

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	Bidbury Lawn, Bidbury Lane, Havant, PO9 3JG		
Proposal:	Erection of two storey rear and side extension and single storey front extension, alterations to fenestration and associated works		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/01019	Expiry Date:	14/02/2025
Applicant:	Jarred Gibbons		
Agent:	Mr Potter	Case Officer:	Jennie Fox
	James Potter Associates		
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 Bidbury Lawn is a detached three storey property set within extensive grounds to the north of Bidbury Lane. The application site is roughly triangular in shape, with a private gated entrance from Bidbury Lane to the south at the narrowest point. The site widens to the north as well as sloping upwards with the main dwelling approximately 13m from the northern boundary at the end of a long driveway that runs parallel to the south-west boundary. The frontage has otherwise been laid to lawn and the lawned area continues around the dwelling to the east and north. There are a number of small outbuildings clustered around the north and west boundaries on paved terrace areas, including a double carport to the south-west of the main dwelling. The main dwelling is finished in brick and hung tiles with a plain clay tile gable ended pitched roof and white cottage style uPVC fenestration. The property has previously been extended with a one and a half storey addition to the west that has modern style anthracite grey bifold doors at ground floor. The boundaries of the site are heavily planted and include TPO groups to the north, west, and south-east as well as individual TPOs.
- 1.2 The application site is within a residential area comprised of one and two-storey dwellings in a variety of style and materials. The properties to the north are part of a modern estate, however the application site and properties to the east, south, and west lie within the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. The Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2019) notes that the area is distinguished by surviving networks of lanes and streams and a generally irregular development pattern, which includes a number of listed buildings and TPOs. The application site is not listed, but has been identified as a Building of Local Interest and is therefore a Non Designated Heritage Asset.

2 Planning History

02/59646/006 - Remove a limb overhanging Edward Gardens from a Eucalyptus tree.,
RNO,07/10/2002

02/56946/007 - Erection of 5 bedroom detached dwelling with integral garage with
access to Bidbury Lane., REF,13/02/2003

01/59646/004 - Notification of intention to remove 1 limb, 2.4 metres - 3.1 metres (8-10
foot) above the ground on the northern sector of a Willow tree at Bidbury Lawn,
Bidbury Lane within Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, WD,23/04/2001

97/59646/001 - Reduce and raise crown of two Willow trees, Scots Pine tree and
Eucalyptus tree on northern boundary to the rear of No 5 Tulip Gardens subject to
Group 1 TPO 496. PERM.02/02/1998

97/59646/002 - Reduce crown and height of Beech tree, Monterey Cypress trees and Western Red Cedar trees on northern boundary to the of No 6 Tulip Gardens subject to Group 1 TPO 496, PERM,02/02/1998

97/59646/003 - Reduce crown and height of Beech trees, Western Red Cedar trees and Leylandii trees on northern boundary at the rear of No 7 Tulip Gardens subject to Group 1 TPO 496, PERM,02/02/1998

03/59646/008 - To reduce height by 50% of 4 Leylandi trees and to reduce height by 40% and reduce crown radius on the northern sector of 5 Beech trees within Old Bedhampton Conservation Area., RNO,11/06/2003

03/59646/009 - To reduce by 33% 8 Leyland Cypress trees within the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area., RNO,12/06/2003

03/59646/010 - Erection of a 3 bedroom detached dwelling with an integral double garage utilising the existing access to Bidbury Lane., REF,04/08/2003

05/59646/011 - Treeworks., WD,22/09/2005

05/59646/012 - Tree works., UNK,

07/59646/013 - Retention of wrought iron fence (height 2.02m) and gates along the south and part of the south west boundary of the site., PERM,23/04/2007

07/59646/014 - Application to carry out works to trees subject to TPO 0496 as detailed in the schedule. , PERM,16/04/2007

01/59646/005 - Fell a willow tree at Bidbury Lawn, Bidbury Lane within Old Bedhampton Conservation Area., RNO,01/06/2001

APP/10/00104 - Fell 1No. Pear tree, 1No. Cherry tree and 1No. Silver Birch tree and crown raise to 4m 2No. Silver Birch trees and 1No. Acer tree, all within Old Bedhampton Conservation Area., RNO,09/06/2010

