DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	**Single and two storey rear extensions with loft conversion including rear first floor balcony. Alterations to fenestrations and external materials.**
LOCATION:	33 Bosmere Road, Hayling Island, PO11 9SB.
REFERENCE NO:	APP/26/00246
APPLICANT:	Mr Kerrigan.
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	17/06/2026
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	18/06/2026 (EOT Agreed 17/07/2026)
WARD:	Hayling East

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. Site Description

1.1 The application site comprises is a period semi-detached bungalow, much altered and constructed in painted render/pebble-dash, under a brown concrete interlocking tile gabled roof, with white uPVC windows and doors. The dwellinghouse is located on a 'wedge' shaped plot and is accessed from the front via a central main door and bay windows either side, and a gravelled driveway. This driveway leads to the rear garden, which contains a detached outbuilding, an area laid to lawn and a rear conservatory on the rear elevation. The front of the property is mainly gravelled with an area of hedging/foliage/soft planting on the northern side and eastern front boundaries. The boundary treatment to the side and rear garden consists of 1.8m high wooden fencing, coupled with mature foliage/trees and soft planting.

1.2 The surrounding area is residential in character with properties of differing height, design, footprint and finish materials. This also includes park home estates to the north-west of the site.

2. Planning History

No relevant planning history.

3. Proposal

Construction of a single and two storey rear extension, with loft conversion including rear first floor balcony, alterations to existing fenestrations and external materials.

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 Coastal Erosion
CS16 - High Quality Design

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014
AL1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
AL2 - Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020
N/A

Listed Building Grade: N/A
Conservation Area: N/A

5. Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultations

Coastal Team
The applicant's FRA appears to have consulted the 'Long Term Flood Risk Service' rather than the 'Flood Map for Planning Service' online, and has concluded that the site is at low risk. However, parts of the site lie in the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 3 and are therefore considered to be at high risk (1 in 200 year / 0.5% annual probability) of experiencing an extreme tidal flood event. In addition, while the National Flood Map for Planning has no data for the climate change scenario for this area, the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment shows that the remainder of the site, as well as the access routes to it, are at risk of flooding once climate change is taken into account.

Given the nature of the proposal - a relatively minor extension to an existing dwelling - Coastal Partners consider that there is no notable increase in tidal flood risk and therefore **do not raise an objection** to the proposal.

Nevertheless, the applicant should consider:
• using flood resilient and resistant construction methods, see Improving the flood performance of new buildings in flood risk areas - GOV.UK
• signing up to the Environment Agency's Flood Warning Service, at Get flood warnings by text, phone or email - GOV.UK
Officer Comment: should permission be granted the above suggestions would be an informative on the decision notice.

End Note:
Coastal Partners makes comments only in relation to tidal flood and erosion risk, and it is for the LPA to consider all other forms of flood risk as required by the NPPF and PPG, taking advice from any relevant consultees. Equally, it is for the LPA to satisfy themselves that any NPPF / PPG / local policy requirements for passing the

sequential and exception tests have been met for all forms of flooding, including for tidal risk. If surface water drainage comments are sought, please request these directly from the Havant Borough Council's Civil Engineering and Landscape Team (CELT).
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: 10

Number of site notices: One

Statutory advertisement: N/A

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
No comments have been received	Due to the amendments to the rear part of the proposal, because of concerns of impact to neighbouring properties, re-notification of neighbours was carried out. However, no representations or objections were received from residents.

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 Provision
(vi) Flood Risk

(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 semi-detached bungalow, is of a period design of the 1930's, which has been partially modernised and is finished in white painted render/pebble-dash, under a brown concrete interlocking tiled gabled roof, with white uPVC windows and doors. The host dwelling also contains a pitch roofed conservatory to the rear elevation. The rear proposal would be for the removal of the existing conservatory and construction of a single storey rear extension. The replacement structure would measure approximately 4.5m in depth, by 8.7m in width, to a height of 3m. The roof would be of a flat roof design, with a low but large roof lantern and would be covered under a felt or membrane type covering. The extension would extend the existing lounge area and allowing for a new kitchen and dining area and part conversion for a new shower/W.C., utility room and new staircase to 1st floor. The walls would match or be similar to the existing dwelling, being of white painted render. All windows would be Anthracite finished uPVC double glazed units, whilst the doors would be of Anthracite finished aluminium.

