

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	Ground and first floor front & rear extensions; increased height of ridge with new gable to front and rear; rear first floor balcony; change of external materials and fenestrations; and erection of linked store & car port to the front; erection of a front boundary wall.
LOCATION:	41 North Shore Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0HN
REFERENCE NO:	APP/25/00478
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs Cox
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	01/04/2026
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	24/10/2025
WARD:	Hayling West
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:	Approve with conditions

1. Site Description

This application site comprises a two storey, detached dwellinghouse located on the north side of North Shore Road. This property has a pitched roof with elevations formed from brickwork and white cladding. To the rear of the site is the Langstone Harbour SSSI.

2. Planning History

N/A

3. Proposal

Ground and first floor front & rear extensions; increased height of ridge with new gable to front and rear; rear first floor balcony; change of external materials and fenestrations; and erection of linked store & car port to the front; erection of a front boundary wall.

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

CS11 Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough

CS15 Flood risk

CS16 (High Quality Design)

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

DM13 Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development

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

Langstone Harbour Board

I refer to the detailed drawings and documents viewed on the Havant Borough Council website concerning the above planning application. The Board's Planning Sub Committee has considered this application and offers NO OBJECTION to the proposal but would like to make reference to the fact that the site is in proximity to the Langstone Harbour SSSI designated site. We hope that these comments are of use. Please do not hesitate to get in touch, should you wish to discuss any further.

Environment Agency

No response received

Ecologist

The application is accompanied by a Phase 1 Bat Survey (Jonty Denton, April 2025). This report describes the dwelling and concludes that it offers negligible potential for supporting protected species such as bats. I would highlight that the report also recommends that an evening bat survey is required – I assume this is an error. I am content to agree that further ecological works are not necessary. The proposed works do have potential to result in construction impacts to the adjacent Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which lie c.40 metres to the west of the dwelling. Potential impact pathways include noise and visual disturbance (affecting overwintering bird species), and airborne and waterborne pollution (affecting the water environment and coastal habitats). In order to ensure that impacts are avoided, I would recommend that a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) is secured by condition. The Council will need to undertake its own appropriate assessment in accordance with the Habitats Regulations 2017. Prior to the commencement of any development activities, a Construction Environment Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include specific

measures to avoid or mitigate potential impact pathways affecting the adjacent Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and should include roles, responsibilities and methods. Reason: to protect biodiversity in accordance with the Environment Act 2021, Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, NPPF, NERC Act 2006 and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

Arboriculturalist/Tree Officer

Having read the AIA I raise no objection on arb grounds – my only suggestion is that the replacement tree for the Willow to be removed is another species – such as a Hawthorn variety or Rowan.

If permission is given please attach the following Arb condition:

The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the submitted *Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement and British Standard BS5837: 2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations)*.

Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity value afforded by the trees in question and in accordance with policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

County Highways Team

The Highway Authority wishes to make the following comments.

This application will change the location of the access to 41 North Shore Road to be further south. The Highway Authority have no in principle object to the proposed relocation. Whilst no visibility splay have been provided in accordance with HCC TG3, the Highway Authority are content that suitable pedestrian intervisibility splays can be achieved given the width of the access arrangement. Furthermore, given the straight alignment of North Shore Road the Highway Authority consider that vehicular visibility will remain unimpeded.

It is recommended to the applicant that they should be made aware that subject to any planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority, a subsequent agreement will need to be granted by HCC as Highway Authority to undertake the drop kerb works on the Highway. Details of this procedure can be found via the following link: [Apply for a vehicular access | Hampshire County Council \(hants.gov.uk\)](#). It is important to note that if there are any minor utility diversions that are required to facilitate the dropped kerb then additional costs may arise in addition to the initial application fee.

The applicant should also be aware that if an existing access is to be closed, a full height kerb should be reinstalled.

It should be noted that the northern-most parking space appears to be difficult to access due to the introduction of stairs to the rear which limits the amount of space available for manoeuvring. Should this quantum of parking be required to meet the Havant Borough Council Parking Standards, then the LPA should be satisfied that this space can be accessed in an appropriate manner to ensure that all spaces can be accessed in practice to prevent any

overspill parking onto North Shore Road.

Recommendations Having regard to the above the Highway Authority provide no objections to this planning application subject to the following conditions:

The proposed driveway should be constructed of a non-migratory surface material for a minimum of 1.0m in to site in order to reduce the risk of loose materials being transferred to the highway.

Reason – In the interest of highway safety

Case officer comment: Further comments received following re-consultation and submission of visibility splay plans

The Highway Authority wishes to make the following comments. The applicant has since submitted updated plans as of The Highway Authority is satisfied that the adjustments shown in these plans will not have any additional impact on the local highway. Therefore, the Highway Authority recommends no objections to the proposed development subject to the conditions which were suggested in the previous consultation response.

