

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	Loft conversion, rear extension and gable end alterations, including rear dormer and rooflights
LOCATION:	25 Bellair Road, Havant, PO9 2RG
REFERENCE NO:	APP/25/00591
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs Bates
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	23/10/2025
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	03/09/2025
WARD:	St Faiths
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:	APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a detached dwellinghouse located in Havant. The property features a rear garden and to the front of the dwelling is parking space. The property features brickwork render and tudor style detailing for the external walls and brown concrete tiles for the roof. The application site is in an urban and residential area, with the character of the street featuring similar properties in evidence.
- 1.2 St Faiths Conservation Area lies to the rear, together with a footpath which travers a wooded area, south to north.

2. Planning History

Is there any planning history relevant to the current application?

Yes - Planning Application - APP/16/00758 - Single storey rear extension and alterations to ground floor fenestration on north elevation – Permitted 15/09/2016.

3. Proposal

Loft conversion, rear extension and gable end alterations, including rear dormer and rooflights.

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 Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of

Havant Borough)
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020: **N/A**

Listed Building Grade: **N/A**
Conservation Area: **Adjacent to St Faiths Conservation Area**

5. Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer	I have looked over the application documents. The site is adjacent to the St Faiths Conservation Area (CA), although the dwelling itself is separated from the CA boundary by the rear garden. I am of the view that the proposed works would not result in harm to the setting of the CA and therefore, no objection is raised.
County Countryside Access Team	There are specific legislative requirements for the Highways Authority, Planning Authority, Developers and Landowners with respect to the PROW network. Where no changes are proposed to Public Rights of Way, the Planning Authority shall be aware of the following, and we request that the applicant is made aware of the following requirements through informatives where appropriate. Informatives: Where Public Rights of Way are close to application sites or are used for access to the development site, they must be shown on the submitted plans with details of how they will be accommodated within the proposals. Government guidance requires that applications should not be validated unless such information has been submitted. Nothing connected with the development, or its future use, shall have an adverse effect on the Public Rights of Way, which must always remain available for safe public use at all times.

	No vehicles (including builder's and contractor's), machinery, equipment, materials, spoil, scaffolding, or anything else associated with the works, use, or occupation of the development, shall be left on or near to a Public Right of Way as to cause obstruction, hindrance, or a hazard to the legitimate users. The public retain the right to use the PROW at all times. The grant of planning permission does not entitle developers to obstruct a public right of way. The diversion or stopping up of footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways is a separate process, which must be carried out before the paths are affected by the development. It cannot be assumed that because planning permission has been granted that an Order under section 257 of the TCPA (1990) will invariably be made or confirmed. Development, in so far as it affects a PROW, must not be started and the PROW should be kept open for public use, unless or until the necessary order has come into effect. All vehicles that would be legitimately accessing the site via a Public Right of Way should give way to public users, which could include horse-riders and cyclists, at all times. In cases with legitimate vehicular access a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should be submitted to, and approved by, Hampshire Countryside Service as Highways Authority prior to any approval by the Planning Authority, and prior to commencement, to ensure the protection of public safety. There must be no surface alterations to a Public Right of Way without the consent of Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority. Planning permission under the Town and County Planning Act (1990) does not provide this and separate consent is required. To carry out any such works without this permission would constitute an offence under Section 131 of the Highways Act (1980). No works to the surface of the Public Right of Way shall be carried out without prior approval of the HCS Area Countryside Access Manager. Any damage caused to the surface of the
--	---

	Public Right of Way by construction traffic will be required to be restored to the satisfaction of the Area Countryside Access Manager on the completion of the build. Officer Comment: <i>Should permission be granted the Countryside Access Team comments would be an informative on the decision notice.</i>
Ecologist	Original comment on 05/09/2025: I would request further information here. The roof is clad with traditional clay roof tiles, and the dwelling is of an age and design where potential bat access/egress/roost features are likely to occur e.g. gaps beneath roof materials. Dwellings of this type usually contain substantial roof voids that are attractive to bat species. On the basis of the information before me I would recommend that the applicant provides an ecological assessment, to be provided by a qualified ecologist, and focussing on the potential for roosting bats to be present and impacted. 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 <i>Further comment on 24/02/2026 after the Phase 1 Bat Survey Report has been received regarding whether a Phase 2 Bat Survey Report was required:</i> Yes – their ecologist has set out why they consider a bat survey is needed and so a bat survey should be carried out. <i>Final comment on 11/06/2026 after the Phase 2 Bat Survey Report had been received and the Council's Ecologist was re-consulted:</i> The application is accompanied by a Phase 2 Bat Emergence Survey (Jonty Denton, May 2026). During a single emergence survey in late May 2026 no bats were observed roosting within the building. It is concluded that bats are not currently roosting within the property. No further information is required.
Councillor Daniel Berwick	No comments received.
Councillor Philip Munday	No comments received.
Councillor Gillian Harris	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: 8

