
Site Address:	26 Bound Lane, Hayling Island, PO11 9HU		
Proposal:	Erection of 1No. 3bed bungalow and associated landscaping and parking.		
Application No:	APP/17/01048	Expiry Date:	06/04/2018
Applicant:	Mr Johns		
Agent:	Mr Forder	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Helyer Davies Architects Ltd		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to an older style detached bungalow located on the west side of Bound Lane. It is constructed of dark red brick beneath a fully hipped concrete tiled roof and has an attached single storey garage with shallow sloping roof to its northern side. It also has an existing flat roof single storey extension in the rear western corner. The 'front' door is located within the southern elevation, accessed through an existing old glazed lean-to style conservatory.
- 1.2 The bungalow is set back some 26m from the highway, within a large plot. It is set within the northern half of the site, with the southern half comprising the open garden area. The bungalow is sited relatively close, within 1m at its closest point, to the northern boundary with No 24 to the north, which comprises a close boarded fence. The western and southern boundaries comprise high hedging and shrubbery - it is noted that the southern hedge is planted adjacent a boundary close boarded fence such that this dense hedge must have a thickness of at least 1m and being garden side therefore makes the site appear narrower than it is. The remaining curtilage is flat and largely laid to lawn.
- 1.3 The extent of the site to the east is noteworthy - there is a front verge that has no known ownership and is classed as 'unregistered' land. This frontage verge was formerly densely hedged with a number of trees but this area was cleared by the applicant and only one oak tree remains. The Local Planning Authority placed a TPO on this remaining oak tree. This front verge has subsequently been covered in bark chippings by the applicant.
- 1.4 Whilst the character of the frontage of the site has undoubtedly changed through the clearance works, this is no different from other adjacent dwellings that also have open and domesticated front verges. Since Bound Lane is an unclassified road, works to either create or alter an access onto it do not require planning permission. Similarly any new gate, fence or wall would also be permitted development provided its height does not exceed 1m where adjacent the highway, or former height if a replacement.
- 1.5 The local area is characterised by low density detached dwellings set in a linear fashion within moderate plots. No 24 to the north is a detached two storey dwelling having a single storey attached garage adjacent the shared boundary. To the south, the rear of the properties in Grand Parade abut the southern boundary - and these are a mix of detached bungalows and semi-detached dwellings.

2 Planning History

APP/17/00151 - Alterations and additions including single storey rear extension; Loft conversion with insertion of dormers in east and south elevations and roof lights in north and west elevations. , PERM,12/04/2017

APP/17/00156 - Tree works., UNK,01/03/2017

APP/17/00505 - Garage extension and replacement flat garage roof., PERM,16/06/2017

APP/17/00561 - Application for Non-material amendment of Planning Permission

APP/17/00151 relating to alterations to positions and details of doors and windows. , PERM,05/06/2017

3 Proposal

Erection of 1No. 3bed bungalow and associated landscaping and parking.

Following the submission of amended plans the proposed dwelling is single storey with hipped roof that would have a height slightly lower than the ridge of the existing bungalow. It would be sited between 21m and 25m from the frontage; have a 12m rear garden; and be within 1.5m from the southern fence line - which would necessitate the removal of a 14m length of hedge where adjacent the footprint of the proposed bungalow. A new access is proposed with frontage parking and turning. Some additional frontage hedging is shown for removal to create this access and in front of the existing dwelling, but the remaining hedging is shown for retention on the submitted plans.

The red line as originally submitted excluded the frontage verge but because the access crosses this strip and the tree protection fencing is proposed to be placed on this unregistered land, then technically to make the application valid, the red line needed to be extended to include this frontage strip. Further revised plans were submitted, and because the applicant does not own this land, and the owner is not known, a Certificate C was completed with the application advertised in a local paper.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS9	(Housing)
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)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

Now I have received the Tree Protection Plan I can confirm that the trees to remain will be adequately protected and I have no objection to the proposal. Please condition that the work is carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Report (0918.bjh.Oct17) and Tree Protection Plan (Drawing number BJH 03/04). I also have no objection to the dead macrocarpa stumps being removed or the Lawson Cypress (T3).

Arboriculturalist - on amended plans

Dwelling is right on the edge of the RPA of T5 - but revised TPP is adequate and offers protection for the trees on site.

Building Control

If the property is within 1m of the north and south boundaries, the proposed windows on these elevations would exceed permitted limits for unprotected areas. The sizes of the windows should be reduced.