Natural England

No Objection

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.

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.

Publicity Type	Publicity Details	Start Date	End Date	Reasons
Site Notice	Wider public interest	18/09/2025	09/10/2025	Is advertised in the public interest

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

Number consulted: 6

Number of representations received: 2 Objections

[Redacted] we wish to make the following comments, raise queries and lodge our strong objections on a number of significant issues to the works as proposed under the above Planning Application. These are listed below:

1. Public Posting of Planning Application notice: Can you please advise when and where the Public Notification for this Application was put up by Havant Borough

Council and for how long it remained in public view? Please advise soonest as we have only recently become aware of this project by chance and understand that the opportunity to submit comments and objections ends on 8th October 2025.

2. Planning Application APP/25/00478 - 41 North Shore Road: Comments to Application and Objections to the proposed works

1. Design and Access statement 29/8/2025:

Section 1 Introduction:

a. Extract: 'The proposed works include: Detached Garage':

Comment and Question: There is no detached garage shown on the proposed plans, therefore do the proposals include for a detached garage that is not currently shown on the plans and elevations?

b. Extract: 'Ground and first floor front extensions':

Comment: The proposed site plans show the construction of new buildings to be built in front of the existing garages, and far in front of the historic building line for the property, literally filling the space between the existing garages and front boundary.

We Object to the proposal to construct additional buildings to the site located forward of the established building line as this will impact negatively on the open amenity, light, space and views enjoyed [Redacted] along the street scene and road views

c. Non inclusion of New Balcony to Rear in Introduction:

Comment: This is a significant element of the proposed design and not on list of proposed works?.

We Object to the proposed installation of large windows and wide/deep balcony to the rear at first floor level, this will cause major loss of privacy and security [Redacted].

Section 2.2 Trees:

Comment: No mention is made in regards the long established Copper Beech hedging located to the front pavement boundary [Redacted] within the Design & Access Statement.

We Object to the proposed works as we believe there should be consideration of the Copper Beech hedging included within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

The proposed works to the existing gravel paving and the proposed new brickwork wall to the front boundary could cause damage and injury to both the Copper Beech Tree and Hedging. The current proposals for design, works and protection do not properly address these risks to the Copper Beech Tree or the Copper Beech hedge; the additional weight of brick front/timber walls and foundations plus and vehicles parking, plus the loss of rainwater caused by the proposed surface treatments, will all together impact badly on the Copper Beech T4 tree root system and potentially the Copper Beech hedging also, these risks have not been properly addressed.

Section 2.3 Relevant Planning History:

Comment: When listing 'relevant neighbouring planning applications', the Design & Access Statement fails to list quite possibly the most relevant Approved Planning Notice issued on 1st August 2025[Redacted]- why?

Proposal: Single storey extension to rear, alterations to main roof, glazed canopy to rear ground floor, alterations to windows and doors, addition of rooflights, extension to balcony to rear, gazebo to rear garden, alterations to porch

roof.

[Redacted]

Case No: APP/24/00364

We object to the proposed works because the Design and Access statement fails to include important and relevant recent planning history in respect of the direct neighbouring home

Section 5 The Proposal:

a. Design Principles:

Comment: The proposed front and rear extensions to both ground and first floor will impact significantly on the views and amenity [Redacted].

We Object to the gross oversizing, siting, scale, design and location of additional elements to the existing property at No 41 as this will result in

- * considerable loss of privacy, security and light and change our current view from first floor windows to the south completely

- * significant development in front of the existing building line overcrowding the site and changing the at street scene completely

- * loss of privacy caused the proposed construction of a balcony overlooking our rear garden.[Redacted] a major consideration for us was that there were no balconies to our immediate neighbouring properties thus providing a good level of privacy which we sought then and wish to retain. The proposal for a viewing platform situated at first floor level [Redacted] is a great concern

In addition we object to the raising of the main roof height as this new height when applied to the overall building adds significant bulk and changes the context entirely between the building in this section of the road

Proposed new brickwork front wall with timber over:

Comment; this is not sufficiently detailed to enable proper review and consideration we request details for height of timber sections and proposed gate/s if any?

Section 7 Design and Access:

Comment: We believe the layouts shown are inaccurate when compared to the Plans, Elevations and Sections included within the Planning Application.

We Object as the detail and information presented is confusing and inconsistent.

3. Arboricultural Report:

Comment: The report does not illustrate the current/latest position regards project site plans and the trees and hedges affected by proposed works

We Object as this is currently out of date and does not reflect the current position

Comment: Impact Assessment and Method statements considered insufficient to properly protect existing Copper Beech Tree T4 and Beech Hedging during construction and during designed use period following build programme.

Please consider our submission and advise

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the appointed Planning Officer to discuss our Objections and Concerns in detail

Case Officer comment: Site visit has been undertaken.

