

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing garage, addition of first floor with associated ridge raising, ground floor side extension, two storey front extension and addition of single garage.
LOCATION:	23 Bracklesham Road, Hayling Island, PO11 9SJ
REFERENCE NO:	APP/25/00197
APPLICANT:	Mr Shoebridge
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	26/09/2025
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	11/05/2025
WARD:	Hayling East
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:	Approve with Conditions

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a bungalow located to the north-west of Bracklesham Road in Hayling Island. The Application site features both a front, side and rear garden, and to the southern side of the dwelling is a detached single garage. The bungalow's materials feature beige brickwork and a brown concrete gabled roof.
- 1.2 The application site is in an urban and residential area, with the character of the street featuring an mix of dwellings; with three storey dwellings with modern and contemporary designs, two storey dwellings to the north of the property and some bungalows in evidence on the street scene

2. Planning History

Is there any planning history relevant to the current application?

No relevant recent planning history.

3. Proposal

- 3.1 Demolition of existing garage, addition of first floor with associated ridge raising, ground floor side extension, two storey front extension and addition of single garage.

Officer comment: *The rear works and side extension works have been reduced in height and footprint during the application process and the double garage has been amended to be a single garage in a different location, owing to concerns about its impact upon visual amenities and to neighbouring properties. Planting has also been proposed to the rear of the curtilage of the application site.*

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

CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS15 (Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk)
DM8 Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Listed Building Grade: N/A
Conservation Area: N/A

5. Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Ecologist HBC

Ecologist comment on 07/05/2025:

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information. I have therefore carried out my own non-exhaustive desk-based assessment using the application documents, site photographs provided by you, online sources and GIS mapping. The proposed works will entail substantial disruption to roof materials and to any roof void/s below. The roof tiles appear generally sound and are of interlocking concrete design. The wooden soffit area is in poor condition, with potential large gaps/holes on the rear of the building.

In this instance, I would request some recent, good-quality photographs of the building. These should clearly show all elevations, the roof and particularly the soffit. This will enable me to provide a more well-informed view as to the suitability of the dwelling for supporting legally protected species such as bats.

Should photos prove inconclusive or demonstrate that features potentially suitable for bats are present, then I would recommend that the applicant provides an ecological assessment, 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. An ecological assessment will determine whether there is any evidence of protected and notable species, and whether the proposed works are likely to result in impacts to those species. Unless the qualified ecologist can 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 will be required prior to determination of any 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, 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 Local Planning Authority prior to determination, particularly in the case of protected sites, habitats and species, which are a material planning consideration. This will enable the Local Planning Authority to determine the application on the basis of full knowledge about the potential ecological impacts of the proposal and to ensure that any impacts can and will be mitigated.

Officer Comment: *The Council's Ecologist was sent over the relevant site photos and on 01/07/2025 stated:*

Further Comments Received

I think this one looks OK – can't see anything obvious from the images – the dwelling is in poor repair but the roof, soffit and fascia appear sound.

Southern Water

From reviewing the submitted documents, If the applicant is proposing to use the existing connection, Southern Water will have no objections to the works proceeding.

Councillor Mark Coates	No comments received.
Councillor Peter Oliver	No comments received.
Councillor Netty Shepherd	No comments received.

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.

Number consulted: **9** addresses consulted

Public comments - Number of representations received: **4**: third parties have objected (with numerous comments).

Comments (some summarised) – multiple objection comments by 4 third parties:	Officer comments:
Overshadowing impacts	This is assessed in section 7 of the report.
Overbearing impacts	See above.
Out of character	See above.
Noise from the construction	This is not a planning issue and any statutory nuisance can be addressed with Environmental Health.
Request for amendments to the rear of the dwelling to make the proposal more neighbourly	The original design has been reduced in footprint to the rear and side.
Red line error	This has been amended during the application process.