There appears to be no restraint to the chimney on the west elevation. Unless this has been adequately designed, the appearance of this elevation may alter to provide the required restraint.

Crime Prevention

None received

Southern Water

Formal application for connection to the public foul sewer required; request Informative; Building Control should comment on adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water; should any sewers be found during construction works then investigation will be required.

Highways Engineer

The Highway Authority have no adverse comment to this application.

Public Spaces

None received

Waste Services Manager

Must ensure wheeled bins are presented close to the main road/highway or allocated in a designated area for emptying, not 60-70 meters which will result in non-collection of waste

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: 14

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: **14 Objection** letters have been received: **7 on the original plans; 3 on the amended plans; and 4 on the final revised red line amended plans:**

Comment	Officer Comment
The 7 original letters raise the following issues:	
<u>Loss of frontage trees</u> - unreasonable removal of healthy trees removed over Christmas period 2016; act was blatant vandalism of trees that were part of natural ecology of area; these trees not in land owned by applicant and he should not have removed them - why have council not imposed fines/court proceedings? If planning permission granted, some oak replanting should be specified;	Trees were NOT protected at time of removal and TPO of remaining oak was served in response to removal works No action possible as no breach of any planning regulations.
<u>Frontage ownership</u> - land to front not owned by applicant but common land/unregistered land; applicants application to Land registry for adverse possession was withdrawn	Noted - strip originally excluded from application site but revised plans include it with appropriate Certificate C and paper advert
<u>Proximity to Boundaries/Siting</u> - very close to southern boundary and we will view a large gable end and roof will affect outlook; windows in south elevation close to boundary with Grand Parade; windows 1m from fence poor outlook for future residents and will overlook back gardens of Grand Parade;	Noted - amended plans for hipped roof see considerations below
<u>Privacy/Removal of Southern Boundary hedge</u> - will impact Grand Parade residents by removing their privacy; adverse impact on residential amenity of neighbours from overlooking and loss of privacy;	amended plans retain part of boundary hedge - single storey only - see considerations below
<u>Inappropriate siting</u> - would make more sense to have development closer to front of plot, allowing for more space around both dwellings	not possible due to constraints of RPA of TPO tree and would be out of character with linear layout of Bound Lane

<p><u>Principle/Overdevelopment</u> - yet another disproportionate overdevelopment structure for garden land, destroying outlook and ecology of area; out of proportion with width of plot; should remain a garden to serve existing house; both family size properties will have inadequate land; dimensions of site too small for proposed dwelling; unacceptably high density not in keeping with Bound lane;</p>	<p>within Urban Area where principle acceptable - see considerations below</p> <p>Bound Lane generally low density and so is this proposal 4 - 24 Bound Lane equates to 17 dwellings per ha - proposed site is 14 dpha</p>
<p><u>Character of area</u> - Bound Lane semi-rural in appearance and locals wish to retain that appearance - this application will not help; removal of trees and hedges already destroyed appearance of Bound Lane; this application will exacerbate this; visually new property is being squeezed into a space that's too small; out of scale and character in terms of appearance;</p>	<p>other properties in Bound Lane have open frontages; amended plans propose retention of part of frontage hedge to help retain rural character and landscaping condition proposed to supplement</p>
<p><u>De-value property</u></p>	<p>Loss of value not a material planning consideration</p>
<p><u>Relationship with existing property</u> - close to existing property cutting off their south facing aspect;</p>	<p>Noted - amended plans re-sited slightly further forward for this reason - see considerations below</p>
<p><u>Bin Storage</u> - as shown would not fit and affect street scene</p>	<p>re-sited in amended plans</p>
<p><u>Highways</u> - not designed as a road to take volume of traffic, but a lane whose charm is being corroded; would adversely affect highway safety when using own drive which is close, visibility will be poorer.</p>	<p>not a classified road and creation of new access does not require planning permission; the addition of a single dwelling would have a limited impact on the overall use of Bound Lane</p>
<p><u>Future roof alterations</u> - no windows on south elevation at roof level, would object if this changed;</p>	<p>Noted - pd rights can be withdrawn for roof alterations</p>
<p><u>Trees</u> - Silver birch in garden 10ft away from site - want assurances that development will not interfere with the continued health of this tree; On site plan root ball circle of T1 is off centre and conveniently misses the proposed drive - if circle was centred would impinge on proposed driveway and impact sustainability of the tree; on tree constraints plan root ball centred</p>	<p>Silver birch is within rear garden of 11 Grand Parade and some 6m from rear corner of proposed dwelling;</p> <p>shape of RPA reflects growth pattern of tree; arb advice is RPA of this tree is correct at 8.7m</p> <p>Council's Arboriculturalist raises no objection to the application</p>