With regard to the front double height building, we raise objections as it is beyond the established building line and will overshadow existing properties in the road, it will also result in overcrowding of the plot. Other properties in the road have successfully extended properties into sizeable homes without breaching the building line.

With regard to the frontage, I would point out the restrictive covenant in place limiting the height of a solid structure i.e. wall or fence thus ensuring the open feel of North Shore Road. The hedge is long established as are the trees removing the hedge for building purpose would endanger these trees.

Material changes are assessed below with the exception of the following:

The removal of a residential hedge is not subject to planning control.

Any covenant on the land is a private matter between the parties involved.

The planning history referred to above does not relate to the application site

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) Trees
- (viii) Flood risk
- (ix) Highways

(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 proposal comprises extensions to the existing dwelling. It is noted that this proposal has been amended following its initial submission with changes including the shortening of the front garage/car port extension, additional front extension at two storey level and first floor rear extension. The balcony has also been moved across towards the southern side of the building.

Alterations to the front elevation

7.4 The proposals include a single-storey front extension forming a gym/sauna, car port and storage area. This would follow the demolition of the existing double garage which currently projects forward of the main front elevation by approximately 7.2 metres. The replacement structure would project forward by approximately 14 metres; however, around 5.6 metres of this would comprise an open pergola-style roof over the car port with a lightweight, open appearance, and the enclosed storage element (approximate width 5.6m x 3m high) would be formed from slatted timber. Representations have been received concerning the proposal extending beyond the established building line.

In this case, built form already projects significantly forward of the dwelling, and the forward-most elements of the replacement are largely open in character. As such, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable encroachment beyond the building line or harm the prevailing open feel of the streetscene.

- 7.5 A front wall is also proposed at approximately 1.2 metres in height, formed from brickwork and timber fins to match those used on the dwellinghouse. Given that a 1-metre-high front boundary wall could be constructed under permitted development, this is only marginally higher and is considered acceptable in the context of the street and would not be materially harmful to the area.
- 7.6 A single storey front extension is proposed which would have a depth of approximately 2.4 metres and a width of 9.5 metres, linking with the proposed gym extension. This would form an entrance lobby area and study, served with rooflights and front elevation windows. This would have a flat roof level with the proposed gym roof.
- 7.7 The property would be undergoing a complete remodelling with the roof ridge height increasing by approximately 50cms – the roof would have a hip to one side (south) and a pitched roof to the other. The property exterior is currently formed from brickwork and white cladding. The proposed materials include dark coloured timber cladding and slate roof tile. There will also be a reconfiguration and redesign of the windows, with a larger amount of glazing to the rooms, particularly the hallway areas. The existing chimney would also be removed. The interior would undergo a reconfiguring of the rooms.

Alterations to the rear elevation

- 7.8 There is a single storey extension proposed to the rear of the property to the northern side which would adjoin the existing rear extension. This would have a depth of approximately 7.8 metres, a width of 5.7 metres and a height of 3.7 metres. This would allow for an open plan living area served by bi-fold doors to the rear and a window to the side elevation (east). A rooflight would also be installed alongside rooflights to the existing extension.
- 7.9 A first floor extension is also proposed to the rear allowing for an additional 70cms and providing balcony area to the master bedroom which would increase to approximately 1.3 metres depth which would be inset and screened by the side elevation wall. This section of the extension would form a gabled roof.
- 7.10 The proposed changes are considered to add a generous additional floor area, particularly at ground floor level. Despite this, it is considered that this is a large plot and the extensions would not bring the property out of proportion with those surrounding it. The proposed materials are judged to modernise the appearance of the building and would not be out of keeping with the streetscene, whereby there is an existing range in material types and colours.
- 7.11 The raising of the roof ridge would be relatively minimal in terms of increase in bulk and the existing range in regard to building styles and heights in the immediate streetscene is noted and thereby the changes are not considered to be out of character.
- 7.12 The proposed front car port has been reduced following the initial submission and use of the slatted wood on the storage area as well as the open pergola style of the car port is deemed to reduce the appearance of a solid structure close to the highway and therefore this is considered to have an acceptable impact on the character of the area.

7.13 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

7.14 To the east of the application site is No. 43 North Shore Road. The proposed front extension forming the gym and car port would be located adjacent with this side boundary as well as the first floor rear extension and ground floor rear extension. It is noted that No. 43 has recently received planning consent for work at the property and it is noted that these works are currently being undertaken. These notably include a ground floor extension, balcony and side elevation window to the existing bedroom adjacent with No. 41. The proposed ground floor front extension at No. 41 would be sited adjacent with the garage at No. 43. There are no habitable windows in the garage to be affected by this extension. The proposed rear extension would project a generous amount beyond the rear of No. 43 however there are existing outbuildings sited alongside the shared side boundary at No. 43 and the extension is not considered to result in harmful impact to No. 43. The proposed first floor extension would be minimal in depth and is not considered to result in any harmful impact to amenity.

