

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	Proposed single storey rear extension.
LOCATION:	73 Church Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0NR
REFERENCE NO:	APP/25/00916
APPLICANT:	Mr Barry Stewart
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	16/12/2025
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	30/12/2025
WARD:	Hayling East
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:	Approve with Conditions

1. Site Description

- 1.1 73 Church Road is a detached chalet bungalow to the western side of Church Road. The property is well set back behind an approximately 16.6m long block paved driveway and is further screened from the road by mature planting within the close-boarded fencing to the front boundaries. It is finished in buff brickwork and light coloured render with white uPVC fenestration under a hipped plain tile roof with a sleepy eye dormer to the front and a flat roofed dormer to the rear. The property has previously been extended to the rear with a small conservatory and there is also a small gable roofed protrusion to the rear that appears to be original. The private rear garden is approximately 30m in length and 13.5m in width and is mostly bounded by at least 1.8m high close-boarded fencing, although immediately behind the dwelling the flank wall of the neighbouring garage forms part of the boundary.
- 1.2 The area immediately surrounding the application site is a mixture of residential properties and commercial uses. The residential properties along Church Road are mostly detached dwellings in a variety of styles and materials. To the north and west, accessed from Manor Road, there is a large supermarket and camping facilities. The site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is also at risk of surface water flooding.

2. Planning History

No relevant history.

3. Proposal

Proposed 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
Chichester Harbour Management Plan 2024-2025
Havant Borough Council and Chichester District Council Joint SPD - Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS15 (Flood and Erosion Risk)

CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: N/A

Conservation Area: N/A

5. **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

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 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: 7

Number of site notices: N/A

Statutory advertisement: N/A

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
No comments received.	

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) Flood risk
- (v) 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 area

7.3 The proposals comprise a single storey rear addition that would replace an existing conservatory and extend an existing ground floor bedroom. An extended patio area is shown on the plans and the agent has confirmed that this would be below 0.3m in height. The extended patio would therefore fall under Permitted Development and is not further considered here.

7.4 The proposed extension would be approximately 9.5m in width, spanning from just beyond the side of the existing conservatory across the gable ended element to the north side wall of the host dwelling. The maximum length of the extension would be approximately 3.8m, roughly level with the rear of the existing conservatory. It would feature a partially pitched roof to continue the line of the existing small rear gable, where the ridge height would be approximately 4.1m, and would drop to an approximately 3m high flat roof across the remainder of the extension with a central roof lantern. The eaves of the host dwelling are very low so that the flat roof would sit above the eaves line, however no part of the extension would be visible within the street scene. The materials would be to match those of the host dwelling. Considering the above, the proposed extension is deemed to be acceptable.

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 south is the detached bungalow of No.71 Church Road, which has a wide driveway and double garage on the northern side such that the main dwelling is set approximately 4.4m from the shared boundary. The proposals would be set approximately 3m from the boundary so that there would be a generous separation

distance to No.71. It was noted during a visit to the site that a small area of fencing adjacent to the existing conservatory, which has side facing fenestration, had been increased in height to approximately 2m to prevent views between properties. The proposed extension would have no side facing fenestration and as such would be an improvement in terms of privacy. Therefore the impact to No.71 is considered to be limited and acceptable.

- 7.7 To the north is No.75 Church Road, which is a chalet bungalow with a steeply pitched roof and side facing dormers. As mentioned in 1.1 above, No.1 has a double garage which forms part of the shared boundary immediately behind the host dwelling. The garage and 1.8m high fencing behind effectively obscures the majority of views between properties, and it is noted that the pitched roof element of the proposals would assist in preventing views between the side dormer of No.75 and the proposed roof lantern. The main house of No.75 is set beyond the garage and access driveway so that the proposals would be at least 6m distance away. The impact to No.75 is therefore considered to be limited and acceptable.
- 7.8 The application site backs on to a camping field that is heavily screened by mature trees. As such there are no other residential properties immediately adjacent.
- 7.9 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) Flood risk

- 7.9 The proposal is within an area at risk of flooding from surface water. The agent has submitted the required Flood Risk Assessment indicating that floor levels within the proposed development will be set no lower than existing levels and has included details of proposed resilience and mitigation measures within drawing 25182_002 Rev C. This is considered satisfactory in meeting the requirements of Policy CS15.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

8 Conclusions

- 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 Development Manager be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/25/00916 subject to the following conditions:

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:

Proposed Floor Plan, Section and Elevations 25182_002 Rev C
Flood Risk for Householders Form received 14 January 2026

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.

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:

- Your application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.