APP/11/00217 - Cut back 4No. Monterey Cypress trees (east side) by 2m to boundary and cut back 1No. Beech tree (east side) by 1m to boundary. All subject to TPO 0496., PERM,06/06/2011

APP/11/01879 - Reduce height of Leylandi hedge to rear of No. 7 Tulip Gardens to 5m, within Old Bedhampton Conservation Area., WD,02/02/2012

APP/12/00107 - Tree Works. , UNK,

APP/12/00241 - Reduce 1No. Eucalyptus to previous pruning points and rebalance crown and fell 1No. Eucalyptus (suppressed), both trees within Group Order 1 of TPO 0496., PERM,01/06/2012

APP/12/00433 - Reduce height of Conifers to northern boundary to 6m; pollard 1No. Windblown Willow at primary fork; crown lift trees including Birch, Cherry, Eucalyptus, Acer and Mulberry to 4m. All trees within Bedhampton Conservation Area., RNO,07/11/2012 15:42:33

APP/12/00881 - Construction of an open-fronted double oak garage with log store and bike shed, incorporating the felling of one conifer and the following works which are covered under separate planning approvals (APP/12/00241 and APP/12/00433): the crown raise of 1no. Mulberry, the felling of 1no. Eucalyptus and the pollarding of 1No. Eucalyptus to original fork. , PERM,08/11/2012

APP/12/01172 - Removal of 2No. Conifers, 1No. Eucalyptus, 1No. Cherry and 9No. Yucca trees, within Old Bedhampton Conservation Area., RNO,14/12/2012

APP/12/01179 - Crown thin 1No. Willow by 10% within Group 2 of TPO 0496., PERM,20/12/2012

APP/16/00913 - Crown lift 1No. Ash (T7) above footway to 3.5m, reduce limbs above carriageway by 5.1m and crown reduce by 2m. Reduce limbs above carriageway by 5.1m and above footway to 2.3m 1No. Field Maple (T6). Reduce limbs around street lighting to provide 1.5m clearance. Reduce limbs above carriageway by 5.1m and above footway by 2.3m for trees within G3 of TPO 1526. , PERM,28/10/2016

APP/20/00120 - Crown reduce height of 1No. Eucalyptus by upto 20m, leaving crown height of 12m. Within conservation area of Old Bedhampton., RNO,01/04/2020

APP/20/00545 - Crown reduce east sector of 1No. Lawson Cypress (T1 on plan) by up to 1.5m or to old pruning points and crown reduce height by up to 5m to leave an overall height of 8m; Crown reduce northern and eastern facing branches of 1No. Beech (T2 on plan) by up to 1.5m or back to boundary edge, cut to growth points to leave a natural shape. Within conservation area of Old Bedhampton.,

3 Proposal

Erection of front porch, front canopy, two storey rear/side extension, and associated works.

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)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Old Bedhampton

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Tree Team

The application proposed is sighted extremely close to a group of trees that are important within the area and in my opinion, it would result in an unsustainable competing relationship between trees and the proposed new kitchen area.

In addition to this Section 5.3 of BS5837:2012 recommends that the default position of structures should be outside of the defined RPAs, and further recommends that justification for demolition or construction work abutting or within the RPAs should be provided if the default position cannot be accommodated.

While justification has been provided by the applicants Arb Consultant there are other options available on site to provide space for an extension without developing within RPAs - giving greater space between built structure and trees.

Based on the above I object to this application.

Officer Comment

Th proposals have been revised since this comment was made and the Arboriculturalist has provided an updated response.

Arboriculturalist, Tree Team

Further to the revised plans and our Teams discussion earlier I offer the following comments:

The proposal has been resubmitted as part of my previous concerns regarding the impact on existing trees and while still not 'perfect' in pure Arb terms (due to there still being a minor incursion into A/B Class RPA) on balance and with the full AIA being conditioned I feel that the application should not be detrimental to the health of the trees if it is followed fully and Arb supervision on site for the works within the RPA is undertaken.

No objection and please if permission is granted would you attach the following condition.

The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement and British Standard BS5837: 2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations).

Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity value afforded by the trees in question and in accordance with policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Officer Comment

A condition has been included as per the recommendation above.

Conservation Officer

Site / Location

The application site comprises a large, C20 two-storey, detached property set with substantial grounds. It is located within the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area – Character Area 1 (Historic Settlement). To the east of the site is a Grade II listed building – The Manor House.

