
Site Address:	30 Sandy Beach Estate, Hayling Island, PO11 9RG		
Proposal:	Proposed extensions to dwelling including front and rear balconies, second floor habitable accommodation, changes to fenestration.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/23/00475	Expiry Date:	31/08/2023
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Carveth		
Agent:	Mr Jenkins	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Coast Architecture Ltd		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to an existing two storey flat roofed detached dwelling located within the private Sandy Beach Estate, at the eastern end of Hayling Island. The site is the last and most southerly dwelling located on the eastern side of the Estate, and backs onto the Sandy Point Nature Reserve which is designated AONB, SSSI and SPA. The defined urban boundary (Policy AL2 and CS17) runs along the rear eastern boundary of the site. The site also falls within Flood Zone 3.
- 1.2 Number 30 has flat roofed single storey front and side extensions, such that to the south the single storey element extends right up to the tapered boundary line. The ground floor is constructed of white render and the first floor above is clad in grey render. The main two storey bulk of the existing dwelling aligns with number 29 to the north, and the single storey front elements project forward of this.
- 1.3 To the south are some two storey flats which are accessed off Southwood Road (Cedarwood), and the building bulk of the adjacent block also align with the main application dwelling. These adjacent flats have a blank northern elevation facing the site, with windows facing west and balconies facing east - the balconies have a screening wall on their north side, preventing overlooking to the application site. Number 29 to the north, a two storey flat roofed detached dwelling, does have a series of windows in its south elevation facing the site.
- 1.4 The frontage of the site is largely hard surfaced and currently provides about 2 parking spaces. To the rear the existing garden is small - about 5.5m deep, but this is one of the widest plots on the Estate, at 11.5m wide.
- 1.5 The Estate has been constructed around a communal green area and comprises properties of a similar age and flat roofed style, however many have been altered and extended and there is now little uniformity to the style or materials used. There are several examples of replacement dwellings with a second floor, and second floor additions within the estate. These generally have the upper floors stepped back and recessed and are more contemporary in design. These include numbers 25 and 20 to the north, which are both replacement three storey dwellings having gradually stepped back elevations (permitted by APP/22/01210 and APP/14/00373); and number 27 to the west (approved under APP/16/00164). Permission has also been granted for second floor additions which have not yet been implemented, at number 23 to the north under ref APP/19/00991, and at number 7 in the north-west corner under

APP/22/00125.

2 Planning History

APP/14/00804 - New ground floor single storey extension to front elevation, enlarging of existing openings to rear and new solar panels to roof., PERM,01/10/2014

APP/20/00703 - Change of use application for ground floor only from residential to Bed and Breakfast accommodation (one bedroom), first floor to remain residential use., PERM,27/10/2020

Officer Note - this does not appear to have been implemented and the applicants occupy the property as a single family dwelling

3 Proposal

3.1 Proposed extensions to dwelling including front and rear balconies, second floor habitable accommodation, changes to fenestration.

3.2 During the course of determining this application amended plans have been submitted reducing the footprint of the second floor extension to provide a more recessive addition which has resulted in a change to the design. The revised proposal includes replacing the first floor conservatory in the north eastern corner with an extension of the same dimensions, as well as a 2m deep first floor balcony, supported on corner posts overhanging the ground floor. A front 2m deep first floor extension over part of the ground floor front projection is also proposed. The second floor addition is set off both sides by 0.5m and back from the front elevation by between 3m and 1m, with a front and rear balcony. A mix of contemporary materials including both vertical and horizontal cladding and render is proposed, with aluminium windows.

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)

CS12 (Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB))

CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)

CS16 (High Quality Design)

CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Chichester Harbour Management Plan (2019 - 2024) Third Review

Policy 1 - Conserving and Enhancing the Landscape

Policy 2 - Development Management

Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Joint Supplementary Planning Document, July 2017

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy - on original submission

Recommendation - Objection: overdevelopment of the site and third storey considered to be harmful to the immediate setting of the AONB, notwithstanding a similar upward extension at No. 20 Sandy Beach Estate and others consented elsewhere in the estate.

A site visit was made 31.7.2023 and having regard to the Policy framework* below, the proposed works, would have an adverse impact to the setting of the AONB, which is easily appreciated when walking the shoreline public footpath.

