

Matthew Pickup  
Pickup Town Planning  
57 Seaview Road  
Portsmouth  
Hampshire  
PO6 1EW

Our Ref: GEN/24/00616  
Direct Line: (023) 07436413995  
Ask For: Mr Robert Riley  
Email: [planning.development@havant.gov.uk](mailto:planning.development@havant.gov.uk)

12 July 2024

**Site Location:** Spindrift, Ferry Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0DG

**Re:** Pre-application for a small extension

Dear Mr Pickup

I am writing to you in regard to your enquiry in relation to the above address. Please find my full response below.

Apologies for the slight delay in the response for this general enquiry.

Having further analysed this pre-application proposal, it is noted that the planning history of the site is important in the consideration of the amended proposals.

Application APP/23/00450 was allowed at appeal and application APP/19/00129 was dismissed at appeal. It is considered that the main issues in the consideration of these applications related to character regarding a terracing impact/set off at first floor level to the boundary and neighbour impact upon next doors porthole windows at Sinah House. These two issues will be further analysed in this response for you.

The proposal of this pre-application outside of reducing depth at the front in comparison to APP/19/00129 which was dismissed at appeal and with a slightly reduced eaves height to the east elevation appears to be very similar, and would bring this back to a design that was rejected by the inspectorate at appeal with regard to the impact on the porthole windows.

#### *Terracing impact and character*

Regarding a terracing impact and first floor gap to the boundary, it is noted that APP/19/00129 extended further forward than both APP/23/00450 and this pre-application's proposal. Application APP/23/00450 was considered acceptable by the Appeal Inspector. The main difference now proposed is the loss of the rear part of the first floor gap to the boundary.

It is considered that if this pre-application's additional first floor element beyond that of APP/23/00450's approved first floor side extension would have a limited additional impact when viewed from the road. From the harbourside Sinah House property is itself angled away such that a slightly larger gap is retained. Overall, it is considered that the amended proposal would on balance be acceptable when considering the previous approval on appeal.

#### *Neighbourly impact upon Sinah House*

It is noted that the Local Planning Authority regarding APP/23/00450 considered that the impact upon these porthole windows to be a reason to refuse that application " *The proximity to the neighbouring property at Sinah House of the proposed first floor element of the*

*extension on the eastern side of the dwelling would adversely affect the outlook from, and light available to and be detrimental to the amenities of the occupier of the adjacent residential property".*

The current proposal would result in the proposed extension being positioned closer to these windows.

It is noted that the Planning Inspector considering application APP/19/00129 stated:

*"The appeal scheme, in contrast, would result in the outlook from these windows being dominated by the proposed two storey east side wall of the proposal, which would be sited within around one metre of the boundary with Sinah House, and directly opposite the porthole windows. The resulting impact on the outlook from these feature windows and reduction in the amount of natural light entering the bedroom, would be materially harmful".*

Although it is acknowledged, that application APP/23/00450 was allowed at appeal, that appeal inspector drew out the differences between the original appeal design and the later appeal stating:

*"The height of the extension has been reduced to include a flat roof, and its side elevation would be tapered at the rear, moving it away from the porthole windows. All of the proposed changes would allow for a higher level of light and outlook to the porthole windows compared to that in the 2019 Appeal scheme."*

It is noted that this pre-application's addition would bring the side elevation closer to the porthole windows on the side elevation of Sinah House. Notwithstanding the slight reduction in height of the extension compared to the dismissed appeal the positioning of the extension would be the same next to the porthole windows. It would therefore be difficult to conclude that this relationship is acceptable given the previous dismissal at appeal.

## **Conclusion**

In terms of the likelihood of receiving officer support; this proposal presents an increased impact to the porthole windows in Sinah Lane compared with those approved under planning permission APP/23/00450.

Any application would need to set out how these concerns are addressed in relation to light and outlook to these windows. In conclusion a further application based on the pre-application plans and elevations is currently considered unlikely to be supported.

## **What next**

If you wish to pursue with this scheme or an amended scheme please fill in a Householder application form and provide the following documents to us:

- " Fee of £258
- " Red line plan
- " At scale 1:1250, must include OS licence number or download details (not Land Registry or Google), a North point and road names (1 or 2)
- " Block plan at scale 1:500, must include a footprint of the proposed development
- " Existing and proposed floor plans to scale

Please note that the above comments are the opinion of individual Planning Officers and are in no way binding upon the Council when determining any future applications for planning permission and nor will they prejudice the outcome of any applications submitted.

This advice also only relates to planning matters, and does not relate to any other application that may be required under Building Regulations or under any other Act, Regulation, Byelaw or Order where the Council's approval may be needed. For further guidance as to the need for consent under the Building Regulations please phone 02392 446571

Yours sincerely

Mr Robert Riley

Our Ref: GEN/24/00616