at the time I had a soak away built , this area was previously marsh land , SW said the whole area is reverting back to this. My garden is the source of a natural underground spring. There's a drain outside my property to take road surface away. This has , over the years been unable to cope and water builds	Please see 'planning considerations' section of the report. Please note section on drainage.

up as it comes down Spring Vale before pouring into my property, into my garage then down the side to my kitchen area ,meeting other surface water from other gardens. The work carried out followed intensive meetings with SW and relevant Gov Departments and neighbours- still this year alone I have fit flood barriers several times due to heavy rains and surface water.

All relevant info on new work, plans can be viewed by contacting SW . I would strongly suggest SW be asked to make a full report of no 32 alongside existing utilities .

Design, Appearance & Layout, Effect on daylight, Privacy

The proposed build has dramatically increased in scale and will undoubtedly affect drainage . The build does not follow the existing character of surrounding properties . People are living longer and many downsize to bungalows but builds such as these stop the elderly from finding bungalows . It also is of concern to existing residents wishing to sell as buyers would be put off by being overlooked. The suggesting of slate tiles is out of keeping.

The design will affect surrounding properties & would overlook my property. The windows proposed would look into my loft area & over my garden which I spend time in. Evening lights will reflect shine into my property & garden and sunlight will be affected. I'm assuming the build will be managed by 32 (as he is a builder firm) and would like to have a limited time frame for build completion . Also restriction on work to be between 9-5 week days only as most of Spring Vale are elderly or retired residents and the work carried out will be long , extensive , creating heavy dust and noise .

The extend of the actual size, area , involved in this new build will have an adverse effect not just on me but surrounding residents , some have spoken to me of their concerns. The impact of the larger 'roof area' will increase the amount of run off surface water so where will this water go , and how will it be addressed , as the current existing system is struggling to cope. The driveway of no 32 was built on concrete and angled to let water run down to the road and drain , which stops it saturating its front garden. Gardens are increasingly saturated , taking weeks to recover , as water tries to drain away , due to our weather patterns and the nature of the land/terrain this will only get worse.

My experience over years of dealing with possible flooding this will only add to the build up of excess water in the road adding pressure to a struggling drainage system and hence more flooding. Other residents have raised the same concerns, questioning why they didn't buy a bigger property in the beginning.

In the planning application reference to floods and estate being in a Flood Zone 1 area ,as I understand it this does not cause 'sufficient concern' if this is the case then why did Southern Water invest £100k plus on my property and more properties on the estate to stop the land reverting back to marsh land unless it

The principle of alterations to a dwelling in the built up area is considered acceptable subject to detailed development management considerations set out below.

If construction noise issues are encountered these should be addressed with Environmental Health

is addressed now.

I have addressed my concerns to the HBC planning department , if other residents have submitted their concerns this is their decision . As requested I have put forward my concerns of the impact of this build on my property and my life. At the end of the day this is my home , not a personal attack on anyone, but having lived here since a child my enjoyment of my home will depend on the outcome of the possible build at no 32.

Further comments following amendments :

Design: Looking at the revised build I see very little has changed in the design or concept . The gable has been reduced to a half hip but there are still windows. The extension at the rear looks over my garden and most of the surrounding properties. The design is out of concept with the surrounding properties , I have no objection to extensions however when one starts to impact my life I must air my concerns.

Privacy: would be severely impacted by this proposal .

Flooding- The size of the build is still concerning. I have put up my flood defenses approx 5-6 times this year as the flood waters from the road head towards my driveway. This year, for the first time I have experienced difficulties in obtaining home insurance due to flood issues. In 2016 , even with flood barriers fitted we had serious issues due to drains, unable to cope with flood waters and raw sewage nearly entered my home.

Suggestions of a soak away to solve this is fine as a temporary measure, however changes to weather patterns may get worse. With our terrain as typically clay based, wet and dry conditions cause immense problems . A build of this size warrants serious considerations as soak aways in this terrain type do not solve flooding concerns - made clear to me by Southern Water and the Civil Engineers who installed mine.

My concerns are as stated in my previous letter which I feel have not been taken very seriously . My objections and why are clear and anyone living in my home , having experienced years of flooding would feel as I do. Neighbours share these concerns . I believe my concerns are valid and justified.

Further comments following amendments to plans showing materials :

I see no changes to the plans except for the cladding etc though no colour stated . As previously stated in response to the plans, my concerns are still very much justified.