Public comments - Number of representations received: 1

Comment: 1 Objection	Officer comment
Please note that this is NOT an objection but points that I believe can be agreed in relation to the application. I am making these points due to activities of previous occupants of 25 Bellair Road and how other	Reasons why conditions 1, 2, 3 and 5 would not be expedient: Condition 1 Unnecessary in planning terms as control over construction hours is typically

building projects that have taken place in the road have been managed. 1. No building or related works on a Saturday, Sunday, or public or bank holiday; 2. Builders to take care with parking; 3. Builders to take care with rubbish and debris; 4. Materials to be "in keeping"; 5. Care with scaffolding overhang.	addressed through separate regulatory regimes, such as Environmental Health legislation, and would not meet the test of necessity. Condition 2: Not enforceable as it relates to the behaviour of contractors rather than the use or development of the land, and therefore fails the enforceability test. Condition 3: Adequately controlled through other legislation (e.g. waste management and environmental protection) and would not be necessary or reasonable as a planning condition. Condition 5: This is a temporary construction matter controlled under separate legislation (e.g. highways/licensing regimes) and does not relate directly to the permanent use or development of the land, therefore not meeting the relevance test. Condition 4: the materials are considered in keeping and acceptable.
--	---

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 and St Faith's Conservation 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 and St Faith's Conservation Area

7.3 The proposal would be readily visible on the streetscene regarding the proposed 3No rooflights and hip to gable roof conversions on both the southern and northern (side) elevations.

Rooflights

- 7.4 The proposed rooflights to the front elevation are considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character of the dwelling and upon visual amenities.

Rear dormer

- 7.5 The rear dormer would be of a very modest subservient scale to the dwelling and would feature a pitched roof in keeping with the existing dwelling. The rear dormer is considered to accord with the guidance from the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD which states:

“They should be designed to sit back into the roof, back from the front line of the wall below, in from the verge and below the existing ridge line. Dormers should not dominate the roof or the existing building. To help avoid this they should be the same size or preferably smaller than the windows below. Generally the dormers should have pitched roofs, with slopes in keeping with the existing roof”.

The dormer considered to be an acceptable addition to the property, and that it would have an acceptable impact upon visual amenities.

Hip to gable conversions of both the eastern and western elevations

- 7.6 The proposed hip to gable conversions of both the eastern and western elevations would be in keeping with properties to the north and south of the application site and is not considered to harm the character of the dwelling or visual amenities.

Rear extension/ gable end alteration

- 7.7 The rear extension/ gable end alteration, would be of a relatively modest size and would be subservient in design to the dwelling as it would be set down from the ridge line and would feature a relatively limited depth and width. With regards to this the rear extension/gable end alteration is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the property.

Materials

- 7.8 The hip to gable conversion and rear extension works would feature render to match the existing property and matching concrete tiles which is considered acceptable. The rear dormer would feature tilework for the roof and walls which is considered acceptable.
- 7.9 Overall the proposal is considered acceptable on the existing building, the locality, with the Conservation Officer content that the proposal would not result in harm to St Faiths Conservation Area.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

Rooflights

- 7.9 The proposed rooflights would face the public realm which would be acceptable regarding overlooking concerns and they are considered to have an acceptable neighbour impact.

Rear Dormer

- 7.10 Regarding overlooking concerns, properties to the front and rear of the site would be acceptably impacted. Regarding No.23 Bellair Road to the south of the site, the dormer would provide oblique views at most of No.23 Bellair Road which would be considered as acceptable. No.27 to the north would be acceptably impacted as any oblique views would be shielded by the rear extension. The dormer is considered to have limited and acceptable impacts regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns as it would be set off from the gable end.

Hip to gable conversions of both side elevations

- 7.11 The hip to gable alteration on the northern side elevation would face a flank wall and extension's roof however this is to the rear of the proposed hip to gable roof alteration and would receive significant levels of overshadowing as existing and would not materially change with the proposal. The northern (side) hip to gable alteration is considered to have an acceptable impact. Regarding the hip to gable alteration to the southern side elevation, there is 1 No. first floor window on No.23's northern side elevation. It is a small window which appears to be obscure and whilst featuring a separation distance to No.25's southern side elevation of approximately 4 metres, likely features significant overshadowing owing to the existing ridge height of No.25 of approximately 10.1 metres. The proposal would not materially change this position.

