DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	**Rear single storey extension with alterations to the front fenestration and 1.8m high close boarded boundary fencing to the side/rear garden (Amended Proposal).**
LOCATION:	35 Victoria Avenue, Waterlooville, PO7 5BN.
REFERENCE NO:	APP/26/00211
APPLICANT:	Mr Richard Garfoot
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	29/06/2026 (Re-Notify Neighbours)
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	21/05/2026 (Agreed EOT 17/07/26)
WARD:	Purbrook

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. Site Description

1.1 The application site comprises a single storey detached period dwelling edged in brick with pebbledash panels, with white uPVC fenestrations under a gabled concrete interlocking tiled roof, with a rooflight on the north-western roof slope. This is located on the north-western corner of the junction between Victoria Avenue and Geoffrey Avenue. The site is on a steep gradient such that the private garden is set over a metre lower than the frontage. The existing entrance to the dwelling is on the front has been blocked up and is now accessed from the side, still from Victoria Avenue. The existing property does not have any facilities for parking vehicles off road, nor does it have a garage or driveway on site. The property has been previously extended by means of a rear conservatory. There is a 1.0m high brick wall to the north-west and north-east boundaries with Geoffrey and Victoria Avenues. The existing hedge has been removed on the western boundary. There is a 1.8m high timber fence on the shared boundary with No.33 Victoria Avenue, towards the rear of the site. The garden of the site has been recently cleared of plants/hedging, ready for the proposed development.

1.2 The area immediately surrounding the application site is residential and is comprised of one and two storey dwellings in a variety of styles and materials. There is a strong precedent within both Victoria Avenue and Geoffrey Avenue for hip to gable loft additions with dormers of varying shapes and sizes and the majority of properties have been extended to the rear, some of which are similar to the proposed scheme.

2. Planning History

No relevant Planning history on site

3. Proposal

Construction of a rear single storey extension, with the continuation of the existing pitch roof over the proposal, and alterations to the front fenestration, by blocking up of the front entrance door and 1.8m high close boarded boundary fencing to the side/rear garden. This has been amended by the inclusion of the boundary fencing proposal.

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
CS19 – Effective Provision of Infrastructure
CS16 - High Quality Design
CS19 - Effective Provision of Infrastructure
DM10 - Pollution
DM13 - Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development

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

Southern Water

Existing Gravity Sewer
The 100 mm diameter gravity sewer requires a clearance of 3 metres on either side of the gravity sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future maintenance access. No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water. All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works. Please refer to:
https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/st5orjvm/stand-off-distances.pdf

Condition: In order to protect public sewers, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following condition is attached to the planning permission;

The developer must agree with Southern Water, prior to commencement of the development, the measures to be taken to protect the public sewers.

Tree Planting We have restrictions on the proposed tree planting adjacent to Southern Water sewers, rising mains or water mains. Reference should be made to Southern Water's publication "A Guide to Tree Planting near water Mains and Sewers" (https://www.southernwater.co.uk/media/pddob0vn/ds-tree-planting guide-1_nwm.pdf) and the Sewerage Sector Guidance (https://www.water.org.uk/sewerage-sector guidance-approved-documents/) with regards to any landscaping proposals and our restrictions and maintenance of tree planting adjacent to sewers, rising mains and water mains. **Condition:** In order to protect public apparatus, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following pre commencement condition is attached to the planning permission; The developer must advise the local authority (in consultation with Southern Water) of the landscaping proposals in proximity of public apparatus in order to protect it in accordance with Southern Water's guidance, prior to the commencement of the development. The developer must agree with Southern Water, prior to commencement of the development, the measures to be taken to protect the public sewers. For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119) Website: southernwater.co.uk or by email at: SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk **Officer Comment**: The agent was contacted and has agreed to the recommended pre-commencement conditions.
Arboricultural/Tree officer No comments received.
Councillor Antonia Harrison No comments received.
Councillor Caren Diamond No comments received.
Councillor Paul Tansom 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: 12

Number of site notices: One

Statutory advertisement: N/A

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
No comments have been received	N/A

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) Park Provision
(v) Drainage Protection
(vi) 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 existing detached bungalow is of a period design of the 1930's and is finished in red/orange brick and pebbledash render walls, under a brown concrete interlocking tiled roof, with white uPVC windows and doors and a uPVC rear conservatory. It also contains a rooflight in the western roof slope. The rear part of the proposal would be for a kitchen/dining room and would measure approximately 5m in depth by 6.7m in width, to a height of 2.9m to eaves and to a maximum height of 5.6m over the ridge. This would replace the existing conservatory. The proposed roof slope would be in-line with the existing pitched roof, having matching slope, angle and height as existing. It would leave a gap of approximately 1.5m between south-eastern side elevation and shared boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at No.33 Victoria Avenue. The front door has already been removed and is presently blocked up at time of site visit (30/04/26). The existing north-western side door will be used as a main entrance into this dwelling. Bi-fold doors and a casement window would be inserted into the rear southern elevation of the proposed extension. The proposed development would be constructed in brick and render, under a concrete tiled roof with white uPVC fenestrations and gable end boarding. These would either match or would be similar materials to the existing host or neighbouring dwellings, which is considered acceptable.

7.4 The proposal would increase the depth of the dwelling compared to existing bungalow on site, however, officers are of the opinion that the amended proposal would remain appropriate in scale and design to No.35. Furthermore, there are other already extended examples of deeper bungalow extensions on Victoria and Geoffrey Avenue nearby. Also, it would not result in an excessive depth to the dwelling on site, with sufficient amenity space remaining and consider it an acceptable addition.