As originally constructed, these two storey, art deco styled, detached dwellings would have had a simple, pleasing uniformity of appearance as a set piece development. Most have now been heavily altered, with some also building structures on the roof/sun deck, which has disturbed the previous simple uniform skyline.

The site directly abuts the Sandy Point Nature reserve to the east which is part of the AONB, also having SSSI designation. There are no trees in the immediate vicinity of the common boundary with the SSSI to visually mitigate any impact.

Two storey flats ('Cedarwood') lie to the south, arranged as two blocks, with detached house lies to the north.

The applicant proposes to build over the top of the front extension built under 28434/1 and also a fully 3 storeyed addition to the rear, creating balconies and a further floor of accommodation. The new areas of masonry would be white render faced, with existing light grey cladding at first floor level taken off and new balcony balustrades to be in horizontal timber boarding (except to the rear/east where they appear to be clear glazed panels), returned around the corners onto part of each side elevation, with side privacy screens to each balcony end. Grey fascias would cap the top roof and supporting columns to the balconies. Some of the balconies would be recessed.

Internally, the stairwell is to be reconfigured, to allow the ground floor accommodation to be seemingly split away from the rest of the other accommodation. The ground floor layout is rather perplexing, with the south-east corner either accessible via a rear (ramped) entry point, or via a peculiar route through the new bootroom/WC/lobby space/bathroom! The bedroom is a very strange shape and only lit by a small window, being added to the side element built under 28434/1, albeit this was the same shape of bedroom approved under APP/20/00703. A rather large 'study' is retained at the west side of the ground floor, which could be accessed externally or internally.

No supporting statement, other than proposed flood risk mitigation, has been submitted to justify the submitted design solution, nor to clarify whether the bed and breakfast accommodation at ground floor level under APP/20/00703 is still intended to go ahead. The application form confirms no pre-application advice was sought from the Council.

The proposals – adding a further whole floor to the dwelling, over a large footplate, would appear to be a first at the estate, where upward additions so far have not covered the entire footprint.

This is not a trend Conservancy Officers would wish to support and in its current proposed configuration, the proposed extensions are considered to harm the setting of the AONB.

Whereas similar extensions have been consented at the Sandy Beach Estate –
No. 20 – APP/14/00373 – 2-6-2014 (and later variations to original consent)
No. 27 – APP/16/00164 – 11.4.2016
No.23 – APP/19/00991 – 15-11-2019
No. 7 – APP/22/00125 – 5-5-2022
No. 25 - APP/22/01210 – 30-3-23

And whilst it is clear the economic life and integrity of many of these houses is seriously compromised, prompting the redevelopment option, this officer still considers these to have been retrograde decisions.

This sad trend seems to have started with No. 24, where despite permission having been refused 2-9-1982 under reference 30563 for a flat roof observatory/conservatory, this seems to have been allowed at Appeal.

Adverse harm is concluded to the AONB, in terms of the purposes of its designation, which is to conserve and enhance natural beauty.

The Conservancy leaves matters of neighbour amenity impact to the Council to assess, especially the impact on 7 & 9 Cedarwood, adjoining to the south.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy - on revised plans

Recommendation – Objection maintained: notwithstanding the adjustments made to the upper bulk of the scheme, overdevelopment of the site is still concluded and third storey considered to be harmful to the immediate setting of the AONB, notwithstanding a similar upward extension at No. 20 Sandy Beach Estate and others consented elsewhere in the estate.

Officer reasoned justification

See comments made 14.8.2023. Cosmetic alterations to fenestration now proposed do not alter those comments made.

The Conservancy is still none the wiser as to whether this is a single dwelling or a mixture of dwelling and holiday accommodation.

County Ecologist

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information and I have therefore carried out my own non-exhaustive desk-based assessment using the application documents, online sources and GIS mapping. The site is situated immediately adjacent to parts of the Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site and Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The close proximity of the application site to these internationally and nationally designated sites raised the potential for construction phase impacts arising from noise and visual disturbance, airborne and waterborne pollution, and fire. The potential risk of disturbance to overwintering bird species associated with the adjacent SPA/Ramsar can be avoided by the timing of works to avoid the period 1 October to 31 March. Alternatively, construction activities can be monitored to ensure that noise levels at the location of the sensitive receptor are limited to 69dB LAMax, potentially achieved through the use of acoustic fencing. The eastern site boundary abuts an area containing the Priority Habitats 'Lowland Heathland?' and 'Lowland Dry Acid Grassland?', both at high risk of fire. Whilst the application red line boundary is not likely to contain these protected habitats, there is clearly a risk of construction activities resulting in impacts.