7.15 To the south west of the application site is no 39 North Shore Road. The proposed front extension would add some additional bulk to the front elevation, adjacent with no 39, however this would have a relatively small depth at approximately 2.4 metres and the extension at No. 39 to the side already has frosted glass. It is not considered to result in harm to the amenity of No. 39. The proposed first floor rear extension would also have a fairly minimal depth and would be sited close with the shared boundary. No 41 is already sited closer towards the harbour than No. 39 and therefore there is an existing impact from the two storey side elevation wall at No. 41. The increased depth is not judged to result in an increase in harm that would result in unacceptable overshadowing or overbearing impact, taking into account the existing arrangement of the dwellings. This side of the roof would remain hipped. The proposed balcony would be screened by the side elevation wall, and any other views would look directly down the garden of the application site, towards the harbour. There would be some new windows at ground floor to both side elevations of the property however these are not considered to result in overlooking and it is noted that planning permission is not required to install side ground floor elevation windows as per the GPDO.

7.16 Towards the front of the application site is No. 38 North Shore Road. There would be additional glazing to the front elevation however there would be approximately 40 metres between the properties at first floor level which is substantial and no material overlooking is considered to occur as a result of this proposal. 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).

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(v) Parking

- 7.18 There would be enough parking on space to allow for 3 parking spaces as required in the Havant Parking SPD.

(vi) Ecology

- 7.19 The proposal has been accompanied by a Phase 1 Bat Survey. This concludes that the dwelling offers negligible potential for supporting protected species such as bats. This has been reviewed by Havant's Ecologist who is content that further Ecological works are not necessary. They have also stated the following:

The proposed works do have potential to result in construction impacts to the adjacent Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which lie c.40 metres to the west of the dwelling. Potential impact pathways include noise and visual disturbance (affecting overwintering bird species), and airborne and waterborne pollution (affecting the water environment and coastal habitats). In order to ensure that impacts are avoided, I would recommend that a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) is secured by condition. The Council will need to undertake its own appropriate assessment in accordance with the Habitats Regulations 2017.

The applicant has agreed to supplying this information via a planning condition. The Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken with Natural England not objecting to the proposal.

(vii) Trees

- 7.20 The site contains an Atlas cedar and a willow tree, which is proposed to be removed and replaced with an alternative species (either Hawthorn or Rowan). An Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have been submitted. The Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objection, subject to conditions requiring replacement planting and compliance with the approved arboricultural details.

(viii) Flood risk

- 7.21 The end of the rear garden is located within Flood Zones 2/3. A Flood Risk Assessment has subsequently been provided, and this states that floor levels will not be lower than existing and that mitigation measures will be incorporated into the scheme. The proposal is considered to accord with Policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan.

(ix) Highways

- 7.22 The vehicular access to the site would be relocated towards the south. Highways have been consulted on this proposal, and, following submission of additional details, have removed their objection subject to a planning condition relating to the use of migratory material adjacent with the highway. Such a condition is recommended.

8 Conclusions

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.
-

9. RECOMMENDATION:

That the Interim Head of Planning be authorised to Approve with conditions for application APP/25/00478

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:

Design and Access Statement REV C uploaded on the 11.03.2026

26029 003 Proposed elevations and sections uploaded on the 22.04.2026

26029 002 REV J Proposed location and block plan and wall elevation plan uploaded on 11.03.2026

Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan-PJC/6919/25-01 Rev – dated 28th August 2025

Flood Risk Assessment uploaded on the 29.8.2025

Phase 1 Bat Survey April 2025 Dr Jonty Denton

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, 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 The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Preliminary Arboricultural Method Statement and British Standard BS5837: 2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations) and Tree Protection Plan.

Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity value afforded by the trees in question and in accordance with policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5 The proposed driveway should be constructed of a non-migratory surface material for a minimum of 1.0m into site in order to reduce the risk of loose materials being transferred to the highway.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and flood risk and having due regard to policies CS15 CS16, and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, policy DM25 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6 Within 3 months of the felling of the existing Willow tree at the front of the site, the agreed tree (either a Hawthorn or Rowan species) shall then be planted within the first planting season. If the tree planted in accordance with this condition is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies or becomes severely damaged or becomes seriously diseased within 5 years of planting, it shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its consent in writing to any variation.

Reason: To conserve and safeguard the visual amenities of the locality, having due regard to policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7 Prior to the commencement of any development activities, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include specific measures to avoid or mitigate potential impact pathways affecting the adjacent Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and should include roles, responsibilities and methods.

Reason: To protect biodiversity in accordance with the Environment Act 2021, Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, NPPF, NERC Act 2006 and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

Informatives:

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 on 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