7.5 The north-western side and south-western rear of the proposal would be visible on the streetscene, due to the corner rear garden position and the low 1m high boundary walling. However, the back garden and proposal would be set lower than the adjacent road to the north-west and would be similar to other corner development within this period residential area. Furthermore, the proposal would be minor in scale, set back from the north-western boundary and would use matching or similar materials to the host dwelling. This would be similar to other existing rear extensions on nearby neighbouring properties, which would be considered acceptable in visual terms within the existing streetscene.

7.6 The applicant has submitted an existing hedging plan within this present application, proposing the trimming of the north-western and south-eastern side boundary hedging. No further details of the height or amount to be trimmed was shown on this plan. However, on visiting the site these hedgerows had been removed, along with a single storey shed. Having discussed this issue of hedging with the applicant, they removed it due to the size and poor condition of the two hedgerows. The Applicant proposes to replace it with 1.8m high close boarded timber fencing, with concrete posts and gravel boards, located behind the existing 1m brick walling on the north-western boundary around the back (side) garden of the property. This is an addition to the initial proposal, and the initial development description has been amended, with agreement of the Applicant. Having visited the site and surroundings, it was noted that there were many different boundary treatments within this area, and especially with the use of 1.8m close boarded fencing for side boundaries on nearby properties being in evidence, this proposal therefore would be considered acceptable in visual amenity terms and would have no significant impact to the streetscene.

7.7 Therefore, the proposed design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and nearby neighbouring dwellings 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) <u>Effect on neighbouring properties</u>

7.8 The proposal would be located on the shared boundary with the south-eastern neighbouring property at No.33. The proposed rear extension would protrude approximately 3m beyond the rear elevation of No.33, with no boundary fencing in place or proposed at this point for the site. However, it is considered to conform with policy, as it would be 3m in distance from the side elevation of this neighbour, single storey in height with a pitch roof, which is angled away from this side and not significantly overbearing in nature. Also, the scheme would be considered to have no significant impact on the amount of daylight received in No.33's side and rear windows, as the rear elevations of these bungalows face south-wards. The proposed extension would contain no windows or openings in the side elevations and that the rear garden and elevation of No.33 contains an approximately 1.8m high wall with gate, ensuring that privacy/amenity levels would also be maintained. Furthermore, there would be bi-folds doors located in the southern rear elevation of the extension, however, the glazed doors would only allow direct views of the site's rear garden and would not directly overlook the rear garden of this neighbouring property, due to No.33's existing outbuilding on the shared boundary and an existing 1.8m timber boundary fencing at the rear of the sites garden. Also the proposed 1.8m fencing on the western side boundary would not be considered detrimental to the visual amenities enjoyed at No.33. Therefore, it is unlikely to result in any harmful degree of overlooking or loss of privacy/amenity to No.33.

7.9 The proposed extension would protrude further to the rear south-western garden area than the existing conservatory on site. However, the proposal would be set away from this shared boundary with No.38 Lansdowne Avenue, (which contains a 1.8m high boundary fence) by at least 16m and would set down in the land, due the sloping nature of this area. The proposed rear patio doors would also not directly overlook the rear garden of this neighbouring property due to the distance and boundary treatment. This would ensure that the extension is unlikely to result in any harmful degree of overlooking or loss of privacy to No.38 and consider it an acceptable addition.

7.10 The proposal would be located at a distance from other neighbouring properties, due to the corner location of the site, no other neighbouring properties would be significantly affected by this proposal. Furthermore, the proposed fencing on the western boundary would also unlikely to impact neighbouring amenity due to many other examples of this nature, within the local streets and area. It is noted that no letters of objection were received in respect to the amended scheme, after re-notification of the surrounding neighbouring properties.

7.11 Consequently, it is considered that the amended proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to a significant 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) Parking Provision

7.12 There would be no facilities for parking on site, and none are proposed. However, the proposal would not increase the existing 2 bedrooms within the host dwelling, therefore there would be no requirement from policy and Parking SPG to include this facility within the site.

.

(v) Drainage Protection

7.13 Southern Water were consulted, they commented that there is a 100 mm diameter gravity sewer running across the rear garden of this site, near to the elevation of the proposal and that this should be protected during construction and landscaping of the site. In mitigation they have requested pre-commencement conditions to be attached, requiring information/details regarding protection of the pipeline to be sent to and agreed by this LPA in conjunction with Southern Water, before the commencement of the development on site. The Applicant has agreed to these conditions. Therefore, subject to conditions requiring compliance with the submitted details, there are no drainage objection.

(vi) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

8 Conclusions

8.1 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in design terms and would relate appropriately with its surrounding context and would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, on the streetscene or to drainage assets. The proposal would therefore meet the requirements of Policy CS16 and is recommended for approval.

9. RECOMMENDATION:

That the **INTERIM HEAD OF PLANNING** be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/26/00211 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:

Site Location Plan, uploaded 14 April 2026
Proposed Site/Location Plan, Sheet 2 of 5
Proposed and Existing Elevations, Sheet 5 of 5
Proposed and Existing Floor Plan, Sheet 1 of 5
Proposed Cross-Section Plan, Sheet 4 of 5

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.

4 Prior to the commencement of development, details of the measures to be undertaken to protect the public sewer to the rear of the site during the course of demolition and construction, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved measures and retained thereafter during the construction work for the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the public sewer having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5 Prior to the commencement of development, details of the landscaping proposals in proximity of the public sewer shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the public sewer having due regard to policies CS16 and DM10 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.