

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	66 Bedhampton Hill, Havant, PO9 3JP		
Proposal:	Proposed loft conversion to include new front gable, front and rear dormers. Existing garage to be converted to form new annexe, rear extension and construction of new garage to front of property.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00816	Expiry Date:	30/12/2024
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Scott		
Agent:	Mr Watford	Case Officer:	Selina Donophy
	WAT Design		
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 **Site Description**

This application site comprises a two storey, detached dwellinghouse located on the north side of Bedhampton Hill, Havant. This property has a pitched roof with projecting gable to the front elevation and porch at ground floor level. The property has a mock tudor facade with solar panels to the roof facing south. It is set back from the road by a large driveway and is located on a rise. The area is residential in character with the A2030 and entrance to the A3 located to the south east.

2 **Planning History**

None relevant

3 **Proposal**

Proposed loft conversion to include new front gable, front and rear dormers. Existing garage to be converted to form new annexe, rear extension and construction of new garage to front of property.

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)

DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Liz Fairhurst - Bedhampton

No comments received

Councillor Michael Lind

No comments received

Councillor Phillipa Gray

No comments received

Southern Gas Network

No comment received

Ecologist

The application is now accompanied by a Bat Roost Emergence Survey (Natalie Boote, undated but probably July 2025). A detailed external and internal inspection of the main dwelling recorded bat droppings and a number of potential bat access, egress and roosting locations. The applicant's ecologist recommended that further surveys were necessary to determine the status of roosting bats at the site. A series of three evening bat surveys were conducted in May and June 2025. No bats were observed emerging from the dwelling and it is concluded that roosting bats were absent at the time of the surveys. However, the presence of bat droppings within the dwelling during the earlier visual inspection survey indicates that roosting Pipistrelle bats are/have been present. On that basis, the dwelling is assumed to support a bat roost, albeit infrequently used.

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 a bat roost.
- *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 and enhancement strategy has been provided, detailing specific measures to avoid harm to bats during development works (to include supervised removal of roof materials and other potential roost features) and to provide compensatory roosts and enhancement features within the development (in the form of bespoke roosting features and the use of specific, safer roof membranes). I would support these measures and, based on 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 Emergence Survey (Natalie Boote, undated but probably July 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 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: 3

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
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) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (v) Parking
- (vi) CIL
- (vii) 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. This proposal includes the addition of an annexe which the applicant has confirmed would be used by an elderly relative. The rear garden would be shared with the main dwelling and services would also be shared with the main dwelling.

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

7.3 This proposal would result in the remodelling of the property with the addition of a new front gable; raising of the height of the existing gable; loft conversion with front and rear dormers; rear extension; new garage; and conversion of the existing garage to form an annexe.

7.4 Alterations to the front of the property would include a first floor extension to create an additional front gable, with a corresponding increase in height of the existing gable. The internal layout would be re-arranged. Steps would now lead up to the front entrance, with a set of doors also added serving the downstairs lounge. To the side of the lounge the chimney breast would be retained. At first floor would be three windows serving two bedrooms and an ensuite in the middle - the first floor extension would create a bedroom. At second floor level in the apex of the gables would be triangular windows serving two more bedrooms. Between the pitched roofs of the gables would be a flat roof dormer running between them which would create a bathroom served by a window in the dormer. The main roof would be built up where it is currently hipped to the side, to create a fully pitched roof. The first and second floors would retain the mock tudor style.

7.5 Alterations to the rear of the property include a rear dormer with a sloped roof with dimensions of approximately 9 metres width and 2 metres height, also with mock tudor styling. A large section of window would be placed in the middle of the property from the second to the first floor which would serve a stairwell. A first floor window would be added serving an office at the rear of the property and a single storey pitched roof rear extension is also proposed which would create an open plan kitchen/diner at the back of the house. This would have dimensions of approximately 3 metres depth, 4 metres width and 2.4 metres to eaves height and 4.8 metres to roof pitch and would feature full glazing to the rear elevation. The existing utility room would be removed.

7.6 Other changes include a new garage located forward of the property to the south west. This garage would have a pitched roof with dimensions of approximately 5 metres depth, 4 metres width and 4.3 metres height to the pitched roof. The garage would be located adjacent to the west side boundary.

