
Site Address: 197 Southwood Road, Hayling Island, PO11 9PZ
Proposal: Demolition of existing chalet bungalow with single garage and replacement with new single storey bungalow with internal mezzanine and single garage.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/23/00381 Expiry Date: 18/07/2023
Applicant: Mrs Russell
Agent: Mr Murray Case Officer: Joseph Toole
 I J Murray Associates Ltd
Ward: Hayling East

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

197 Southwood Road, Hayling Island, is a detached chalet bungalow located to the back of the row of houses to the north of Southwood Road. The existing bungalow comprises timber cladding, yellow render and white PVCU and fibre slates. There is also a detached garage on site in the rear corner. The bungalow is accessed via its own drive between No.s 195 and 199 Southwood Road with parking to the side.

The bungalow is located within a residential area with forms of backland development established within the immediate locality.

The application site is located within Flood Zone 2/3.

2 Planning History

84/31945 - Roof conversion and porch extension., UNK,20/08/1984

3 Proposal

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing chalet bungalow and single garage to be replaced with a new bungalow with internal mezzanine and single detached garage to the front. Two on site car parking spaces on the driveway and one within the garage would be provided on site, with the existing access from Southwood Road.

During the process of the application revisions have been made to the plans in order to provide a more suitable form of development within its context.

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

CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS21 (Developer Requirements)
CS9 (Housing)
DM10 (Pollution)
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)

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

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Building Control

No Comment.

Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design

CIL Liable: <http://www.havant.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy-charging-schedule>.
The applicant has made an application for self build relief.

This application relates to a replacement dwelling. As there is no net increase in dwellings, SRMS or Nutrient Neutrality will not apply.

Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East

No Comment.

Councillor Mark Coates

I therefore officially Red Card this application with a view to catching up with you at your convenience, after you have had a look at the detail? As I wrote to residents, my concern is primarily with the significant, negative change in outlook, particularly for those neighbours directly adjacent to the South and East boundary of the new build.

Officer Comment

The Councillor's Red Card has subsequently been removed due to the amendments to the proposed plans.

Councillor R Raines - Hayling East

No Comment.

Ecologist (1)

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information. Whilst I would not expect the dwelling to be of significant ecological importance, features such as gaps within roof materials may be suitable for protected species such as roosting bats and the proposed works will result in the disturbance of roof materials and any void/s below. It is not currently possible for me to determine whether such features are present.

In this instance I would be happy to review recent, good-quality photographs of the areas of the dwelling to be affected. This should include roof tiles, soffit/fascia areas and any roof void interior areas. This should enable me to provide a more informed view of the potential for protected species to occur. Should photos prove inconclusive or show that suitable features for protected species are present, then I would recommend that the applicant commissions an ecological assessment. This should comprise as a minimum a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA), to be provided by a qualified ecologist. The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (www.cieem.net) holds a database of suitably qualified ecologists. A preliminary ecological appraisal will determine whether there is any evidence of protected habitats or species or whether the site offers habitat suitable for supporting protected species, and whether the proposed works are likely to result in impacts to those habitats or species.

Unless the qualified ecologist is able to conclude that there is no reasonable likelihood of protected species being present (due to negligible potential) or that if present they are not to be impacted by the works, it is likely that further ecological survey work (Phase 2 survey) will be required prior to determination of the application. The results of any further surveys should be used to provide an assessment of the likely ecological impacts of the proposed works and to inform any mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures.

NPPF, Circular 06/2005 and Natural England Standing Advice on Protected Species, require that planning decisions are based on full, up-to-date ecological information and it is essential that all necessary survey, assessment and mitigation information is available to the LPA prior to determination, particularly in the case of protected species, which are a material planning consideration. This will enable the LPA to determine the application on the basis of full knowledge about the ecological impacts of the proposal and to ensure that any impacts can and will be mitigated, and are acceptable.

Ecologist (2)

Based on the photographs provided I am content to agree that the likelihood of bats being present and impacted is very limited. The small building is in poor condition overall, but from the images provided I would suggest that the overall structure does not exhibit suitable bat roosting features.