I am content that the dwelling itself is not likely to be of ecological value for e.g. roosting bats or nesting birds. There is however clearly potential for the redeveloped site to incorporate measures to enhance biodiversity such as the installation of nesting features for e.g. Common Swift or roosting opportunities for bats. I would like to see a proportionate number of such features in the extended dwelling.

If you are minded to grant permission, can I suggest that all ecological avoidance measures are secured through a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). The CEMP should include full details of how development works will proceed whilst ensuring that the nearby designated sites, their qualifying species (over wintering birds) and protected habitats are not impacted. This will include full details of: control of noise and visual disturbance; control of airborne and waterborne pollution; control of fire. The CEMP should clearly state the roles and responsibilities for those managing its implementation.

Prior to the commencement of any development activities, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include full details of: control of noise and visual disturbance; control of airborne and waterborne pollution; control of fire; roles and responsibilities for those managing its implementation. Reason: to protect biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Natural Environment & Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, NPPF and Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

Southern Water

It appears that the developer is intending to build close to a public foul sewer which is crossing the site. Building over a "public sewer" is not normally permitted by Southern Water. An investigation of the sewer is required to confirm its size and depth, ascertain its condition, number of properties served and potential means of access before any decision can be made as to whether it would be acceptable for Southern Water to allow building close to the sewer.

The length of sewer to be built over under the terms of Part H of the Building Regulations dictates that the matter is determined by the sewerage undertaker, which in this case is Southern Water. The conditions and application associated with the build close-to a public sewer are available at Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk

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.

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

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

To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk and please read our New Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link:

southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

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

***Officer Note** - the sewer runs north/south in the rear garden, approximately 2m from the rear of the house. Whilst the majority of development is as an upward extension with no change to the footprint of the dwelling, the supporting posts for the rear balcony would be approximately over the sewer and hence a pre-commencement condition for a build over agreement is recommended.*

Natural England - initial response

NO OBJECTION - SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATE MITIGATION BEING SECURED

We consider that without appropriate mitigation the application would have an adverse effect on the integrity of Chichester and Langstone Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) or destroy the interest features for which Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) has been notified.

In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, Natural England advises that the following mitigation measures are required / or the following mitigation strategy should be secured:

- Submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

We advise that an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.

Natural England's further advice on designated sites/landscapes and advice on other natural environment issues are provided in their full response.

Natural England - following submission of CEMP

DESIGNATED HABITATS SITES – NO OBJECTION SUBJECT TO SECURING APPROPRIATE MITIGATION

This advice should be taken as Natural England's formal representation on appropriate assessment given under regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). You are entitled to have regard to this representation.

With regard to European Sites, Natural England does not object to the granting of this permission subject to the advice given below.

Your appropriate assessment, dated 8th April 2024, concludes that your authority is able to ascertain that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions.

The application is supported by a Construction Environmental Management Plan, the details of which are outlined in your appropriate assessment. Natural England advises the 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 approved CEMP should be secured via an appropriately worded condition attached to any planning consent and shall be adhered to at all times, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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: **10: 3 Objections and 7 letters of Support**

Comment	Officer Comment
Objections:	
Concerns about balcony over looking garden; the height of the property would also impact privacy and light.	See section 7
The balcony to the front of the property would affect a neighbour and the light will have impact to their property with the proposed height.	

30 Sandy beach estate abuts the boundary fence with no gap so a third floor will overpower the adjacent 2 floor block of flats which only has a 1.5m path down the side; too big, too close; proposed balcony will look directly into garden; most properties on the Estate are 2 stories so a third is out of line	Upper floors not above single storey side section that abuts boundary - above first floor element only, and recessed in - see section 7 many have third floors - see section 7
too much front and rear balconies and second floor habitable accommodation too much and would impact our property; would overlook and noise pollution with noisy works impacting our property;	see section 7 Noise of construction not a material consideration - Informative can be added
Supports:	
fully support this exciting development; proposed development is welcome and a good example of what future developments in the area may look like; would rejuvenate and upgrade this section of the estate with modern architecture that blend well with existing buildings and the natural landscape; style does not disrupt the skyline or impact the AONB; only slightly taller than before; privacy is maintained with views to the east made the most of; in line with other recent builds/renovations and will contribute to overall aesthetics of the estate; hope the build will take into account any impact on nesting birds, wildlife etc and mitigate accordingly; will not have any impact on the nature reserve; wonder if all the privacy screens are necessary - personally think they interrupt the views; use of permeable surfaces for the drive and outside spaces to help mitigate runoff; similar to other permissions;	Noted