No garage elevations originally provided	Provided during the application process.
Description is inaccurate	The description has been considered appropriate for this application.
Plans are missing neighbouring windows	Noted but windows assessed on site.
Trees will be removed – not stated on application form	The tree removal would not require consent.
Parking not shown on plans	The amended site plan shows parking in accordance with Parking Standards.
Request bathroom window be obscure glazed and fixed shut with only a top-hinged fanlight for ventilation.	The bathroom window is now proposed to be obscure on the plans and is assessed in section 7.
The rear bedroom window should be changed from double opening to single pane & be obscure glazed. This bedroom already benefits from a main window on the side elevation, providing main source of light, therefore a reduction in size on the rear window will not adversely impact occupiers of this bedroom.	The separation distance to rear properties and overlooking is assessed in section 7.
Rear works will lead to an unacceptable increase in the sense of enclosure	This is assessed in section 7.
Poor Design and Overdevelopment of the Plot	The proposal is not considered to be poor design or overdevelopment. See section 7.
Detached Front Garage Out of Character with the Street scene. Generous set back on this side of the road would be harmed.	The double garage has been amended to be a single garage and its siting is now considered acceptable.
Request for Screening Measures	The site plan has been amended to reflect this.
Precedent & Planning Context - Current proposal, particularly in relation to the rear extension's projection & front garage, is excessive & requires revision.	Each application is considered on its own planning merits. Other matters are considered in part 7.
Materials are out of keeping	The materials considered acceptable with reference to the wider streetscene.
Garage design would be overshadowing and overbearing	The double garage has been amended to a single garage & is better sited, this is assessed in section 7.
Officer Comment: Comments received regarding the superseded plans which	

<i>reduced the rear elements height to approximately 2.7 metres:</i> Amendments do not address the objections made in our original representations. Concern that Street scene elevations Dwg. No. A122 and revised A115.1. are misleading and inaccurate: The street view shown in the lower left part of dwg. No. A115.1 shows three houses in isolation with no other neighbouring houses on either side of the street. This is one of the important street scenes that will be adversely affected. No windows are shown on our house. A hedge is shown on the road frontage. The effect of the treatment of the hedge on submitted drawing is to disguise the appearance / impact of double garage proposed in the front garden. Hedge is shown to be 2.1m high to the west of the drive entrance and 1.6m high to the east of the drive entrance. Drawing may reflect the height of the current Lonicera hedge, unlikely that it will be maintained as existing because it is in poor condition and unattractive as well as protruding onto the pavement. Any replacement hedge will take many years to establish - no information on height it would be. Hedges at adjacent houses are significantly lower. No planning controls regarding the removal, replacement, or future retention of the hedge, so misleading to submit drawing not reflecting the proposed boundary treatment. Three additional documents have been uploaded that are labelled as 'amended' but it is not clear what has changed in the proposal. The two sets of documents (initial proposal and amended proposal) do not show the same information so it is not possible to compare them to see what has changed. We have been asked to comment by 16 July but do not know what has changed so it is not possible to make any comment. I regard this as	Continued objection noted. Concerns noted however the full context of the proposals have been assessed on site. See above. See above. The removal of the hedge would not require planning permission, and it has not been considered appropriate to impose a planning condition to maintain/replace it. See above. The original plans were amended regarding the rear works, to reduce the height to approximately 2.7 metres.
--	---

