

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	Replacement of a rear glazed conservatory with a single storey extension.
LOCATION:	13 Windsor Road, Waterloooville, PO7 6BA.
REFERENCE NO:	APP/26/00469
APPLICANT:	Mr Terry
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	20/07/2026
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	19/08/2026 (Agreed EOT 18/09/26)
WARD:	Waterloo
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:	Approve with Conditions

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site No.13 Windsor Road, Waterloooville is located to the south-western side and in the middle of Windsor Road. The site comprises a single-storey period detached bungalow, comprising of cream painted rendered walls, on top of brick foundation plinth, bricked-in garage door (single garage already converted to residential space), under red pantile roof, with a mixture of brown and white finished uPVC fenestrations. The house has benefited from a rear single storey extension and an attached conservatory at the rear. Also, there are 3 sheds/outbuildings at the south-eastern rear of the garden plot. The double vehicular access is from Windsor Road with parking to the front on the block-paved driveway.
- 1.2 The property is located within a residential area with properties similar in period, style and design, many of which have been extended by means of a single storey rear extension.

2. Planning History

APP/10/00957 – Installation of 12No. solar panels to existing rear flat roof extension, Conditional Approval 28/01/2011.

3. Proposal

The removal of an existing rear located conservatory and replacement with a single storey extension in the same location.

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
CS16 - High Quality Design

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014
AL1 – Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020
N/A

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

5. **Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultations**

Councillor Peter Wade No comments received.
Councillor Gwen Robinson No comments received.
Councillor Ryan Brent 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: N/A

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) 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 on site is of a period design of the 1960's but has been modernised and altered in recent times. This is constructed of cream painted rendered walls, on top of brick foundation plinth, with a panel of 'Island' coloured stone blocks by the front entrance door, and a brick panel using similar brick materials, under red pantile roof and mineral felted flat roof, with a mixture of brown and white finished uPVC fenestrations. The host dwelling has benefited from a rear single storey extension and an attached conservatory at the rear. Also, there are 3 sheds/outbuildings at the south-eastern rear of the garden plot.

7.4 The proposal would be for a further reception/garden room and would measure approximately 6.4m in depth (max) or 4.6m (min), by 6.7m in width, by 3.2m to the eaves and 3.5m in max height over the hipped roof. There would also be a small area of flat roofing on the western side. The side elevation would be constructed close with the shared boundary with the neighbouring detached dwelling at No.15 to the west but would be a distance of approximately 9.4m to the shared eastern boundary at No.11. The scheme would replace a smaller conservatory structure, at the same location, on rear of the host dwelling. The proposed development would be constructed in matching or similar materials to the existing host dwelling, which is considered acceptable. Furthermore, the proposal would increase the depth of the rear elevation of the dwelling by 2.4m, compared to existing conservatory, however, officers are of the opinion that the proposal would remain subservient to No.13 Stakes Road. This is owing to its proposed modest height and scale in proportion to the host dwelling, using the same location of the present conservatory and would not result in an excessive depth to the house on site and consider it an acceptable addition. Sufficient amenity space would remain in the rear garden and plot post development.

7.4 The rear aspect of the proposal would not be readily visible on the streetscene, due to the boundary treatment of the 1.8m high grey plastic fencing and the rear location behind the converted garage/study on site. With the use of matching or similar materials to the host dwelling and would be of the type that are constructed to the rear elevations on neighbouring housing, the proposed scheme would be considered acceptable in visual terms, especially within the existing streetscene.

- 7.5 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) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.6 The proposed single-storey rear extension would face southwards out over the rear garden of the site and would be located directly adjacent to the shared boundary with the western detached neighbour at No.15 Windsor Road. This boundary is marked by 1.8m high grey plastic and concrete posted fencing with this neighbour. The proposed extension would replace an existing conservatory in this location. However, the proposal would be positioned to the east of this neighbour and would project out further than the rear elevation of this neighbour by approximately 2.4m. However, No.15 has also been extended to the rear elevation, by means of two single storey extensions, one in line with the present conservatory (closest to site) and another on the western side, which projects out in a similar depth to the proposal. The proposal would only project out by a further 2.4m than this neighbour's rear extension/elevation and being single storey in height (to eaves of 2.4m) with a low angled hipped roof and access path down the side, the scheme would be unlikely to cause significant impact to loss of light or outlook to their rear facing windows to warrant refusal. Furthermore, the extension would only project up at eaves height above the fencing by only 0.6m and would not contain any opening or windows on the western side elevation, thus reducing the perception of possible overlooking. Therefore, the proposal would also not appear overbearing or result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to No.15 rear facing windows and would not cause significant enclosure to this neighbour. Given its siting to the east, scale and boundary treatment, the proposal would have only a limited impact on the outlook, privacy and general amenity of No.15 Windsor Road and its private rear garden.
- 7.7 No.11 Windsor Road is located to the east of the site and shared boundary, but due to the distance of 9.4m from the side elevation of the proposal and the 1.8m high shared boundary fencing and driveway in between, there would be no significant impact to residential amenity or loss of privacy, then already exists from the existing conservatory and dwelling. Furthermore, No.3 Armstrong Close to the south of the site would also not be impacted by this proposal, due to the distance of 14m to the rear shared boundary and over 32m to No.3's rear elevation, and the single storey nature of the proposal, there would be no loss of privacy or amenity to No.3 than already exists. No other neighbouring properties would be adversely affected, having regard to their separation distances and the corner position of the site. It is also noted that no letters of objection have been received in respect of the scheme.
- 7.8 Consequently, it is considered that the 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, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

8 **Conclusions**

- 8.1 The 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 and no amenity impacts to the surrounding streetscene. The proposal would therefore meet the requirements of Policies CS16 and AL1 and is recommended for approval.

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the **INTERIM DEVELOPMENT MANAGER** be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/26/00469 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:

Location Plan, received 24th June 2026.
Existing Block Plan, received 24th June 2026.
Proposed Block Plan, received 24th June 2026.
Proposed Elevation Plan, received 24th June 2026.
Proposed Floor Plans, received 24th June 2026.

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives:

- 1 In accordance with paragraphs DM3 (1a) 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.