Rear extension/ gable end alteration

- 7.12 The rear extension/ gable end alteration would acceptably impact No.23 to the south and properties to the front and rear of the site. Regarding overlooking, there would be rear fenestration, as this would only be able to provide oblique views this is considered as acceptable. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, the proposal would have minimal impacts upon No.27's rear amenity space which is considered as acceptable. There are no side windows on No.27's side wall and there would be an acceptable impact upon the flank wall. There is 1 No rooflight on No.27's side extension, however it would already be significantly overshadowed by No.25 and the proposal is not considered to materially increase these impacts.
- 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). It is noted a letter of neither objection nor support were received with respect to the scheme.

(iii) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(v) Ecology

- 7.15 Due to work to the roof, the Council's Ecologist was consulted regarding the potential impacts on bats. The Council's Ecologist recommended for a

Bat Survey Report to be undertaken. This was received, however the survey recommended for a Phase 2 Bat Survey Report to be undertaken. This was received on 26/05/2026 and the Ecologist was re-consulted. The ecologist stated on 11/06/2026

“The application is accompanied by a Phase 2 Bat Emergence Survey (Jonty Denton, May 2026). During a single emergence survey in late May 2026 no bats were observed roosting within the building. It is concluded that bats are not currently roosting within the property. No further information is required.”

- 7.16 Regarding this comment, officers consider the proposal to have an acceptable impact upon protected bat species, and to accord with Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and consider it acceptable 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 St Faiths Conservation 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 Interim Head of Planning be authorised to **Approve with Conditions** for application APP/25/00591

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:

Phase 2 Bat Survey Report by Dr Jonty Denton: Uploaded 26/05/2026

Bat Scoping Report by The Ecology Co-op: Uploaded 05/11/2026

Drawing Number: 9023 25 0 Rev A: Amended block plan: Uploaded 30/10/2025

Email By Thea Travers-Ayre named: Agent confirmation of rear dormer materials:
Uploaded 30/10/2025

Drawing Number: 9023.25.2 Rev G: Proposed plans: Uploaded 10/09/2025

Drawing Number: 9023.25.1 Rev D: Existing plans: Uploaded 10/09/2025

Location Plan: Uploaded 10/09/2025

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.

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. Countryside Planning has left the following informatives for the applicant during the application process:

Where Public Rights of Way are close to application sites or are used for access to the development site, they must be shown on the submitted plans with details of how they will be accommodated within the proposals. Government guidance requires that applications should not be validated unless such information has been submitted.

2. Nothing connected with the development, or its future use, shall have an adverse effect on the Public Rights of Way, which must always remain available for safe public use at all times.

3. No vehicles (including builder's and contractor's), machinery, equipment, materials, spoil, scaffolding, or anything else associated with the works, use, or occupation of the development, shall be left on or near to a Public Right of Way as to cause obstruction, hindrance, or a hazard to the legitimate users. The public retain the right to use the PROW at all times.

4. The grant of planning permission does not entitle developers to obstruct a public right of way. The diversion or stopping up of footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways is a separate process, which must be carried out before the paths are affected by the development. It cannot be assumed that because planning permission has been granted that an Order under section 257 of the TCPA (1990) will invariably be made or confirmed. Development, in so far as it affects a PROW, must not be started and the PROW should be kept open for public use, unless or until the necessary order has come into effect.

5. All vehicles that would be legitimately accessing the site via a Public Right of Way should give way to public users, which could include horse-riders and cyclists, at all times. In cases with legitimate vehicular access a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should be submitted to, and approved by, Hampshire Countryside Service as Highways Authority prior to any approval by the Planning Authority, and prior to commencement, to ensure the protection of public safety.

6. There must be no surface alterations to a Public Right of Way without the consent of Hampshire County Council as Highways Authority. Planning permission under the Town and County Planning Act (1990) does not provide this and separate consent is required. To carry out any such works without this permission would constitute an offence under Section 131 of the Highways Act (1980).

7. No works to the surface of the Public Right of Way shall be carried out without prior approval of the HCS Area Countryside Access Manager. Any damage caused to the surface of the Public Right of Way by construction traffic will be required to be restored to the satisfaction of the Area Countryside Access Manager on the completion of the build.