If you are minded to grant permission can I suggest that an informative note is added to any permission, reminding the applicant of the legal protection afforded bats and that the proposed work should be carried out sensitively to ensure that impacts continue to be avoided. For example:

Bats and their roosts are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. All work must stop immediately if bats, or evidence of bat presence (e.g. droppings, bat carcasses or insect remains), are encountered at any point during development works - should this occur, further advice should be sought from Natural England and/or a professional ecologist.

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No Comment.

Environment Agency (1)

In the absence of an acceptable flood risk assessment (FRA) we **object** to this application and recommend that planning permission is refused.

Reasons

The submitted FRA does not comply with the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 20 to 21 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change planning practice guidance and its site-specific flood risk assessment checklist. The FRA does not therefore adequately assess the flood risks posed by the development. In particular, the FRA fails to:

- consider how people will be kept safe from the identified flood hazards
- consider how a range of flooding events (including extreme events) will affect people and property
- consider the requirement for flood emergency planning including flood warning and evacuation of people for a range of flooding events up to and including the extreme event
- take the impacts of climate change into account for the 2123 1 in 200-year (0.5% AEP) flood event using the Upper End climate change allowance.
 - There is no assessment of the impact of climate change using appropriate climate change allowances 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances']
 - Flood risk mitigation measures to address flood risk for the lifetime of the development included in the design are inadequate because they will not make the development resilient to the flood levels for 2123 1 in 200-year event (0.5% AEP) using the Upper End climate change allowance. Consequently, the development proposes inadequate:
 - Raised finished floor levels
 - Resistance and resilience measures
 - Safe access and egress routes

Overcoming our objection

To overcome our objection, the applicant should submit a revised FRA which addresses the points highlighted above. If this cannot be achieved, we are likely to maintain our objection. Please re-consult us on any revised FRA submitted and we'll respond within 21 days of receiving it.

The applicant needs to submit an FRA which considers the 2123 design flood level. The design flood level should consist of:

- 1 in 200 year (0.5% AEP) flood level
- Climate change until 2123 using the Upper End climate change allowance
- A suitable freeboard.

Once the design flood level has been calculated, the applicant will need to compare this level against development proposals.

Climate change allowances:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>

Environment Agency freeboard guidance:

<https://www.gov.uk/flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-research-reports/accounting-for-residual-uncertainty-an-update-to-the-fluvial-freeboard-guide>

Advice to the Local Planning Authority

If you are minded to grant permission against our advice, please contact the Sustainable Places Advisor named below before making a formal decision to discuss the conditions and advice that we would wish to apply to this proposal.

In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (Ref. ID: 20150415), please notify us by email within 2 weeks of a decision being made or application withdrawn. Please provide us with a URL of the decision notice, or an electronic copy of the decision notice or outcome.

Advice to Applicant

If the Applicant would like any further detailed advice we would be happy to provide this subject to a charge.

As part of this service you would have a dedicated project manager to coordinate the advice from different teams within the Environment Agency. It would also include bespoke technical and planning advice if you request this. This will allow you to have greater clarity about the assessments you need to accompany your planning application and certainty about whether the development is acceptable to us before you resubmit.

Signing up for flood warnings

The applicant/occupants should phone Floodline on 0345 988 1188 to register for a flood warning, or visit <https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings>. It's a free service that provides warnings of flooding from rivers, the sea and groundwater, direct by telephone, email or text message. Anyone can sign up.

Flood warnings can give people valuable time to prepare for flooding – time that allows them to move themselves, their families and precious items to safety. Flood warnings can also save lives and enable the emergency services to prepare and help communities.

For practical advice on preparing for a flood, visit <https://www.gov.uk/prepare-for-flooding>.

To get help during a flood, visit <https://www.gov.uk/help-during-flood>.

For advice on what to do after a flood, visit <https://www.gov.uk/after-flood>.

Advice to the Local Planning Authority and Applicant

Flood resistance and resilience

We strongly recommend the use of flood resistance and resilience measures. Physical barriers, raised electrical fittings and special construction materials are just some of the ways you can help reduce flood damage.