(A) The size of the build overlooks my home/property invading my privacy having a dramatic effect on my wellbeing. This is my home, a place to relax, feel comfortable in , where I grew up in and not a place where I feel I can no longer go into my garden without the fear of being looked on . It is where I intend to spend the rest of my life, and enjoy. The extension, due to its size will

be overlooking all parts of my home and garden.

(B) It is unfair for neighbours to be put through so much upset and constant worry of flooding due to the size of this extension. Many, like myself have experienced flooding along Spring Vale, those immediately to my front and rear- this fear never goes away. We are all made aware by the Government that climate change is affecting our weather patterns and it will only get worse. Having experienced more than once sewage and flood waters run through my home is a fear I do not wish to go through again.

(C) I appreciate the desire 32 have to improve their home, but not at the expense of other people's homes and privacy. When making a decision of this scale, please consider the impact and implications it will have on neighbours, utilities and people's lives. The current system is struggling, so adding more will cause further stress to the homes of Spring Vale and the agencies who need to rectify the situation.

I have written twice, with detailed accounts and reasoning on all my concerns, backed up with involvement with Southern Water, as well as conversations with members of planning. I assume seeing current extensions throughout the area, 32 would be no different. Should I experience flooding due to this extension, especially as everyone has been made aware of my concerns I would have no choice but to seek compensation from all parties involved, as recommended under Government and Environmental Law, supported by the rights of the Common Law.

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) Drainage
- (v) CIL
- (vi) Parking

(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

7.3 This proposal comprises raising the ridge level of the main roof, a two storey side extension, a two storey rear extension and a dormer to the south west, side roof slope. The proposal also includes internal alterations and alterations to the facade incorporating modifications to fenestration. This proposal has undergone various amendments in design including the raising of ridge to facilitate usable head heights, alterations to the side dormer, a half hip to the side extension and a reduction in the total depth.

- 7.4 Proposed alterations to the roof include raising of the ridge level by 1 metre in height following the removal of the chimney. The ridge raise would allow for increased head height for rooms proposed to the first floor which include a bedroom towards the front, followed by another bedroom and bathroom and master bedroom towards the rear. This is not judged to result in an unacceptably altered appearance of the main property as the pitched roof design would be retained with first floor rooms accommodated within the roof space to limit the increase in height. A dormer is also proposed to facilitate living space at first floor level which would have a length of approximately 13 metres. A dormer of this length is not generally supported by the LPA as guidance set out in the Havant Borough Design Guide states that dormers should be subservient additions to the roof slope. In this case, however the dormer would be set back from the front elevation, with a sloping roof and set up from the eaves level and as there are various examples of similar dormer styles in the area (including a long dormer to No.34), on balance this is judged to be acceptable in terms of visual impact.
- 7.5 Proposed extensions include a two storey rear extension with a depth of approximately 6.5 metres, a width coming level with the main property and a height in continuation of the ridge line proposed to the main roof. This was reduced in size following amendments as concerns were raised over potential overdevelopment of the site. Also proposed is a two storey, barn hip extension to the side (north east) elevation and single story side extension. The side extension would have a flat roof and would be sited towards the front of the side extension set back from the front elevation by approximately 3.7 metres and would step up to the two storey element with the half hipped roof and height on level with the proposed main ridge. Both side extensions would have a width of 2.6 metres and a total depth of approximately 13 metres. These extensions would allow the space at first floor level as noted above and enlarged kitchen and living space towards the rear and side as well as an attached garage. The side extensions would be visible from the highway and it is noted that there are not many examples of this type of development in the immediate area and it is noted that the bulk of the roof both to the side and rear would be a substantial addition within the context of the existing modestly sized, bungalow property. Despite this, the set back from the road is judged to reduce any prominent impact this may have, materials proposed would include dark grey concrete tiles to the roof - there are many variants of roof tile type and colour in the immediate area and this is not judged to be harmful. Composite cladding is proposed in dark grey to the gables and dormer and render is proposed in light grey/cream to the remainder of the elevations. Overall the proposed materials are considered to provide a more modern appearance but would not result in an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area which includes a mixed pallet of materials and finishes.
- 7.6 Other alterations include large, triangular shaped windows to the front and rear gable ends. Although many of the properties in the surrounding area have retained the small, box shaped windows to the front elevation at first floor level, as this proposal is facilitating use of the space at first floor it is judged that larger windows would provide a necessary supply of light whilst mitigating against impact on the neighbouring properties to the sides. Windows to the front of properties are judged to be a standard feature in residential areas and these are not judged to be harmful to the character of the area. Windows are also proposed to the other elevations, although these would not be readily visible from the public realm. This would include high level windows on the ground floor on the south west elevation, two sets of windows on the dormer, large bi-folding doors and two sets of windows at ground floor level on the rear elevation and 2 rooflights on the rear elevation of the side extension. To the north east elevation would be 3 rooflights to the roof slope and at ground floor some high and low level windows.
- 7.7 Overall, whilst the proposals result in a significant change to the original dwelling including significant additions, it is considered that the alterations would have an