<p>correctly but radius set at 8.7m - should be at least 10m.</p> <p><u>Financial gain motives</u> - applicant not intending to live at property, just making financial benefit at expense of surrounding residents; moral issue - council are merely custodians of the borough's natural resources;</p> <p><u>Housing need</u> - 1 dwelling will not relieve housing shortage on its own and is hardly affordable;</p> <p><u>Ecology</u> - Trees were important part of green corridor of biodiversity, especially for bats and stag beetles; vegetation suppressing membrane which has prevented regrowth should be removed in spring to allow mature stag beetles to emerge and mate; immature stags beetles grubs remain in soil for 2 to 7 years before emerging;</p>	<p>not a material planning consideration</p> <p>Noted - but site within defined built up area and proposal makes a modest contribution to the Council's Housing needs.</p> <p>The works within the road frontage including the provision of the membrane took place prior to the planning application and do not require planning consent.</p> <p>Stag beetles are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 - any impact on their larva would be subject to this legislation and a potential criminal offence.</p>
<p>The 3 letters on the amended plans raise the following issues:</p> <p><u>Protective fencing</u> - why does it incorporate the unregistered land that does not belong to applicant and is outside the boundary of the plot?</p> <p><u>Hedging to remain</u> - note hedging indicated green is to remain and receive protection - seek clarification on this</p> <p><u>Hip roof</u> - appreciate gable end replaced with pitched roof which has helped aesthetics;</p> <p><u>Privacy concern</u> - south facing window will look directly into my garden and 2m fence will not prevent person inside looking up garden and into kitchen-diner; removal of the hedge has created this issue.</p> <p><u>NPPE</u> - rules that apply to garden windfall development should be properly applied by LPA.</p>	<p>Noted - should be within application site - subsequently amended</p> <p>can be protected/retained by planning condition</p> <p>noted</p> <p>see considerations below</p> <p>The LPA have considered the planning merits of the development in detail.</p>

<p>The 4 letters on the revised red line amended plans came from 3 addresses and raise the following issues:</p> <p><u>Use of Hampshire Independent</u> - contacted publishers and advised that distribution is just 25 copies on Hayling Island; given population of 18,000 residents wholly inadequate method of advertising; age and internet use demographics of Hayling island suggest publication as part of planning process changed to reach more than 25</p> <p><u>Character/safety</u> - disappointed and sad to see further disfigurement to "old lane" Bound Lane - seems forward of the building line and would create precedent and cause safety concerns;</p> <p><u>Boundary</u> - note boundary extends as far as roadway outside new bungalow but not outside 26 - hope this land grab an error that needs correcting</p> <p>overdevelopment by squeezing in additional bungalow and 'special arrangements' to put additional driveway over land not owned by applicant; size should be reduced to 2 bed; should use existing driveway and not create a second; neighbours should no suffer for applicants profit</p>	<p>legal requirement is only a paper circulating in the locality; and the Councils' Statement of Community Involvement notes use of The Hampshire Independent for formal adverts</p> <p>see considerations below of character of area and linear pattern of development</p> <p>Not an error - is correct and shows extent of application site but not land ownership of frontage strip which remains unknown (Cert C served)</p> <p>see considerations below</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 and ownership issue
- (ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Impact on trees
- (v) Highways and parking
- (vi) Developer Contributions

(i) Principle of development and ownership issue

7.1 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. The NPPF notes that "Housing applications should be considered in the context of the

presumption in favour of sustainable development" but also suggests resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens if, for example, harm would be caused to the local area. Therefore it is the specific impact on the local area of the development of this residential garden that must be considered.

- 7.2 The applicant does not own the frontage verge which is unregistered land, and the ownership of this parcel of land is unknown. However this does not prevent it from being included within the application site provided the correct procedures are adhered to. In this case it is necessary to include the frontage verge as it provides the proposed access drive and the tree protection fencing is proposed on this land. A Certificate C has been completed and a Notice published in the Hampshire Independent on 9th February 2018.
- 7.3 An objector has queried whether the placing of the Notice in the Hampshire Independent with an alleged circulation of only 25 residents on Hayling is adequate. However, The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 only requires at Article 13:

"b) where the applicant has taken reasonable steps to ascertain the names and addresses of every such person, but has been unable to do so, by publication of the notice after the prescribed date in a newspaper circulating in the locality in which the land to which the application relates is situated."