To find out which measures will be effective for this development, please contact your building control department. If you'd like to find out more about reducing flood damage, visit the Flood Risk and Coastal Change pages of the planning practice guidance. Further guidance on flood resistance and resilience measures can also be found in:

Government guidance on flood resilient construction

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/flood-resilient-construction-of-new-buildings>

British Standard 85500 – Flood resistant and resilient construction

<https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail/?pid=0000000000030299686>

Please do not hesitate to contact me using the contact details shown below should you have any queries regarding the above information.

Environment Agency (2)

The submitted information does not address our earlier concerns.

We therefore maintain our objection set out in our previous response dated.

Please do not hesitate to contact me using the contact details shown below should you have any queries regarding the above information.

Environment Agency (3)

Following the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment we remove our objection to the proposed development. The proposed development will only meet the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements in relation to flood risk if the following planning condition is included.

Condition – Implementation of Flood Risk Assessment

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and the following mitigation measures it details:

- The flood resilience measures listed within the Flood Risk Assessment shall be incorporated into the development.

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason

- To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants The condition is in line with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change.

Hampshire Highways

In regard to application APP/23/00381, as the application is for 5 dwellings or less, there is no required change of vehicle access onto the highway, and the development does not access directly onto a classified road, HCC's Highway Standing Advice should be referred to in the first instance. This can be viewed via the following link under the heading Consultation with the Highway Authority - <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/consultation>

However, in regard to the application, having undertaken an initial review, there would be no objection to the proposals from a highways perspective. There will be no increase in anticipated vehicle movements to / from the site as it is a replacement, not new dwelling, and adequate space is afforded for parking which includes space on-site to turn and enable forward gear access and egress. Access into site from the highway is also to remain unchanged.

Norse South East, Operations Director

No Comment.

Waste Services Manager

No Comment.

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: 15

Number of site notices:1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 5

Comment	Officer Comment
Original Plans	Amended plans have been provided
Loss of privacy	
Loss of light and overshadowing	
Negative affect on the environment and nature conservation	
The removal of hazardous materials	
Overdevelopment of the site	
Out of keeping with the area	
Dominate our garden space	
Close to neighbouring boundary	
Flooding concerns	
Impact the value of our property	
Asbestos in roof	
Bats living in the property	

Concerns with overlooking into our private amenity space - windows should be reduced in height Proposed vehicle turning is too small - with area to the front being used which would cause concerns with fumes, noise and safety concerns Boundary should be brick Contrary to planning policy Driveway does not confirm it is permeable Drainage concerns Impact on outlook	
Revised Plans 1 Width of the drive approaching the garage is too narrow Hedging issues Still concerns with overdevelopment Max-height roofline is too large and overbearing No attempt at reducing the max-height of extended roofline No real attempt to move the property back (north) which would reduce its impact on neighbours No addressing of water run-off Garage roof overhanging concern Concerns with turning area due to introduction of boundary fences No need for loft space, should be flat roofed Adverse impact on daylight/sunlight Fencing should be installed on their side	Amended plans have been provided

Reviewed solar study and it would block out light in June The property should be moved to the north Significant impact on the value of my property Property insurance concerns Wish for new boundary fence south of the proposed building to be of brick construction Fumes and danger of vehicles turning would have an adverse impact on the use of our garden space	
Revised Plans 2 Overdevelopment contrary to policy 5 metre high wall less than 1 metre away from the boundary and runs along the garden Not inkeeping with the character of the area and imposing mass Not permitted development Loss of light and cause overshadowing Turning area concern No mention of drainage to avoid flooding Concern with overlooking from mezzanine windows Suggestion to create a stepped roofline on the west side Displacement of bats Unacceptably close to our garden appearing overbearing with an increase in footprint If approved there should be suitably high fencing along the boundary	Amended plans have been provided

Revised Plans 3	No comments received
------------------------	----------------------

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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Impact on future occupiers
- (v) Flood risk and Drainage
- (vi) Access and parking
- (vii) Ecology matters
- (viii) CIL

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. As the proposal is for a replacement bungalow the principle of residential development on the site is established.

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

7.3 The proposal would replace an existing chalet bungalow and garage on site, both of which are in a poor condition. The replacement chalet bungalow would be contemporary in design with white Sillcon k render and Purbeck stone for the walls with lead grey single ply membrane for the roof. The windows would be grey, with an orange composite front door. The design of the proposal is considered to be appropriate within the context of the site and surrounding area, which has a mixture of house designs and styles.