acceptable scale and design in the context of surrounding development. 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 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.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 It is considered that the proposals would have the greatest impacts on 34, 30 and 23 Spring Vale and 77-81 (odd numbers) Hazleton Way. These impacts are considered below.
- 7.9 To the north/ north east of the application site is No. 34 Spring Vale which is a chalet bungalow of similar design to the application property, with a dormer facing towards the site towards the south west as well as one window at ground floor level on this side elevation towards the front of the property. This side ground floor window is not judged to be impacted as this is set further towards the road than the proposed side extensions. The two storey element of the extension would be sited mainly behind the dormer windows and is therefore not judged to impact these significantly. The proposed 3No. rooflights facing No.34 at first floor level in the application property would be high level (1.7m from finished floor level) to avoid overlooking. There are also lower rooflights serving the ground floor study of the application property again these would not overlook No.34. There are windows to the rear elevation of no 34, and although the side extension would result in the building mass brought closer to this property, with a set off of 1 metre from the boundary there is already a garage sited on the boundary in this location at no 34 at single storey level. Although it is noted the increase in height the side extension would have, following amendments the roof has been partially hipped away from this boundary and this is judged to help to mitigate against any unacceptable overbearing impact on the rear of this property. In terms of impacts on light, the half hipped design combined with the slight set off is considered to mitigate the impact on the rear of No.34 to an acceptable degree. There are not judged to be any impact on overlooking from the windows proposed to the side elevation, although the first floor window proposed to the rear would be of a reasonable size, this would not directly overlook any private amenity space instead facing down the rear garden of the application property..
- 7.10 To the south west of the application site is no 30 Spring Vale which is a bungalow property of a similar pitched roof design, but turned 180 degrees in relation the application property. The proposed dormer would be sited on the roof slope facing towards No.30. Concerns were initially raised in regards to potential impact on privacy via the dormer windows as the dormer would be located forward from the front elevation of No.30 and therefore could overlook the front elevation windows. The windows in the proposed dormer have subsequently been reduced in number and set back by approximately 4 metres from the front and the dormer windows to the rear back from the rear by approximately 5 metres in order to reduce any overlooking towards the private amenity space towards the rear of No.30. The amended design is considered to have resulted in a mitigation of any overlooking to an acceptable degree. Towards the rear of No.30 is a single storey, flat roof extension located on the boundary with No.32 and there are 2 windows facing towards the rear garden of the property. Although the rear extension would come beyond these windows and would impact upon these, this room is also served by a window facing towards the rear/ south east which is the direction most sunlight would be coming from. The windows serving the ground floor kitchen/ dining room would be high level at 1.7 metres above ground floor level and therefore would not result in any overlooking to no 30. Whilst it is noted that this proposal would impact this property due to the increase in size, the impact would be reduced by the existing side extension separating the private amenity space towards the rear at No.30 and overall there is not judged to be any significant harmful impact to

amenity at this property.

- 7.11 To the rear of the property are No's 77- 81 Hazleton Way , with no 79 directly to the rear of the application site. There would be approximately 15 metres of rear garden space between the rear elevation wall and the rear boundary and 34 metres back to back distance between the two properties. It is noted that the first floor window proposed to the rear elevation serving the bedroom is a significant addition in an area which is predominantly characterised by low rise, single storey bungalows and potential impact on privacy has been evaluated. It is also noted that in residential areas such as this , windows at first floor level are a fairly normal occurrence - in this instance it is judged the set back from the rear boundary would mitigate against any unacceptable overlooking, with a general back to back distance for facing windows of 24 metres recommended in the Havant Borough Design Guide (two storey to single storey relationships). Additionally, although not applicable to this property, it is noted that dormers could be constructed at first floor level under permitted development which could have rear facing windows and would not require planning permission.
- 7.12 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) Drainage .