unfair and feel that this undermines the planning process. If there has been an amendment to the proposal we should be able to understand what has changed so we can comment on the amendment The most recent street scenes are hugely misleading - fail to illustrate the positioning & indeed impact of the proposed development on numerous properties to the back of the plot. In fact, the street scene provided creates the illusion that there are no properties to the rear of the plot The extension of the property beyond the current bungalow will be overbearing and significantly affect the privacy for the inhabitants of these properties. In fact, the removal of the existing screening by the new owners has already (redacted) which is now visible from Bracklesham Road (which it was not before). I was hoping that revised plans might include some provisioning of screening, but disappointing to see no real material changes made to the plans. Officer Comment: <i>The plans were later amended to reduce the footprint to the side and rear which was readvertised:</i> Request to lessen size of single garage as existing single garage is smaller Materials are out of keeping Fence south of dwelling - contrary to a restrictive covenant for the properties on this side of Bracklesham Road, whereby fences in front gardens are not permitted. Bracklesham Road hedge – drawings A111 and A116 suggest Bracklesham Road frontage boundary will be defined by a hedge. Existing hedge is in very poor condition & a condition should be attached to any planning permission granted to require its replacement	Concerns noted, however a full set of proposed plans have been provided. The street scene illustrates the Bracklesham Road frontage. Impacts on properties to the rear have been fully assessed on site and are considered in part 7. Screen planting has been added to the amended plans. The existing garage size would not accord with Havant Parking SPD. The design & neighbour impacts of the single garage are assessed in section 7 The materials are considered acceptable with reference to the existing streetscene. The fence would not border a highway and would not need planning permission. Covenants are not a planning consideration. It has not been considered reasonable or necessary in this case to impose a planning condition for the front hedge.
---	---

Trees – drawing A111 states there is no impact on existing trees. There is a mature Pittosporum tree located in the north-east corner of our garden that is immediately to the rear of the proposed garage. We request a condition requiring further details to be submitted for approval of measures to be taken to protect roots of this tree during construction. There is a large apple tree in the applicant's front garden which, whilst in need of pruning, will help to minimise the impact on the streetscene of the proposed development, we request a condition is imposed to protect the tree from damage during construction.	The apple tree is not under a tree preservation order and could be removed at any time. Trees are considered to be acceptably impacted by the works.
--	---

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) Parking
- (vi) Ecology
- (vii) Flood Risk

(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 The works would be readily visible in the streetscene, and would result in very significant re-design of the existing dwelling.

7.4 The existing bungalow would be converted to a two-storey house as a result of the works.

7.5 Regarding the significant re-design of the bungalow to a two-storey dwelling, Policy CS16 states that development "*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*".

7.6 Bracklesham Road is noted to feature a diverse streetscene, with properties to the north featuring a more traditional two storey pattern of development, and properties to the east of the application site featuring a very eclectic mix of two and three storey dwellings with contemporary and traditional materials and roof forms. Whilst the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD desires works to be in keeping with the existing

property, it is noted that the works would significantly change the character and appearance of the dwelling. However, given the wider mixed character of the street and varied house types, the proposal needs to be considered in this varied context. As such it is considered that the proposals can be assessed in this wider context. The proposed alterations to form a two storey dwelling with contemporary detailing and materials would lead to the appearance of a contemporary house. The lower side and rear elements would appear as subservient elements to the main building. It is considered by officers that the proposed development would have an acceptable appearance in the existing context and that the dwelling would have a cohesive appearance.

- 7.7 Regarding the proposed addition of a first floor with its associated ridge raising, the existing bungalow is noted to feature an approximate 4.7 metre ridge height, which as a result of the works, would be increased to feature an approximate ridge height of approximately 7.1 metres. Whilst this would be a significant increase of height, it would be in keeping with both No.25 Bracklesham Road to the northeast and No.21 Bracklesham Road to the southwest, and moreover, it is noted that the streetscene features a mix of one, two and three storey dwellings and this increase of height is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character of the application site and upon visual amenities.
- 7.8 The proposed demolition of the existing garage is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character of the application site and upon visual amenities.
- 7.9 Regarding the proposed ground floor side extension, it would with the combination of the works, appear as a contemporary side extension in addition to the dwelling. With reference to its modest footprint, with a proposed approximate height of 2.7 metres, a proposed approximate width of 2 metres and a proposed approximate depth of 9.7 metres, it is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character of the dwelling and upon visual amenities.
- 7.10 Regarding the proposed two storey front extension, It would increase the bulk to the dwelling and increase its prominence. Whilst officers note, that the two storey front extension would modestly extend beyond the established building line of the western side of Bracklesham Road, noting that only a very modest part of the dwelling would breach the building line in relation to the road, officers do not consider this to have such an unacceptable impact to warrant the refusal of this planning application, and on balance consider it acceptable.
- 7.11 Regarding the proposed addition of a single garage. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states "*Garages and car ports should not project forward of the building lines*". Whilst the garage would be in a prominent location and would be readily visible on the streetscene, it would be of a more modest footprint than the double garage proposed under the superseded plans and would not extend beyond the established building line of the road. With regards to this, the proposed single garage is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character of the dwelling and upon visual amenities.