Legislation

When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken in consideration.

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Conservation Area, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

National Planning Policy Framework (revised December 2024)

Chapter 16 of the NPPF relates to the Historic Environment including paragraphs 195 – 214. The building subject to this application is not listed but is deemed to be a non-designated heritage asset (as set out in the introduction) and therefore the following paragraphs are most relevant to the determination of this application:

Para 212 states that:

'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation

(and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance’.

Para 214 states that:

‘Where a development will result in substantial harm to, or total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, permission should be refused, unless this harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits, or a number of criteria are met. Where less than substantial harm is identified paragraph 208 requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development

Para 215 states that:

‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’.

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011 and Allocations Plan 2014)

Policy CS11 – Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of the Havant Borough

Policy CS11 (4) states that planning permission will be granted for development which: ‘Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough’s statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest’.

Policy CS16 – High Quality Design

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states that:

‘Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site’.

Integrates with existing local landscape features, promotes wildlife and biodiversity and/or applies characteristics of the local area into the design of a scheme wherever possible to create variety and interest;

Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;

Is well connected to and integrates with the immediate local area and the wider area by linking to existing pedestrian and cycle routes and encouraging people to use public transport where possible; and

The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

Policy DM20 (Allocations Plan) - Historic Assets

Policy DM20 states that;

'Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that conserves and enhances the historic assets of Havant. It also states that application which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets are expected to provide a Heritage Statement that:

1. Describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise and where necessary original survey, at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal.
2. Sets out the impact of the development on the heritage assets and mitigation that is proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage asset, including where possible positive opportunities to conserve and enjoy heritage assets.

Assessment

The proposal is to renovate and enlarge the dwelling. This includes the addition of a front porch and canopy and a two-storey side and rear extension.

The proposed front porch and canopy are of an attractive, traditional design with exposed oak and clay tile roof materials. The proposed rear extension would eradicate what is currently a unique elevation with the inclusion an attractive curved wall to house the staircase with separate pitched roof and replace it with a bland, almost windowless elevation with minimal character. However, the proposed rear extension would not result in specific harm to the significance of the conservation area and it is noted that the chimney stack would remain, which is supported.

Of more concern is the proposed side extension, as it would appear that the extension has been designed from the inside out to maximise floorspace, resulting a contrived appearance. The extended dormer on the front elevation of the side extension, appears overly dominant for the roof slope in which it would be set into. The side (west elevation) appears top heavy and overly bulky, bearing little relationship with the architectural form of the main house.

For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset (the Old Bedhampton CA). It would therefore not meet the test set out in S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("1990 Act"), nor the relevant policies in the NPPF and Local Plan.

Conclusion

OBJECTION

Officer Comment

Th proposals have been revised since this comment was made and the Conservation Officer has provided an updated response.

Conservation Officer

Site / Location

The application site comprises a large, C20 two-storey, detached property set with substantial grounds. It is located within the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area – Character Area 1 (Historic Settlement). To the east of the site is a Grade II listed building – The Manor House.

Legislation

When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken in consideration.

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Conservation Area, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

National Planning Policy Framework (revised December 2024)

Chapter 16 of the NPPF relates to the Historic Environment including paragraphs 195 – 214. The building subject to this application is not listed but is deemed to be a non-designated heritage asset (as set out in the introduction) and therefore the following paragraphs are most relevant to the determination of this application:

Para 212 states that:

‘When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance’.

Para 214 states that:

‘Where a development will result in substantial harm to, or total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, permission should be refused, unless this harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits, or a number of criteria are met. Where less than substantial harm is identified paragraph 208 requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development

Para 215 states that:

‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’.

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011 and Allocations Plan 2014)

Policy CS11 – Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of the Havant Borough

Policy CS11 (4) states that planning permission will be granted for development which: ‘Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough’s statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest’.

Policy CS16 – High Quality Design

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states that:

‘Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site'.

Integrates with existing local landscape features, promotes wildlife and biodiversity and/or applies characteristics of the local area into the design of a scheme wherever possible to create variety and interest;

Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;

Is well connected to and integrates with the immediate local area and the wider area by linking to existing pedestrian and cycle routes and encouraging people to use public transport where possible; and

The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

Policy DM20 (Allocations Plan) - Historic Assets

Policy DM20 states that;

'Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that conserves and enhances the historic assets of Havant. It also states that application which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets are expected to provide a Heritage Statement that:

1. Describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise and where necessary original survey, at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal.