7.4 The new staircase would allow for the conversion of the existing roof space, with 2 new bedrooms and a small en-suite and the addition of a full width box dormer/1st floor extension of the western roof, along with a balcony area on the flat roofed single storey extension. The scheme has been amended, as the 1st floor extension/dormer has been reduced in depth and balcony moved back, (in agreement with the Agent/Applicant), due to concerns over visual and privacy impacts on the attached neighbour at No.35 Bosmere Road. The 1st floor structure would be part set further back, with the side closest to No.35 would be in-line with the rear elevation and 3.8m in depth. While the 1st extension to the south would be 4.5m in depth, with a width of 5.2m and 2.4m in height. The structure also being set down from the existing ridge by approximately 0.2m (this has also been amended from the initial submission). The amended proposed balcony would now measure 1.7m in depth by 5m in width and set further back, with new 1.8m obscured glazed balcony screens on the northern and southern sides, which will be conditioned. A window and French doors would be inserted into this 1st floor structure on the rear western elevation, whilst a roof lantern would be introduced to this structure's flat roof, to allow illumination of the staircase below. The 1st Floor structure would be finished in black vertical weatherboarding, with Anthracite finished fenestrations

7.5 Furthermore, this scheme would also include blocking up of a window on the southern side at ground floor level and introduction of a small window for shower room and side door and small window for the utility room. There would also be a small window on this

side at 1st floor level for the proposed en-suite. There would be two sets of bi-fold glazed doors to be inserted into the rear western ground floor elevation of the extension. The replacement ground floor structure would be larger in depth and width to the existing conservatory but would still leave a gap between the proposed northern elevation and shared boundary with No.35 of approximately 0.7m. Although the 1st floor extension would be finished in black vertical weatherboard and the fenestrations would be finished in Anthracite, which is a change from the white painted walls and white finished openings, however, this development would be mostly located at the secluded rear of the host dwelling and is still subservient in size and design. In the light of this, officers are of the opinion that the amended proposal would remain ancillary to No.33 Bosmere Road and would not result in an excessive depth to the house or be sufficiently impacting on the host dwelling to warrant refusal, and consider it an acceptable addition.

7.6 The aspect of the proposal would not be readily visible on the streetscene, due to the rear garden position and the 1.8m high timber fencing on the boundary with neighbouring properties. Beyond the western boundary there is an area of dense mature trees, which lines the boundary at this point and forms part of mature gardens for No.55 Sandy Point Road. Due to this there are no significant views of the site or proposal from Bosmere Road. The proposed side elevation of the ground floor extension and the amended side cheeks of the 1st floor structure would be set at a distance, across driveways/sheds, to the southern neighbour of No.31, and leave a strategic gap to the attached neighbour's boundary to the north at No.35. This would be similar to other existing rear extensions on nearby properties within this area, which would be considered acceptable in visual terms within the existing streetscene.

7.7 Therefore, the amended proposed design and size of the proposal is now 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 northern attached neighbouring bungalow at No.35. The ground floor extension would protrude further back off the western rear elevation by 1.2m more than the 3.3m depth of the existing conservatory but would still be considered to conform with policy. This would be due to being not significantly overbearing in nature, with a flat roofed design and a lower height of 3m and 1.8m high boundary fencing at this point, and would have no significant impact on the amount of daylight received in No.35's rear windows, than already exists from the site. However, there would be 2 sets of bi-fold doors and windows located in the rear elevation of the ground floor extension. These proposed glazed doors/windows would be a reduction in glazing at this point from the existing conservatory. The proposed fenestrations 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 surrounding 1.8m timber boundary fencing. The proposal would also introduce a 1st floor extension element to the host dwelling, with the inclusion of a large box dormer, in-line with the original rear elevation and a further extension out over the single storey extension part, with a small balcony area. Due to officers' concerns of visual impact and loss of privacy to the attached neighbour, this element was reduced in depth, the balcony moved further back on the flat roof, with the inclusion of 1.8m high obscure glazed privacy screen, with no windows on the northern elevation. There would be a gap of approximately 4m from the side of the balcony privacy screen and rear extension wing, ensuring that this would not have an overbearing impact or have significant loss of natural daylight received in the

rear windows of this neighbour's dwelling. Therefore, it is unlikely to result in any harmful degree of overlooking or loss of privacy to No.35.