The Hampshire Independent does circulate in Hayling Island and there is no requirement beyond that fact to source a paper with greater circulation. Therefore the Notice is considered sufficient to comply with Article 13. Notwithstanding this correct procedure, the granting of planning permission does not convey ownership which remains a separate issue.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

- 7.4 The western side of Bound Lane is characterised by linear residential dwellings set well back from the highway. The application site is the southern most dwelling in this stretch and the proposal would make a logical continuation of this linear siting, respecting the pattern of development in the area. The width of plots on this western side of Bound Lane varies, from about 9m to 15m, but the application site is noticeably a wider than average plot having a road frontage width of 34m. The proposed subdivision would result in 19m frontage width for the existing No 26 and 15m for the proposed bungalow (although this does taper to 13m to the rear of the site). This is clearly compatible with the surrounding area.
- 7.5 In terms of design the amended plans propose a hipped roof bungalow that would reflect the hipped roof style of No 26 and create sufficient separation at roof level to maintain skyline and space about the proposed bungalow. Its ridge height would be marginally lower than No 26 and is considered appropriate in street scene terms to the character of the area. The amended plans also retain much of the existing eastern boundary hedge - an 11m stretch from the southern corner would be retained which would help to maintain the character of the existing mature verdant site frontage. It is regrettable that the trees on the frontage have been lost, which has already changed the character of the lane, and therefore it is particularly important to retain the remaining hedge - this can be conditioned.
- 7.6 Overall the siting, design and appearance of the proposed additional bungalow is deemed appropriate in context to the site and can be satisfactorily achieved whilst respecting the character and pattern of development in the area, 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) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.7 The siting of the proposed dwelling is pulled slightly forward (east) of the existing dwelling at No 26 to achieve a staggered rear layout in order to respect the outlook from the main lounge bay window set within the south-western corner of No 26.
- 7.8 To the south the properties in Grand Parade are set at right angles to the application site with their private rear gardens abutting the shared boundary - which comprises a close boarded fence with the hedge set within the application site and currently higher than the fence line providing additional screening. The proposal would result in the loss of a 14m stretch of this hedge and screening, primarily against the rear boundary of No 13 Grand Parade. Therefore the outlook from these properties, and in particular No 13, will be altered. The eaves line of the proposed dwelling is about 2.5m so would be visible above the fence line with the roof hipping away. However the actual harm to the outlook is considered to be minimal - the development above the fence line would be receding away, thus reducing the impact.
- 7.9 A kitchen window is proposed for this south elevation - but as a single storey development any outlook and overlooking would be very limited and not result in any significant loss of privacy. Given that the rear of No 13 Grand Parade is some 20m away, the separation provided by the long rear garden is considered adequate to protect neighbouring privacy and amenity and meets the requirements of the Borough Design Guide SPD. Objectors have requested that no future roof alterations take place to prevent any first floor windows with associated potential overlooking - this is a reasonable request to protect privacy and permitted development rights can be withdrawn. It is also recommended to condition boundary details of any new fencing/walls between the new and existing dwelling and any frontage boundary treatment and/or replacement landscaping where the hedge is to be removed.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Impact on trees

- 7.11 An Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have been submitted and amended accordingly as the scheme has evolved. The TPO'd oak tree within the unregistered land in the south eastern corner of the site is unaffected by the proposal with the proposed new driveway being beyond the 8.7m RPA of this oak tree. Adequate protective fencing is shown for this tree and others in this southern end frontage area of the site. The proposed two parking spaces would be provided under the RPA of tree 5 (gum tree) and the AMS proposes adequate no dig porous construction. The Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objection, provided the AMS and TPP are conditioned.
- 7.12 The site is currently bounded on its southern and part of the eastern boundary with a high evergreen (euonymus and privet) hedge that provides valuable screening and visual amenity to the road frontage. Other than where indicated to be removed immediately adjacent the proposed bungalow, the remainder of this hedge has been

agreed to be retained and this needs to be conditioned to ensure it is kept in perpetuity. Within the blue lined adjacent site of the existing dwelling at No 26, an area of frontage hedge is also proposed to be lost and it is considered appropriate to condition some replacement landscaping for this area to try to provide some natural planting and screening to soften the visual appearance of the site.

