
Site Address:	Fieldside, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RT		
Proposal:	Part two storey, part single storey extension to include balcony		
Application No:	APP/20/00773	Expiry Date:	27/10/2020
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Charter		
Agent:	Mrs Wells	Case Officer:	Bee Crawford
	Applecore PDM Ltd		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a modern two storey detached property and attached double garage. It has a brown tiled pitched roof and elevations of red multibrick and tile hanging. The site is level with open vehicular access leading to an area of tarmac and shrubs enclosed with fencing and mature shrubs. The rear garden is mainly laid to lawn with a patio area and is enclosed by fencing and mature shrubs.
- 1.2 Detached two storey dwellings are to the north, south and opposite and agricultural land is to the rear. The area is of low to medium density with detached two storey and chalet style dwellings and bungalows of similar and individual age, style and design.

2 Planning History

91/56668/000 - Single storey side extension, PERM.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is for the construction of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension to include balcony.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

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

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

County Ecologist

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information and I have therefore carried out my own non-exhaustive desk-based assessment using the application documents, online sources and GIS mapping. The dwelling is partly clad in clay hanging tiles and the proposed works would result in disturbance to these as well as the roof structure and any voids below. These features may support legally protected species such as roosting bats and nesting birds and if present these would be impacted by the proposed works.

I would recommend that the applicant commissions a Phase 1 ecological survey of the site: this should include an assessment of the potential for the site to support protected species (to be provided by a qualified ecologist (see Natural England [guidance](#) on finding a suitably-qualified ecologist). The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (www.cieem.net) holds a database of suitably-qualified ecologists.

A Phase 1 ecological survey will determine whether there is any evidence of protected species or whether the site offers habitat suitable for supporting protected species, and whether the proposed works are likely to result in impacts to those habitats or species. Unless the consultant is able to conclude that there is no reasonable likelihood of protected species being present (due to negligible potential) or that if present they are not to be impacted by the works, it is likely that further ecological survey work (Phase 2 survey) will be required prior to determination of the application. The results of any further surveys should be used to provide an assessment of the likely ecological impacts of the proposed works and to inform any mitigation measures.

NPPF, Circular 06/2005 and Natural England Standing Advice on Protected Species, require that planning decisions are based on full, up-to-date ecological information and it is essential that all necessary survey, assessment and mitigation information is available to the LPA prior to determination, particularly in the case of protected species, which are a material planning consideration. This will enable the LPA to determine the application on the basis of full knowledge about the ecological impacts of the proposal and to ensure that any impacts can and will be mitigated, and are acceptable.

Officer comment: Noted, however the recommendation is to refuse planning permission.

Natural England Government Team

No objection- subject to securing mitigation

Thank you for consulting with Natural England on the above planning application and sincere apologies for the delayed response. We have reviewed this for potential impacts on designated sites and landscapes and come to the conclusion that, providing the appropriate mitigation is secured, Natural England have no objections. Please see below for more details.

Solent Waders and Brent Geese Strategy

The property is adjacent to Site H60G, which is classified as a Core Area in the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy. As a result we would suggest a noise condition as outlined below.

Wherever possible, percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (i.e. plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dbAmax – measured at the sensitive receptor) should be avoided during the bird overwintering period (i.e. October to March inclusive). If such a condition is problematic to the applicant, then Natural England will consider any implications of the proposals on the SPA bird interests on a case by case basis, through our Discretionary Advice Service.

Note: The sensitive receptor is the nearest point of the SPA or any SPA supporting habitat (e.g. high tide roosting site).

Species and Biodiversity Enhancement

Natural England refer your authority to our national standing advice for protected species. As standing advice, it is a material consideration in the determination of the proposed development in this application in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation and should therefore be fully considered before a formal decision on the planning application is made.

It is a requirement of all development to enhance the natural environment, as stated in the NPPF (2018 as amended), paragraphs 170,174 and 175. Natural England recommend that an appropriate level of enhancement, such as the addition of bat boxes and/or bird boxes, are secured as part of this application.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

Officer comment: Noted, however the recommendation is to refuse planning permission.

6 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: 4

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
We wish to object to the proposed two storey	

extension including balcony at "Fieldside", St Peter's Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RT on the basis of overshadowing and loss of light to our neighbouring home.