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 AONB
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking
- (v) Flood risk
- (vi) Impact on Habitat Sites and Ecology
- (vii) CIL

(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. The previous permission for B&B accommodation was not implemented and the site is a single family dwelling (C3 use). The proposed floor plans do indicate that the existing ground floor kitchen and living space would in part be retained and duplicated by new kitchen and living spaces on the proposed second floor. The agent has confirmed that the dwelling would remain a single family dwelling and this ground floor space may be occupied by a relative in the future, on an ancillary basis as an 'internal' annexe only. Any future independent occupation or holiday use of this ground floor accommodation would require a separate planning application in the future.

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

7.3 Given the mixed character of the Sandy Beach Estate with other examples of second floor additions to previously flat roofed dwellings, the principle of the proposed addition is considered appropriate. The design retains the flat roofed theme of the estate with contemporary design solution including windows with a horizontal emphasis and alternate material blocks, that would make a bold visual statement in street scene terms. But given other contemporary external appearances, then this is not considered inappropriate to the context of the site. There are also some other examples of more contemporary materials and timber cladding within the estate, and as such the use of such materials would not be inappropriate to the visual appearance of the area.

7.4 By virtue of the first floor 2m forward extension, the second floor addition will have the appearance of being set back and recessed. Together with the insets off the side elevations, the overall silhouette of the front and side elevations would appear recessed or "wedding tier", as others on the estate have achieved. This particular dwelling is already one of the widest, on one of the widest plots on the estate. As such the building bulk is greater than some, but nevertheless the stepping in and back of the proposed second floor achieves a more recessive top floor that respects similar negotiations on other plots.

- 7.5 It is acknowledged that Chichester Harbour Conservancy have objected to the proposed third storey which they consider to be harmful to the immediate setting of the AONB. However it is the opinion of the LPA that the long distance views from the east across the nature reserve include a hard edge of development in the form of the strong linear line running north-south made up of the rear of the properties in Sandy Beach Estate, 242 Southwood Road, and Treloar Road further to the north. The scale and skyline of these properties varies from two storey developments with pitched roofs, to the flat roofed two storey properties in Sandy Beach estate, some with part 3 storey projections, and bungalows with pitched roofs. Arguably the scale, mass and bulk of the block of flats at Cedarwood at the southern edge of the Sandy Beach Estate has the most dominant silhouette and visual impact on these long distance views from the AONB. But the skyline and edge of development is varied and not uniform.
- 7.6 It is considered that the proposed height at 8.2m would not be dis-similar to the height of the pitched roofs of other two storey developments and in particular the Cedarwood flat development to the immediate south, and would therefore blend with that overall skyline - it would not project above or visually jar with the general scale of surrounding development. The second floor addition would be set off the southern boundary by about 2.5m and this separation would help to soften its long distance appearance and help it appear more visually recessive than the first floor below. Given a very similar silhouette of three storey property has been approved and is under construction at number 25, just 1 dwelling to the north, then it is the opinion of the LPA that given the context of the site the proposed development would not be harmful to the wider skyline views, nor the natural beauty or setting of the AONB when viewed from the east.
- 7.7 Overall the amended design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the estate in which it is sited, and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policies CS12 and CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) and adopted Design Guide SPD. It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality or setting of the AONB.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 Number 29 to the north has a series of side windows facing the site, and the amended plans re-site and step the first floor front extension away to the southern end of the application dwelling, to give maximum separation from number 29. As such the additional first floor bulk would be over 5m from the shared boundary and unlikely to have any adverse impact on the outlook from these windows. This front extension would however be forward of the east elevation of the flats to the south. The separation would be about 4.5m and being due north of the flats would not be overly enclosing or lead to a loss of light. The elevation of the front extension has a raised parapet effect, creating a screen to the balcony. Therefore it is considered that any views down into the gardens of the flats from the front balcony would be limited.
- 7.9 On the rear elevation the only new projection would be the addition of two 2m deep balconies, supported on posts and with side timber screens to 1.8m high, which can be conditioned to be provided and retained. These rear balconies would only be slightly deeper than the flats own balconies, the closest of which is also screened with a brick wall, and as a result it is considered that there would be minimal direct overlooking to the sides and private gardens of the neighbouring dwelling and flats. Generally the views and outlook from the proposed balconies would be over the nature reserve and sea.