2. Sets out the impact of the development on the heritage assets and mitigation that is proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage asset, including where possible positive opportunities to conserve and enjoy heritage assets.

Assessment

THIS IS AN UPDATED RESPONSE FOLLOWING PREVIOUS COMMENTS PROVIDED ON 14/2/25 AND FOLLOWING THE SUBMISSION OF AMENDED PLANS.

Following concerns raised with the previous scheme in that it was too bulky and top heavy, the scheme has been amended to now propose a full, two-storey side extension with dual gable end. Whilst this extension is still on the larger side, it is a cohesive design and addresses the previous concerns. The previous objection to the application is now removed and it is concluded that the proposal would not result in harm to the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area.

It would therefore meet the test set out in S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("1990 Act"), and the relevant policies in the NPPF and Local Plan.

Conclusion

NO OBJECTION

Councillor Liz Fairhurst - Bedhampton

No comments received.

Councillor Michael Lind

No comments received.

Councillor Phillipa Gray

No comments received.

County Archaeologist

Thank you for your consultation. The proposal is of relatively small scale and the location is marginally outside the historic core of the settlement. On that basis I would not raise any archaeological issues.

Ecologist, Planning Policy Team

Thank you for consulting me on this application.

The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Phillips Ecology, February 2025) and a Bat Roost Assessment (Phillips Ecology, June 2025). Following an initial assessment which identified various potential bat access, egress and roosting features a series of three bat emergence surveys were carried out in May and June 2025. These surveys confirmed the presence of roosting Common Pipistrelle (four bats), Serotine (one bat) and Brown Long-eared Bat (two bats).

This development will affect bats, which receive strict legal protection under UK law by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (commonly referred to as the Habitats Regulations). Where development affects a European protected species (EPS), permission can be granted unless the development is likely to result in a breach of the Habitats Regulations and is unlikely to be granted a licence from Natural England to allow the development to proceed under a derogation from the law.

Will the development result in a breach of the EU Directive?

Yes, the proposed development will directly impact bat roosts.

Is the development unlikely to be licensed?

An EPS licence can only be granted if the development proposal is able to meet three tests:

1) the consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment?; (Regulation 53(2)(e))

2) there must be 'no satisfactory alternative? (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and

3) the action authorised 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range? (Regulation 53(9)(b)).

It is for you as the case officer to assess the proposals against the first two tests ? you may wish to ask for further information from the applicant. If the development is ordinarily acceptable in planning terms then the first two tests can be met. In order to assess the development against the third test, sufficient details must be available to show how killing / injury of bats will be avoided and how the loss or damage to bat roosts will be compensated.

A mitigation strategy has been provided, detailing specific measures to avoid harm to bats during the construction works and to provide compensatory roosts and enhancement features within the development. I would support these measures and, on the basis of the information currently available, and if you are satisfied that the first two tests can be met, I am confident that the development is not unlikely to be licensed. I would recommend that LPA's engagement with the Habitats Regulations is detailed in your report. It is for the applicant and their appointed agents to ensure that the requisite licence is obtained.

Provided that the proposed mitigation measures are implemented, I would have no concerns over these proposals. If you were minded to grant permission, I would simply suggest that the measures are secured through condition of any consent.

Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological enhancement measures within the Bat Roost Assessment (Phillips Ecology, June 2025) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to provide ecological enhancement in accordance with the Environment Act 2021, NPPF, NERC Act 2006 and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

Officer Comment

The proposals have been assessed against the relevant tests and a condition has been included in line with the above recommendation.

Environment Agency

No comments received.