Materials

- 7.12 The application form states that white render and grey cladding would be used for the external walls and the roof would feature slate effect tiles. With reference to the proposed palette, and with reference to the eclectic mix of materials, adjacent to the application site this palette is not considered to detract from the streetscene. Regarding the proposed garage, the agent has stated "*Walls, white render to match*

house, Windows and doors grey composite to match house, Roof high performance grey membrane/felt and Fascias and gutters to match house". This is considered to be an appropriate palette and would not detract from the streetscene.

- 7.13 The design and appearance of the proposal is on balance 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) 2011. It is considered on balance that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.14 To the southwestern, northeastern and western side of the application site are Nos 21 Bracklesham Road, No.25 Bracklesham Road and Nos 16 and 17 Pagham Garden's. Properties to the front of the application site are considered to be acceptably impacted owing to a sufficient separation distance. The proposed demolition of the existing garage on the application site is considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties.

No.21 Bracklesham Road

- 7.15 To the southwestern side of the application site is No.21 Bracklesham Road. The first floor element of the works and two storey front extension which would feature a raised ridge height, of approximately 7.1 metres would be at minimum approximately 7.5 metres from No.21's curtilage and would be at minimum approximately 12 metres from No.21's rear elevation. The two storey element of the works would also be positioned forward of No.21. Regarding this, officers consider this separation distance as acceptable and consider that the two storey element of the works would have an acceptable impact regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns.
- 7.16 Regarding overlooking concerns, there would be oblique views provided by the rear fenestration (west), and views facing the public realm from the front fenestration (east), however this is considered acceptable. There would be 2 No. side windows on the first floor, however, these windows would face No.23's front/side garden, and officers consider on balance that any oblique views of No.21's rear garden, would not be so significant to warrant the refusal of this planning application.
- 7.17 Regarding the proposed side extension, and associated works to the rear, regarding the removal of the pitched roof, there would be an immaterial change of potential overlooking, to the rear and side of No.23 Bracklesham Road, and officers consider this as acceptable. Regarding overlooking and overbearing concerns, the minimum separation distance of the ground floor works to No.21 Bracklesham Road, would be approximately 1.5 metres. At approximately 2.7 metres, the rear/side element of the works, with consideration of the modest height, is considered to have an acceptable impact upon No.21 Bracklesham Road. Regarding the proposed single garage, it would feature no fenestration facing No.21, and it is considered acceptable regarding overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, the existing garage, which abuts No.21's boundary would be removed, the proposed single garage, would at approximately 2.6 Metres height face approximately 3.3 metres of No.21's garden, whilst there would be an increase of overshadowing and overbearing in this location, officers in consideration of the reduced impact from this single garage which would be flat roofed, and the reduced extent of No.21's garden which would be impacted, find this acceptable.

No.25 Bracklesham Road

- 7.18 The proposed side extension and proposed single garage would not impact No.25. The proposed two storey front extension would feature fenestration facing the public realm and no fenestration directly facing No.25, which is considered acceptable. Given that there are owing no side windows on No.25's southern elevation, the two storey front extension is considered acceptable regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns. The proposed addition of a first floor with a raised ridge height has been considered important to assess. Regarding overlooking concerns, there would be no side fenestration facing No.25, and rear windows at the first floor level would at most provide oblique views of No.25 which is considered acceptable, the first floor rear bathroom window has also been shown as obscure which will be conditioned if permission is forthcoming, and overlooking concerns are considered as acceptable from these rear first floor windows.
- 7.19 Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, whilst the first floor would significantly increase the bulk of No.23 Bracklesham Road in proximity to the clear side fenestration of No.25's conservatory and would have a significant increase in an overshadowing impact and sense of enclosure of this fenestration, officers have considered the reduction in bulk from the altered ground floor to the rear of the two storey element. For approximately 6.2 metres of the rear element to the two storey aspect of the works, there would be the removal of the previous pitched roof, thus significantly lessening a sense of enclosure and bulk abutting the common boundary of the two properties. Whilst there would be an increase in overshadowing of the side fenestration of the conservatory, owing to the two storey element of the works, being in close proximity, the removal of the pitched roof of the original bungalow, officers on balance consider there to be an immaterial change in overshadowing and the sense of enclosure that would result from this proposal, and on balance consider the first floor element of the works to have an acceptable impact.