(v) Highways and parking

- 7.13 Bound Lane is an unclassified road and therefore the creation of a new access point does not in isolation require planning permission. The access crosses the unregistered land which has now been included within the application site and the appropriate ownership Notice served and advert undertaken. Therefore technically planning permission can be granted and the future implementation and actual use of this unregistered land is a civil matter.
- 7.14 The proposed dwelling would have 3 bedrooms and therefore 2 on site parking spaces are required to meet the adopted Parking SPD. These are adequately provided and as noted above, under the RPA of tree 5. The use of appropriate porous surface is required in the AMS and can be conditioned.

(vi) Developer Contributions

- 7.15 The proposed additional dwelling is both CIL liable and subject to policy DM24 requesting a financial contribution towards the mitigation of the impact on the SPA.
- 7.16 The CIL rates to be applied to development are set out in the Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which was adopted by the council on the 20th February 2013. This followed two public consultation exercises and an Examination into the Charging Schedule by an independent Examiner. The Examiners Report concluded that the Havant Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule provided an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the borough. The levy is charged at £100 per square metre on new floorspace (measured as gross internal area), plus indexation in Hayling Island.
- 7.17 The submitted CIL forms note a floorspace of 120.19sqm giving a CIL liability of £16,204.19. The Draft Liability Notice has been sent to the applicants.
- 7.18 This development would also increase the number of dwellings within the 5.6km zone identified as significant in potentially increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. Natural England's advice in regard all new housing development within this zone is that it is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA. Policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan, covers this issue and allows for a financial contribution to be made towards mitigation measures. This is currently set at £181 per dwelling, plus admin and monitoring fee, totalling £210 for the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project. The appropriate Deed has been signed and returned and the monies paid.

8 Conclusion

It is considered that the amended plans proposing a hipped roofed bungalow would be compatible with the character of the area and not result in any significant harm to neighbouring amenity. The trees and hedges on site can be sufficiently retained. With appropriate conditions, particularly to ensure the retention of the hedge and removal of permitted development rights to the roof, then the proposal, on balance, is considered

to accord with the relevant Local Plan and Allocation Plan policies and the guidance set out in the Borough Design Guide SPD, Parking SPD and the NPPF. The application is therefore recommended for permission.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/17/01048 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Site Plan Drawing Number 17001-154 Revision E
Parking Plan Drawing Number 17001-153 Revision E
Proposed Plans, elevations & Sections Drawing Number 17001-151 Revision E
Tree Protection Plan Drawing Number 17001-156 Revision C (Revised 09/02/18)
Arboricultural Method Statement by Bernie Harveson document 0918.bjh.Jan18
Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the building and all hardsurfacing proposals including surfacing materials; have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The existing evergreen hedge along the southern and eastern boundaries of the site shall be retained at a minimum height of 2m metres and to a standard consistent with good arboricultural practice, in perpetuity, except where shown for removal on Tree Protection Plan Drawing No 17001-156 Rev C (revised 09/02/18).
Reason: To ensure the maintenance of screening to the site and to protect the appearance and character of the area and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 5 No development shall commence on the site until details of soft landscaping and planting for the frontage of both the application site and No 26 Bound Lane has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such approved planting shall be completed prior to the first

occupation of the hereby approved development. Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its consent in writing to any variation.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate standard of visual amenity in the local area and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 No part of the development shall be first occupied until details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of all means of enclosure including boundaries, screens or retaining walls, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved structures have been erected in accordance with the approved details. The structures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and occupiers of neighbouring property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order, no alteration to the roof of the dwelling hereby approved, including the addition of windows permitted by Part 1, Classes B and C of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 shall be undertaken without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to maintain control of such additions in the interests of the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents, and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 The hereby approved development shall take place in full compliance with the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement by Bernie Harveson document 0918.bjh.Jan18 and Tree Protection Plan Drawing No 17001-156 Revision C (revised 09/02/18). No development shall commence on site until the protective fencing is in situ and thereafter the development and no dig porous parking spaces shall be implemented in full accordance with this Arboricultural Method Statement.

Reason: To safeguard the continued health and presence of the adjacent TPO'd oak tree and other trees on site and to protect the amenities of the locality and having due regard to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 9 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 10 No development shall take place until details of existing and finished floor and site levels relative to previously agreed off-site datum point(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
- Reason:** To ensure the hereby approved dwelling is not artificially raised, to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.