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: 2

Statutory advertisement: 17/01/2025

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
The proposed two story extension will potentially directly overlook the currently private garden of Tulip Gardens. The trees from Bidbury Lawn have been allowed to overgrow and now are too high and also hang over the fence into the garden. If this extension is to go ahead, the trees require professional Tree Surgery so that they provide a screen to hide the new building which will be closer to the fence boundary. This should be	Following revisions, all first floor windows looking towards Tulip Gardens to the north are to be obscure glazed and fixed below 1.7m above finished floor level to avoid potential overlooking. The existing TPO group to the north is mature, as noted, and currently provides screening. Whilst works to the trees are not included within this application, any future works would be subject to agreement with the Local Planning Authority as the trees are part of a TPO group and within a conservation area.

done before the proposed development takes place.	
---	--

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 Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and on a Non Designated Heritage Asset
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Impact on Trees
- (v) Impact on Ecology
- (vi) Developer Contributions
- (vi) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and on a Non Designated Heritage Asset

7.3 The proposal comprises a two storey rear and side extension as well as a front extension replacing the front porch and canopy, internal works and alterations to fenestration. The property currently has four bedrooms, although it is noted that the fourth bedroom is extremely small. The proposals would not increase the number of bedrooms, but would provide larger floor areas with en suite bathrooms and walk in wardrobes as well as an office space that could potentially be used as an additional bedroom. This would, however, not increase the requirements for parking provision as set out within the Havant Borough Council Parking SPD (2016), and it is also noted that the site contains ample parking space within the existing driveway and car port. At ground floor the proposed additions and internal reorganisation would provide a new playroom, plant room, and larger open plan kitchen/diner. The proposals were substantially revised following initial concerns raised regarding the bulky form of the additions as originally submitted as well as their proximity to a TPO group and neighbouring properties to the north.

7.4 Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 requires that new development responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site. Policies CS11 and DM20 of the of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 seek to protect and, where appropriate, enhance the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to Conservation Areas.

7.5 In terms of the impact of the proposals on the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and on the dwelling as a Non Designated Heritage Asset, the council's Conservation Officer has been consulted and has raised no objection to the revised proposals. The Conservation Officer noted that the revisions address the contrived and top-heavy appearance of the originally submitted design.

7.6 The existing porch is semi circular in shape and there is a small existing oriel window above the porch which is truncated in height due to the design of the porch roof. The proposed front extension would be located in approximately the same position as the existing porch but would be rectangular, extending to the west and relocating the

entrance door to a central position with a width of approximately 2m and a length of 8.4m. The additional floorspace to both sides of the entrance door would create a cloakroom and informal sitting area within the entrance hall. The roof would pitch back to the main house with three small decorative gables, with a maximum height of approximately 3.6m, and the proposals include the removal of the oriel window, which would be replaced by a casement window to match existing fenestration. The proposed front extension would form a cohesive design with the other proposed additions, giving the property a symmetrical appearance centred around the entrance door when viewed from the front. The proposed front extension is therefore considered to be acceptable.

- 7.7 Following revisions, the proposed two storey extension to the rear would mirror the design of the original host dwelling, so that the property would have a double hipped roof joined by a small flat roofed area. This design would then be extended to form the two storey side extension, replacing the existing one and a half storey extension. The proposed rear extension would be a maximum 5.2m in width, with a height of approximately 8.1m, and would maintain a gap of approximately 8m to the rear boundary. The addition would extend approximately 21.2m across the existing rear of the host dwelling and the side extension. The proposed side extension would be approximately 6.8m wide with a bay window to mirror the existing frontage. Given the generous size of the application site and how well screened it is, the proposals would not be readily visible from the public realm and are therefore deemed to have a limited impact on the streetscene and the Conservation Area. The proposals are overall considered to be acceptable.
- 7.8 The materials proposed would be brickwork, hung tiles, roof tiles and fenestration to match the host dwelling. The proposed canopy to the front elevation would be oak framed, again with brick bases to the posts and roof tiles to match existing. The proposed materials are therefore considered to be in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the local area and are deemed to be acceptable.
- 7.9 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy). It is considered that the scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, in accordance with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the tests in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 To the north of the site is Tulip Gardens, Nos. 5, 6, and 7 are bungalows bordering the application site. It was noted during a site visit that the application site is set approximately 1.1m lower than Tulip Gardens, as indicated on the proposed elevations, and is separated from the estate by 1.8m high close-boarded fencing that is not visible from within the application site due to the dense boundary planting. No. 7 is situated to the east, would not be directly behind the proposals, and its view towards the application site is partially obscured by an existing pitched roof garage. The proposals are therefore deemed to have a minimal impact on No. 7. However, Nos. 5 and 6 would be immediately to the north of the proposed two storey extension.
- 7.11 No. 5 Tulip Gardens has a rear door and small area of garden facing the proposed side extension. Its main garden is to the east and there are two outbuildings in between this property and the proposals. Therefore, although this property is the closer of the two, there would be no direct views from the proposals to any principal windows or the main private amenity space. No. 6 has south facing windows serving a bedroom, bathroom, and kitchen, with the bathroom and kitchen having been obscure glazed. The lounge of No. 6 has been extended and faces west into the garden. Given the difference in site levels, the proposals