7.9 The proposed extension would protrude further to the rear western area, than the rear elevation of the southern neighbouring dwelling at No.31 to the south. However, the proposal would be set away from this shared boundary (which contains a 1.8m high boundary fence, driveway on site and carport/sheds on the neighbour's side boundary) by over 8m. Also, one window would be blocked up, and 2 windows and a door would be inserted into the southern side elevation at ground floor level and one small en-suite window at 1st floor level (this will be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7m above FFL). Due to this, the amended scheme would not directly overlook the rear garden of this neighbouring property and is unlikely to result in any harmful degree of overlooking or loss of privacy to No.31. Furthermore, due to the amended size, height and flat roofed design, with 1.8m high obscure glazed balcony screens, it would lessen any perception of the development being overbearing to No.31 and consider it an acceptable addition.

7.10 The proposal would be mostly located at a distance from other neighbouring properties, and with only 2 other properties is located directly to the rear garden of the site, this is No.56 Haven Road to the north-west and No.55 Sandy Point Road to the south-west. However, due to the length of garden on site, the 1.8m high boundary fencing to these neighbours and dense mature trees at this point, there would be no significant visual impact or overlooking issues. The amended 1st floor balcony, with side screens and set back nature of this part of the scheme, would further ensure that residential amenity would not be significantly impacted. No other neighbouring property would be affected by this proposal. It is noted no further letters of objection/representation were received with respect to the amended scheme, even after the renotification of neighbours, due to the 1st floor element of the proposal being reduced in size/design and balcony screens being introduced.

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) <u>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</u>

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

(v) Parking Provision

7.13 The scheme would increase bedrooms in the host dwelling from 2 existing to 4 proposed. The existing driveway has a dropped kerb for access onto the residential road and has room for at least 4 x 4.8m by 2.4 parking spaces, thereby exceeding the requirements specified in the Havant Borough Council Parking SPD (2016) for a four-bedroom chalet bungalow and is in accordance with Policy DM13.

(vi) <u>Flood Risk</u>

7.14 The application site is located within Flood Zone 2 and 3. The proposal includes a single storey and two storey rear extension with balcony considered of a modest footprint and scale. Flood Risk Assessment form and statement have been submitted by the Agent confirming that appropriate mitigation measures have been considered. Furthermore,

the Coastal Team were consulted. They concluded that "*given the nature of the proposal - a relatively minor extension to an existing dwelling - Coastal Partners consider that there is no notable increase in tidal flood risk and therefore do not raise an objection to the proposal"*. In light of this and based on the submitted plans and provided information, it is deemed that the proposal would not result in an increase of flood risk, meeting the requirements of Policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy (2011).

8 Conclusions

8.1 The amended proposal is considered to be acceptable in design terms and would relate appropriately with its surrounding context. The proposal would not result in any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, or to parking standards on site, no amenity impacts to the streetscene and no significant impact to flood risk. The proposal would therefore meet the requirements of Policies CS15, CS16, AL1 and AL2 and is recommended for approval.

---

9. RECOMMENDATION:

That the **INTERIM DEVELOPMENT MANAGER** be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/26/00246 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:

Amended Existing Ground Floor Plans, Location and Block Plans PL.992.26.01 C
Amended Proposed Floor Plans PL.992.26.03 B
Amended Proposed Elevations PL.992.26.04 C

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

3 The external materials used shall match, in type, colour and texture, to those details stated in the submitted plan: Amended Proposed Elevations drawing No. PL.992.26.04 C and in the Planning Application Form, 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 en-suite window to be inserted in the 1st floor level on the southern gabled elevation shall be glazed in obscure glass and shall be non-opening below a height of 1.7 metres measured from the internal finished floor level. The windows shall not thereafter be altered in any way without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To satisfactorily protect the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenities of nearby occupiers and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Prior to the first occupation/use of the balcony hereby approved, the 1.8 metre high obscurely glazed privacy screens shown on the approved plans shall be installed on the northern and southern sides of the balcony. The obscurely glazed privacy screens shall thereafter be retained in place and maintained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities and privacy of neighbouring occupiers, 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.

Coastal Team's Recommendations

• using flood resilient and resistant construction methods, see Improving the flood performance of new buildings in flood risk areas - GOV.UK
signing up to the Environment Agency's Flood Warning Service, at Get flood warnings by text, phone or email - GOV.UK