- 7.7 An annexe is also proposed to the rear of the property adjacent with the west side boundary. There is currently a garage in this location however this would replace the garage and would be larger in size at approximately 10 metres depth, 5 metres width and 5 metres height to the top of the pitched roof. To the east side of the roof would be two rooflight windows as well as a set of double doors leading out from the bedroom and two doors leading out from the lounge / kitchenette. An ensuite bathroom would be located to the rear of the bedroom which would not be served by windows. The annexe would be used by an elderly relative of the applicant. The use of the annexe is deemed to be acceptable in principle with the garden and services retaining an integral link with the main dwelling however this would be regulated via planning condition.
- 7.8 The proposed alterations would result in an increase in the general bulk of the property at first and second floor levels with the extension of the roof, first floor extension and dormers. However the property is of a reasonable size, is detached and set back a considerable distance from the public highway. Within the context of the existing dwelling and its surroundings, the additions are judged to be acceptable and would not result in overdevelopment of the property. The proposed materials would be in keeping with those existing, and whilst the dormer to the rear would be generous in size, it is deemed to be subservient in appearance with the existing roof and the sloping of the dormer roof is considered to reduce the mass within the roof slope. The first floor extension and alterations to the front gable would create symmetry to the front elevation. Furthermore, it is noted that there is an eclectic mix of dwelling forms and architectural detail within the street scene. The rear extension is not considered to result in harm to the appearance of the host dwelling and would not be highly visible from the public realm.
- 7.9 The proposed garage to the front of the property would remain set back from the road, separated by an area of lawn. The garage is not deemed to result in unacceptable building mass and could easily be accommodated within the site. The staggered building line at this point of Bedhampton Hill is such that the impact of the garage is further mitigated by the bulk of dwellings located further to the west. The proposed annexe would be larger than the existing garage; however the design would remain similar to the existing garage. No material harm to the character of the host dwelling nor the wider area has been identified.
- 7.10 Overall, 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

- 7.11 To the west of the application site is no. 66A. Part of no. 66A steps forward of no 66 and it is located close to the shared boundary with the east side elevation wall set off the shared boundary by approximately 1 metre. No. 66 itself is set off the shared boundary by approximately 4 metres. The first floor extension would increase the building bulk at first floor level however there are no windows on this side of No 66A that would be affected. To the west side of no 66 the window configuration would remain the same as existing with a set of double doors added to the side elevation of the proposed rear extension facing west. The annexe would be located on this side however the impact of this as viewed from No 66A is not considered to be materially worse than the existing garage.

- 7.12 To the east of the application site is no 64 Bedhampton Hill - the separation distance between these two properties is approximately 2 metres. On this side at no. 66 one of the side elevation first floor windows would be removed. No additional windows are proposed, and whilst additional building bulk would be introduced to this side by the gable build up and raising of the ridge height this is not considered to have an overbearing effect. The single storey rear extension is proposed to this side however would not result in overshadowing to no 64.
- 7.13 To the rear of the site is no. 1B Glebe Park Avenue which has a rear garden which runs along the back of no.s 62-66 Bedhampton Hill. The rear end of the garden of no. 1B is attached to the rear of the garden at no 66. There would be a significant amount of additional glazing proposed at no. 66 including the stairwell window and dormer windows - however, whilst there would be some level of increased overlooking as a result, there are already windows at first floor level which look back towards the rear, together with other first floor windows in No. 64 which offer a similar level of overlooking. There is a separation distance of approximately 30m from the proposed dormer and the site boundary. Furthermore, it is noted also that a substantial rear dormer could be constructed to No 66A under permitted development which could have clear glazed windows, and this represents a feasible fallback position for the applicants in the event that this application is refused. Having regard to this, and the character of the area, overall the impact is considered to be acceptable to the neighbouring properties.
- 7.14 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to an unreasonable 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)

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

(v) Parking

- 7.16 There is a large driveway to the front of the property which would allow for enough on site parking to meet the requirements for the main dwelling plus the annexe (4 parking spaces).

(vi) CIL

- 7.17 The proposal would be CIL liable however self build exemption has been claimed for the annexe.

(vii) Ecology

- 7.18 An Ecological Impact Assessment and has been provided following consultation with the Councils Ecologist. It has been established that the proposed works would result in the possible disturbance of bat roosts. 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.

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

Yes, unmitigated, the development has potential to result in harm to individual bats and result in impacts to the favourable conservation status of bat species locally.

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))

The proposal would result in the improvement and alteration of a dwelling house in the built up area. The design is tailored to meet the evolving needs of the homeowner, ensuring the house remains functional and accessible. The project focuses on utilising the existing structure and providing a contemporary facelift to elevate its aesthetic appeal. This is considered to provide an overriding public, social and economic benefit and would provide a dwelling improving its function for the occupiers and improving the appearance of the area.

2) there must be 'no satisfactory alternative?
(Regulation 53(9)(a)); The proposals relate to the applicants property and the works require a comprehensive scheme to achieve the required evolving needs of the homeowner. It is not considered that the improvements sought could be accommodated elsewhere.

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)). The Councils Ecologist has confirmed in relation to the third issue that: 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. The mitigation would be secured by a planning condition.

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/24/00816 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:

04 Nov 2024 WATD-001-P LOCATION AND BLOCK PLAN, EXISTING HOUSE ELEVATIONS

04 Nov 2024 WATD-002-P PROPOSED HOUSE FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

04 Nov 2024 WATD-003-P PROPOSED ANNEX AND GARAGE FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

Bat Roost Emergence Survey by Natalie Boote

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes ancillary to the occupation and enjoyment of the existing dwelling and shall not be used as a separate independent unit of accommodation.

Reason: The unit of accommodation is not a satisfactory position and has insufficient outdoor amenity space and access, to be occupied separately from the main dwelling and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 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.

- 5 Development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological avoidance and mitigation measures as detailed in the Bat Roost Emergence Survey document - authored by Natalie Boote unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to provide ecological protection in accordance with the Environment Act 2021, Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, NPPF, NERC Act 2006, Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough (Core Strategy) March 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