would not result in a significant reduction in light or outlook, however concerns were raised regarding potential overlooking from the proposed first floor bedroom windows to the garden of No.6 as this would be only 8m away, particularly during winter months when the existing boundary planting is less dense. Following discussions with the agent, it has been agreed that all first floor north facing fenestration would be made obscure glazed and top opening only and this will be secured by a condition. In light of this, the impact to Nos. 5 and 6 is now deemed to be limited and acceptable.

- 7.12 To the west are Nos. 23 and 25 Brookside Road, and Willowbrook. Willowbrook lies to the south and the proposals would not be visible from this property. Nos. 23 and 25 are at least 25m from the proposals and are well screened by an existing TPO group. As such the proposals are deemed to have a minimal impact on these properties. There are no immediately adjacent properties to the south and east of the application site.
- 7.13 Consequently, 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 properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Impact on Trees

- 7.14 The proposals would bring the building line of the dwelling closer to a TPO Group adjacent to the north boundary of the site. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement, and Tree Protection Plan have been provided and have satisfactorily demonstrated that the revised proposals accord with Policy DM8 of the HBLP (Core Strategy), with minimal encroachment of the Root Protection Zones identified and a suitable mitigation strategy suggested. The council's Arboriculturalist was consulted and a condition has been added in line with the consultation advice provided.

(v) Impact on Ecology

- 7.15 It has been established that the proposed works would result in the disturbance of bat roosts and would therefore have an impact on a European Protected Species. However, it is considered that the proposed works are likely to be granted an EPS licence if the development proposal is able to meet the following three tests, as set out in set out in Regulation 55(2)(e) and Regulation 55(9)(a) of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017):

1) the consented operation must be for preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment; (Regulation 53(2)(e))

2) there must be no satisfactory alternative (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and

3) the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range (Regulation 53(9)(b)).

- 7.16 With regard to the first two tests, the works to the roof would be intrinsic to the overall proposals. It is noted that this is an application for works to a private domestic dwelling, and therefore whilst the works would not be of public value there would be no alternative location for carrying them out.
- 7.17 A mitigation strategy has been provided, detailing specific measures to avoid harm to bats during the construction works and to provide compensatory roosts and enhancement

features within the development. The council's Principal Ecologist was consulted and has confirmed that the proposed measures are considered satisfactory, meeting the requirements of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Habitat Regulations (2017) and in accordance with policies DM8 and CS11. The mitigation measures will be secured by a condition and an informative is recommended regarding engagement with Natural England to obtain an EPS licence.

(vi) Developer Contributions

7.17 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 20 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 £80 per square metre (plus indexing) on new floorspace (measured as gross internal area) outside of Emsworth and Hayling Island.

7.18 The scheme would be Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable due to the proposed use and the appropriate forms have been submitted. The gross new internal floor space for the building has been calculated by the agent as 208 sqm which generates a total CIL liability of approximately £16,640 plus indexing. It is noted that a self-build residential extension exemption has been claimed in relation to the development.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

7.18 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and 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/24/01019 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:

Block & Location Plan 24023-PL-001 Rev. P03
Proposed Ground Floor Plan 24023-PL-003 Rev. P03
Proposed First Floor Plan 24023-PL-005 Rev. P03
Proposed Elevations 24023-PL-007 Rev. P03
Indicative 3D Visual 24023-PL-008 Rev. P03

Heritage Statement by James Potter Associates
Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Preliminary Method Statement MDJAC-BS24116-AIAPMS-01 Rev. B
Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment by Phillips Ecology, February 2025
Bat Roost Assessment by Phillips Ecology, June 2025

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used 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 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the windows in the first floor on the rear elevation facing north shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

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

- 5 Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological enhancement measures within the Bat Roost Assessment (Phillips Ecology, June 2025) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to provide ecological enhancement in accordance with the Environment Act 2021, NPPF, NERC Act 2006 and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

- 6 The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement and British Standard BS5837: 2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations).

Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity value afforded by the trees in question and in accordance with policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.