Nos 16 and 17 Pagham Garden's

- 7.20 The single storey elements of the works would acceptably impact these properties, owing to the proposed fenestration facing these properties, facing common boundary treatment and due to a minimum separation distance of approximately 12.8 metres of any single storey works to these properties. It has been considered important to assess the impact of the first floor addition above the existing dwelling. Side fenestration at first floor level (south), would not face these properties, which is considered acceptable. The rear fenestration at first floor level would be approximately 19-22 metres from the rear boundary and approximately a minimum 26 metre separation distance to the rear elevations of these properties, and the agent has amended the site plan to feature hedging and trees to be planted to the rear of the application site, this would meet the 20 metre requirement between rear first floor to rear first floor windows and this is considered acceptable under the Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(v) Parking

- 7.22 The application would reduce parking space on site. This would require 2 parking spaces to be provided on site to accord with the Havant Parking SPD. The site exceeds this requirement, with two spaces plus a garage shown and the proposal is

considered to accord with Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the Havant Parking SPD and is considered acceptable in this regard.

(vi) **Ecology**

- 7.23 Following an assessment the Council's Ecologist raises no concerns regarding the proposals in relation to protected bat species and the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(vii) **Flood risk**

- 7.24 The application site is noted to be in Flood Zone 3. The agent has provided a flood risk assessment form which states "that the floor levels would be set no lower than existing floor levels and that flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where appropriate", given the nature of the development officers consider this acceptable.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle, and is on balance 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 Planning be authorised to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION for application APP/25/00197

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:

Email named: Confirmation of garage materials by Mr Murray: Uploaded 10/10/2025
Drawing Number: A111 V8: Amended proposed site plan and location plan: Uploaded 17/09/2025

Drawing Number: A112.1 V8: Amended proposed ground floor plan: Uploaded 10/09/2025

Drawing Number: A113 V8: Amended proposed elevations: Uploaded 10/09/2025

Drawing Number: A114 V8: Amended proposed section plans: Uploaded 10/09/2025

Drawing Number: A117 V8: Amended 45 degree angle/retained walls/sight line/ stair section plan: Uploaded 10/09/2025

Drawing Number: A118 V8: Amended proposed garage elevations and floor plans:
Uploaded 10/09/2025
FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT: Uploaded 28/08/2025

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 and in the email by Mr Murray named: Confirmation of garage materials: Uploaded on 10/10/2025, 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. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the works hereby permitted the bathroom window in the first floor on the west elevation shall feature textured glass with an obscuration level of no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall be 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. The additional driveway space shown on the approved drawings, shall be constructed of either porous materials, or shall provide provision to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse and shall subsequently be retained in that condition.

Reason: In the interests of avoiding flood risk and providing sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) in Havant Borough and having due regard to policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework

6. The landscaping works shown on the approved proposed site and location plan: drawing number A111: Uploaded 17/09/2025 shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be grown to and retained at a minimum of 3 metres in height unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning authority. The landscaping shall be implemented in the first planting season following first occupation of the extensions hereby permitted, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 ,CS16, DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives:

1. 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 were updated about issues after the initial site visit.

2. During the application process, Southern Water has left the following comments:

From reviewing the submitted documents, If the applicant is proposing to use the existing connection, Southern Water will have no objections to the works proceeding.