DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	**Retrospective planning application for single storey rear extension.**
LOCATION:	8 Coddington Grove, Waterlooville, PO8 9ZE
REFERENCE NO:	APP/25/00549
APPLICANT:	Mr Robert Buick
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission

CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:

APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE: 17/09/2025

WARD: Unspecified

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. Site Description

This application site comprises a two storey, detached dwellinghouse located on the south side of Coddington Grove, Waterlooville. This property has a tiled, pitched roof with brickwork to the elevations. There's a hardstanding to the front of the property allowing for on site parking and a garden to the rear of the site . The area is residential in character.

2. Planning History

Is there any planning history relevant to the current application?

No

3. Proposal

Retrospective planning application for single storey rear extension.

4. Policy Considerations

In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the Planning Considerations section of the report.

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Listed Building Grade: NA
Conservation Area: NA

5. Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Ann Briggs
No comments received

Councillor E Shimbart - Hart Plain
No comments received

Councillor James Blades
No comments received

Ecology

A single storey extension is highly unlikely to result in impacts to bat flight paths. In the context of the surrounding development, I would not consider this to be a tangible impact on bat habitat.

6. Publicity and Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Local Code of Corporate Governance and the Statement of Community Involvement.

Neighbouring properties consulted (as defined by the Statement of Community Involvement) 9

Public comments - Number of representations received:

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the retrospective planning application APP/25/00549 for a single-storey rear extension at 8 Coddington Grove, Waterlooville, PO8 9ZE.
As a resident [redacted text], I am deeply concerned by this development for several reasons, including the lack of adherence to established planning processes, its significant detrimental impact on visual amenity, the creation of an overbearing sense, loss of light, and potential ecological implications.

It is noted that this is a retrospective planning application, with construction having commenced prior to the submission and determination of this application and notably, continued since the requirement for a planning application was made. This demonstrates a clear disregard for established planning procedures. Furthermore, I understand that Permitted Development Rights for Class A (The enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse) of the Town and Country Planning Act have been specifically removed for the Woodcroft Farm Development site. This means that even an extension that might ordinarily fall under permitted

development would require a full planning application. The fact that this extension was commenced and largely completed without seeking the necessary planning permission, despite the removal of PDRs, highlights a significant breach of planning control and shows a complete disregard for the specific regulations applicable to this development and the interests of the neighbours.

My specific grounds for objection based on material planning considerations are as follows:

1. Detrimental Visual Impact and Character:
The extension, as built, is significantly larger and higher than depicted in the block plan, and its actual appearance creates an imposing presence. The height and distinct roof design do not match the existing buildings within the estate and are fundamentally out of character with the established aesthetic. This incongruous design and substantial bulk create an overbearing and dominant visual impact, contributing to a feeling of an "oppressive rigid city atmosphere" rather than complementing the existing wholesome rural estate character.

2. Overbearing Nature and Loss of Amenity:
Due to its considerable height and proximity to our property and other neighbouring dwellings (particularly those to the east and west), the extension creates a palpable sense of being overlooked and overshadowed. Its sheer scale and massing result in an oppressive feeling and a demonstrable loss of amenity for us and our neighbours, impacting the enjoyment of our private outdoor spaces.

3. Significant Loss of Light and Overshadowing:
The height and substantial size of the extension demonstrably block natural sunlight to our property and the gardens of neighbouring properties, particularly those to the east and west. This overshadowing will lead to a significant reduction in light levels, negatively impacting the usability and enjoyment of these areas throughout the day and year.

4. Ecological Impact–Disruption to Bat Flight Paths:
Our estate is known for its bat population, and we regularly observe bats using the air space now occupied by this extension as a recognised flight path. The construction of this extension directly obstructs and displaces this established route. Given that bats are a protected species, I urge the Council to fully investigate this ecological concern and consider whether the development impacts their protected flight paths or access to for aging areas. An ecological assessment should be requested.

5. Aesthetic Inconsistencies (Gully Traps):
Furthermore, the visually prominent gully traps appear out of place and detract from the overall aesthetic integration of the extension.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that this retrospective planning application be refused. The negative impacts on visual amenity, neighbourly amenity, light, and the local ecology are, in my view, unacceptable and contrary to sound planning principles.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,
[Redacted text]

Case officer comment : Comments above have been noted . Please see Section 7 . In regards to Ecological concerns, the Council's Ecologist has been consulted in this regard.

Material planning considerations are addressed in Section 7.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

(i) Principle of development
(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
(v) Ecology

(i) Principle of development

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

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

7.3 This proposal comprises a single storey rear extension which has already been constructed and is therefore retrospective . This has a width following that of the rear gable wall , a depth of approximately 3.3 metres and a height of 3.5 metres with a parapet roof. Within the roof are two rooflights and the space creates an enlarged lounge area with doors and windows to the rear elevation wall. Materials comprise of brickwork to match existing . There are two rooflights in the roof and doors and windows to the rear elevation leading out to the rear garden.

7.4 Whilst it is noted that properties in the surrounding area generally have not been extended and that permitted development rights for Class A developments have been removed as stipulated in Condition 23 of APP/13/00804 , the proposed extension is considered to be generally subservient in regards to its scale and design in relation to the host dwelling. It is located at ground floor height and would not be highly visible from the public realm and the area is already urban in nature in regards to building massing . There would be an acceptable amount of rear garden space retained , with a width of approximately 15 metres of garden area, meeting the 10 metres requirement as specified in the Havant Borough Design Guide.

7.5 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.6 To the east of the application site is no 10 Coddington Grove. The extension is located away from the shared boundary with no 10 and no therefore no harmful impact has been identified.

7.7 To the west of the application site is no 6 Coddington Grove . The extension is located on the side of the plot adjacent with no 6 however the properties are slightly angled away from one another and there is a reasonable degree of separation between the properties at the rear. The rear bi fold doors at no 6 are set off the side elevation wall and the extension would not breach the 45 degree line when taken from the mid point of the glazing.

7.8 To the rear of the site are nos 2 , 4 and 6 Manns Way . There would be approximately 18 metres separation distance between the extension and the rear elevations of these properties, screened by the rear boundary fence . A site visit by the case officer showed that no view could be had from the extension back towards these properties . No harmful impact in regards to overshadowing is also judged to occur as a result of the extension , which is sited at single storey height and separated from these properties by the rear garden of the site .

7.8 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). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(v) Ecology

7.10 It is noted that concerns have been raised in relation to the interruption of bat flight paths. For this reason Havant's Ecologist has been consulted and he has not raised concern in this regard.

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 Executive Head of Place be authorised to Approve with Conditions for application APP/25/00549

Conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

BUICK_01A EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATIONS AND FLOOR PLANS
Block plan uploaded on the 23.06.2025
Location plan uploaded on the 23.06.2025

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

2) 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.

Informatives:

GR1 Granted Perm Working with Applicant
In accordance with paragraphs 38-50 of the NPPF Havant Borough Council (HBC) takes a positive and proactive approach and works with applicants/agents on development proposals in a manner focused on solutions by:
Offering a pre-application advice service, and
Updating you of any issues that may arise in the processing of your application and where possible suggesting solutions, and,

In this instance:
You sought and were provided with pre-application advice,
You were updated about issues after the initial site visit,
Your application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.