- 7.13 The site lies in flood zone 1 (low flood risk), however it is apparent that there are local drainage and flooding issues. Objections have been received in regard to this proposal, many of which refer to the historical flood and drainage issues along Spring Vale. Such localised issues are not always known to the LPA until highlighted by local residents. In this instance there have been various flooding incidents close to the application site and this has been reported to be from both fluvial and foul drainage systems. This has resulted in the installations of a Pumped Anti Flood Device and flood door. No 34 in particular has experienced historic flooding and Southern Water, who are responsible for much of the infrastructure, have invested in various mitigation measures at the property. The initial consultee response from Southern Water did not highlight any historical issues, therefore an information request was submitted alongside a second formal consultee request to Southern Water. The information request showed flood events that has occurred until 2013 which were related to blockages and hydraulic overload in the pipes. An informal response was also received from Southern Water stating there have been 17 recorded flood incidents at this postcode which appeared to be related to wastewater.
- 7.14 The Council's Civil Engineer has also been consulted in regards to this application and is aware of both the objections received and the responses from Southern Water. Although no objection has been received from Southern Water, there are considered to be potential issues with the ability of the public drainage system to cope with excess foul and surface water. Southern Water have stated they would be unlikely to object in regard to foul drainage and the applicant has suggested use of a soakaway as a method of surface water drainage. With no objection from Southern Water in relation to Foul Drainage the foul drainage proposals are considered acceptable. An informative in relation to Southern Waters requirements is recommended. Due to localised issues surrounding surface water drainage the Council's Civil Engineering Team Leader has requested a condition be applied to this permission, requesting that a percolation (BRE365) test be undertaken so as to calculate the necessary size of the soakaway prior to commencement.
- 7.15 Prior to a decision being finalised, details of a soakaway have been submitted by the applicant which proposes a soakaway with a size of 2.5 m3. The Council's Civil

Engineer has been consulted on this and has stated that this would be acceptable and therefore the pre-commencement condition is no longer necessary. A compliance condition is however recommended in relation to the size/capacity of the soakaway to seek to ensure that surface water drainage is appropriate to serve the building, it is also noted that Building Regulations are also likely to consider drainage requirements. Overall and based on a detailed assessment of the drainage concerns raised it is considered that drainage for this residential extension can be appropriately managed.

(v) CIL -

- 7.16 This proposal would result in additional floorspace over 100 square metres which means this would be CIL liable. It is also noted that self build exemption has been claimed.

(vi) Parking -

- 7.17 This property would be increasing from 3 to 5 bedrooms as a result of this proposal. This would require 3 parking spaces as stipulated in the Havant Borough Parking SPD. These have been shown on the floor plans and measure within the 2.4 x 4.8 dimensions and therefore meet the parking standards. It is also noted that a garage is retained. A new dropped kerb to the unclassified road would not in itself require planning permission. An informative is recommended in relation to the need to contact HCC as the Highways Authority.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 In conclusion, the proposal to extend an existing dwelling in the built up area is considered acceptable in principle, the design of the alterations have been carefully assessed and are considered to have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. In relation to neighbours residential amenities, the scheme has been amended during the course of the application to ensure that impacts in terms of potential overlooking, mass and bulk have been addressed and are now considered acceptable. Drainage concerns have been addressed and considered in detail with Southern Water and the Councils engineer and the drainage proposals are considered acceptable. Parking requirements can be met on site. The development 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/19/00925 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:
Final material details confirmation received on the 26.08.2020
0003 REV A Proposed plans with material details
Email confirming soakaway details received on the 31.07.2020
Email confirming soakaway size as 2.5 m3 received 04.08.2020
Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The three rooflight windows at first floor level in the north-east facing elevation serving the bathroom, stairs and bedroom shall have a minimum cil height of 1.7m from finished floor level.
Reason: To accord with the submitted details and to avoid potential overlooking to the neighbouring property having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 No above ground construction works shall take place until the proposed soakaway to serve the development has been provided on site. The proposed surface water drainage soakaway shall have a minimum capacity of 2.5 cubic metres and be constructed to allow for future maintenance for example with a crate design. The soakaway shall thereafter be retained in good working order to serve the development.
Reason: To ensure that surface water drainage is adequately provided to serve the development hereby permitted and to seek to reduce flood risk having due regard to policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5 The proposed car parking, shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the extension being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose. Any additional parking shall be provided with a porous surface.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy CS15 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the building 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.