7.4 The replacement chalet bungalow would be located to the rear of the application site, backing onto the shared boundary with No.52 Wheatlands Avenue. The proposed property would have a 'L' shaped design with a width of approximately 12.4 metres, a maximum depth of approximately 10.6 metres with a low pitched roof including a flat roof dormer at the mezzanine level. The proposal would have a height of approximately 5.4 metres to the top. The proposal would also involve the erection of a detached garage with a width of approximately 3 metres, a depth of approximately 6 metres and a low pitched roof having a maximum height of approximately 2.7 metres.

7.5 The proposal would be larger than the existing bungalow on the site. Although, the proposal would take up more space within its boundary it is not considered to dominate the site due to the retained amenity space and scale of development. The proposal would provide a garden area of approximately 7 metres in length which is considered appropriate within the context of the area. It is worth noting the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states the garden of a two storey home should be a minimum of 10 metres in length. As the proposal is for a single storey bungalow with a mezzanine level it is considered to provide adequate amenity space.

Furthermore, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD rule of 10 metres is dependent on the local context and historic pattern of development. It is noted No.199 to the south of the application site has a small garden space.

- 7.6 Due to the proposed replacement bungalow's location being to the rear of the properties along Southwood Road not being visible from the street scene, it is not considered to be readily visible from the public realm or have an adverse impact upon the character of the area.
- 7.7 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of 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

- 7.8 It is acknowledged that the existing property on the site results in a level of overlooking and impact on neighbouring properties, which is not unusual in a residential estate. This is material to the determination of the proposal.
- 7.9 To the front (south) facing the rear of No.199 Southwood Road the proposal would have a separation distance of approximately 10.5 metres from the shared boundary. Due to the proposal's location set back into the site, the low scale nature of the development which includes a pitched dormer roof design, a 1.8 metre high fencing along the southern boundary and a proposed detached garage along the same boundary, which would partly block views of the replacement bungalow from No.199, the proposal is not considered to appear overbearing or result in a harmful loss of outlook/light for the occupiers of No.199. As to the two high level windows serving the mezzanine area, these would be 1.7 metres above finished floor level, which are considered to be 'non-overlooking' and therefore would not result in a loss of privacy to No.199.
- 7.10 On the east side facing No.201 Southwood Road the proposed property's side wall would be offset from the shared boundary by approximately 1.8 metres. As the proposal would only extend out along the shared boundary with No.201 towards the rear end of their garden, partly screened by the 1.8 metre high fencing and pitched away it is not considered to have an adverse impact on loss of outlook, loss of light, nor appear harmfully overbearing to warrant a refusal. There would also be no side windows facing out onto No.201 therefore not causing any form of harmful overlooking.
- 7.11 On west side facing No.195 Southwood Road the proposed property's side wall would be offset from the shared boundary by approximately 1 metre. As the proposed property would only extend out along the shared boundary with No.195 towards the rear end of their garden, partly screened by the existing hedging and pitched away it is not considered to have an adverse impact on loss of outlook, loss of light, nor appear harmfully overbearing to warrant a refusal. There would also be no side windows facing out onto No.195 therefore not causing any form of harmful overlooking.

- 7.12 To the rear the proposed property would be offset from the shared boundary with No.52 Wheatlands Avenue by approximately 2 metres. The rear wall of the proposal and the rear wall of No.52 would have a separation distance of approximately 23 metres. Due to the roof design of the proposed property being pitched away from the shared boundary, being partly screened by the existing detached outbuilding at No.52 and the 1.8 metre high screening along the boundary it is not considered to have an adverse impact on loss of outlook, loss of light, nor appear harmfully overbearing to warrant a refusal. There would be ground floor windows in the proposal which would be screened by the existing detached outbuilding at No.52 and partly by the 1.8 metre fencing, as such not considered to cause harmful overlooking. At first floor level there would be a dormer with no windows. A condition for no additional first floor windows to be installed in the proposal unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority has been recommended to the decision. This would prevent any future concerns of overlooking.
- 7.13 Due to the size and placement of the proposed garage it is not considered to have an adverse impact on the neighbouring properties.
- 7.14 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011).