- 7.10 The new first and second floor side windows have all been shown as high level only, such that they would be above internal eye height which would prevent any overlooking.
- 7.11 Overall it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the other flats within Cedarwood, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.12 The site currently has 3 bedrooms and the proposal would result in 4 bedrooms and as such 3 on site parking spaces are required to meet the adopted Parking SPD. The site frontage cannot easily accommodate a third space, but it is noted that as the last dwelling in the estate, the site is opposite a turning head which is also used for overflow parking on the estate. This is a private road, and presumably able to be used by all residents. None of the third party comments note parking as an issue. Whilst the proposal does not strictly comply with the Parking SPD, it is not anticipated that there would be any material harm to highway safety or neighbouring amenity from the lack of on site parking to serve the extended dwelling.

(v) Flood risk

- 7.13 The site lies in flood zones 2 and 3 and as a householder extension with only upper floor development, there would be no increased flood risk to occupiers of the house - arguably escape routes would be improved. A flood risk assessment has been submitted indicating that during proposed works new electrical sockets would be installed so that they are a minimum of 600mm off the internal finished floor level. Overall it is considered that there would no increased flood risk as a result of the development.

(vi) Impact on Habitat Sites and Ecology

- 7.14 The site is located adjacent a nature reserve designated a SPA, SAC, RAMSAR and SSSI, and part of the beach is a brent geese support site (site H81). Following Natural England's guidance a Construction Environment Management Method Statement has been submitted addressing how noise and disturbance from the construction process would be mitigated. This includes no works that exceed 69db LAMax being carried out between 1st October and 31st March when the birds are overwintering; dust control measures; storage of materials and equipment to prevent spillages/dust etc.
- 7.15 A Habitats Regulations Assessment was then undertaken, which noted that as extensions only, there would be no additional significant effect arising from either recreational pressures or water quality, and that the impacts from any noise and visual disturbance and construction impacts would be adequately mitigated by the submitted CEMP, which can be conditioned.
- 7.16 Natural England were consulted on the HRA AA and raise no objection.

- 7.17 In terms of ecology, the Councils Ecologist is satisfied that the dwelling itself is not of ecological value but requests that measures to enhance biodiversity are included, such as nest boxes. Whilst this is laudable, as a householder application for extensions only, this is not considered proportionate to the development, especially considering this was not required on the recent permission for the replacement dwelling at number 25.

(vii) CIL

- 7.18 The floorspace increase of the proposal is only about 66sqm and therefore less than 100sqm which does not trigger CIL.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed extensions at first and second floor level are considered acceptable in principle, and appropriate to the character and design of the Sandy Beach Estate, and their impact on the character of the area and AONB would not be harmful. It is considered that the proposal would have a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00475 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:

1:1250 Location Plan
Flood Risk Assessment
Flood Risk Mitigation
Proposed Plans & Elevations - Drawing Number 101 Rev C
Construction Environment Management Plan dated 20-03024

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.

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 Prior to the commencement of development, the details of any Build-Over Agreement and/or measures to be undertaken to protect the public sewer crossing the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Southern Water). The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the adequate protection of infrastructure having due regard to Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) policies CS19 and DM10 and the National Planning Policy Framework. This is a pre-commencement condition as it goes to the heart of the permission.

- 5 Privacy screens of 1.8m in height shall be provided on both sides of both hereby approved rear balconies prior to the first occupation of the hereby approved extension, and retained as such thereafter. The screens shall comprise either slatted timber that results in a non-see through solid material screen, or frosted glass that provides a degree of obscuration no less obscure than that which is provided by Pilkington's Texture Glass Obscuration Level 4 (or equivalent).

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.

- 6 All details of the hereby approved Construction Environmental Management Plan dated 20-03-24 shall be strictly adhered to at all times. No percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (i.e. plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dbAmax - measured at the sensitive receptor - the nearest point of the SPA or any supporting habitat) shall be undertaken on site within the bird over wintering period, from 1st October to 31st March inclusive.

Reason: To protect the habitats of the adjacent SPA designated site H81 and the SSSI, RAMSAR and SAC, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011.