(iv) Impact on future occupiers

- 7.15 In terms of the living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, the proposed gross internal area needs to accord with the Government's Technical housing standards - national described space standard. From measuring the internal floor area of the proposed dwelling, it would comply with the minimum gross internal floor area for a three bed dwelling.
- 7.16 As previously mentioned the proposed property would have a rear garden with a length of approximately 7 metres. This is considered to be appropriate for a single storey property and it is worth noting there is further space around the perimeter of the property. Whilst there would be some views from the surrounding properties into the amenity space of the proposed property, it is considered to be similar to that already established on site and some views would be blocked by the proposed garage. Therefore, the scheme is considered to provide adequate private amenity space.
- 7.17 The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the future occupiers and would comply with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011).

(v) Flood risk and Drainage

Flood risk

- 7.18 The site falls within Flood Zones 2 & 3. The proposal is for a replacement dwelling, and, as such, according to national and local guidance, a sequential test is not required. However, in line with national and local policy, the applicant must demonstrate that the development will be safe over its lifetime and will not increase flood risk elsewhere.

- 7.19 A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted with the application. Following amendments to the FRA the Environment Agency raised no objection subject to a condition for the proposal to accord with the FRA provided. A condition to this effect would be recommended if permission is forthcoming. As such the proposal is considered to satisfactorily address flood risk and measures to be undertaken, complying with Policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011).

Drainage

- 7.20 The provision of foul and surface water drainage for the proposal would fall within the remit of Building Control.

(vi) Access and parking

- 7.21 As the access to the site between No.s 195 and 199 Southwood Road would remain unchanged the principle has been established and deemed therefore acceptable., as found by the Highway Authority.

- 7.22 There would be no increase in bedrooms from the existing bungalow and 3 car parking spaces can be provided on site with two on the driveway and one within the garage with adequate turning, thus complying with the Havant Borough Parking Standards SPD and Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011).

(vii) Ecology matters

- 7.23 The Council's Ecologist commented on the application initially requesting 'high quality' photographs of the property to understand whether there are any bats roosting within the existing bungalow. The photographs were provided with the Ecologist being content that the likelihood of bats being present and impacted is very limited. In view of this the Ecologist raised no objection to the proposal recommending that an informative be imposed on the decision notice reminding the applicant of the legal protection afforded bats and that the proposed work should be carried out sensitively to ensure that impacts continue to be avoided. As such, the informative is recommended to be imposed if permission is forthcoming.

(viii) CIL

- 7.24 The development is for a replacement residential dwelling and therefore CIL is liable. However, the application has been submitted with Form 7 - Self Build Exemption Claim form, which means the CIL is now not liable for the charge, subject to the relevant criteria being satisfied.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposal is replacing an existing bungalow on the site, which gives rise to a level of overlooking and impact on neighbouring properties. Therefore, the replacement of this bungalow is acceptable in principle, with the proposal's impact on neighbouring properties not materially different to that currently being experienced, which would be limited and acceptable in residential amenity terms. The proposal is also appropriate in terms of design, its impact on the character of the area and acceptable in flood risk, access/parking and ecology terms. On this basis it is recommended for approval.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00381 for the following reasons

- 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 and Location Plan - A101
Proposed Site and Location Plan - A111 V23
Proposed Floor and Garage Plans - A112 V23
Proposed Elevations - A113 V23
Proposed Site Sections - A114 V23
Proposed 3D Site Views - A115 V23
Proposed Site Overviews - A116 V23
Revised Flood Risk Assessment received 8th December 2023

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 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and the following mitigation measures it details:

- The flood resilience measures listed within the Flood Risk Assessment shall be incorporated into the development.

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants in accordance with Policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011), the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change.

- 5 The car parking 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 2021.

- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), no extension or outbuilding permitted by Classes A, AA, B, C, D or E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the 2015 Order (as amended) shall be constructed within the curtilage of the site without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the immediate locality and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

- 7 The proposed garage hereby permitted shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such and shall not be used for a separate dwellinghouse or any business, commercial or industrial purposes whatsoever.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 No additional first floor windows shall be added to the proposal hereby approved unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the immediate locality and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.