We note that the Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (Section 5.43, page 47) states that, "The design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours."

The bulk and height of the proposed two storey extension would most certainly cause us loss of light, and the protruding wall of the extension would effectively box us in. The extension would be very near to the boundary fence between the two houses, somewhere in the region of 2 metres, perhaps less.

See section 7.

The back of the houses faces West, so the section of sky which will be blocked out by the obstruction of the double storey extension is exactly where the sun moves round. It will place much of our garden directly outside our kitchen window and back door in shadow for a considerable portion of the day, and it will create constant shadow in winter when the sun is lower in the sky.

See section 7.

Furthermore, it will additionally block light from our kitchen window and we believe it may place us in a Section 45 degree overshadowing zone. We would ask that this be checked on the ground by an independent professional, and not solely calculated from plans submitted for the proposed extension. A physical check is something that would be done outdoors; it could be done without the presence of the householders and therefore it seems reasonable to ask for this to be done even at this time of restrictions due to Covid.

See section 7.

We wish to make the point that a single storey extension at "Fieldside" would not place us in this same invidious position and we believe that it would be a more acceptable alternative. The proposal at present means that just in order for the neighbours to have a balcony, we have to lose our light. We respectfully request that the Development Management Committee/authorised officers refuse permission for a double storey extension.

See section 7.

We have sent 3 photos by email, showing firstly how close "Fieldside" is to our boundary, and secondly, the current line of the back of the houses, past our kitchen window, which is consistent with all the properties in this part of St Peter's Road. The existing one storey extension at "Fieldside" can also be seen.	
--	--

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

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located outside the defined urban area on Hayling Island. Policy AL2 of the Allocations Plan sets out the criteria regarding development in such locations, and allows, in principle, for householder development subject to its impact on the character of the area and other development management criteria as laid out in the Local Plan.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 The proposal is for a part two storey and part single storey rear extension including the provision of a covered balcony and would not be visible from the public realm. It would provide a generous extended kitchen and dining area at ground floor and re-configure the accommodation at first floor to provide a large master bedroom suite with a covered balcony. It would be built on the northern side of the property and have a total width of approximately 8.1 metres and a depth of 3.7 metres, with the width of the two storey element 4.8 metres.

7.4 The two storey extension would be a continuation of the northern elevation of the property with a pitched roof matching the existing 5.1 metre eaves height and a ridge height of 6.55 metres which is 0.4 metres below the current ridge height. The covered balcony would have a depth of 1.2 metres with a 0.9 metre high balustrade.

7.5 The single storey element would have a width of 3.3 metres with a mono-pitched and flat roof with roof light to an eaves height of 2.3 metres and an overall height of 3.15 metres.

7.6 It is considered that the proposal to extend the dwelling with a two storey rear addition would significantly increase the overall bulk of the property and this, together with its proximity to the boundary would be highly overbearing to the occupiers of the property to the north at Clamshells. It is acknowledged the single storey element is effectively replacing the current rear addition, however the planning application process necessitates determination of the scheme in its entirety. As such, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on this neighbouring property which is

contrary to the advice laid out in policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted HBC Borough Design Guide 2011.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

Impact on Clamshells, St Peters Road - side/north

- 7.7 This property is a two storey detached property and lies to the north of the application on a smaller sized plot and situated at an angle to Fieldside, with the rear elevation closer to the boundary. The northern elevation of the two storey extension is approximately 2 metres from the southern boundary of this property, with the side elevation of Clamshells a further 2.8 metres away.
- 7.8 Although this is a reasonable distance between the properties, the proposed two storey extension is of a substantial depth and height. The resulting southerly outlook from this property would be of the side elevation of the extension which is predominantly brickwork and tile hanging, although there is one high level window in the ground floor section. Furthermore, the properties along this part of St Peters Road benefit from an open outlook from their rear amenity areas and it is considered an extension of this size, together with its proximity to the boundary would significantly reduce this characteristic for the occupiers of this neighbouring property.
- 7.9 With respect to the proposed balcony, whilst this would result in a degree of overlooking to the rear amenity space of this property, given the enclosed design of the balcony it is considered this would be limited. A degree of overlooking already exists from the rear first floor windows and it is deemed any additional impact would be comparable to that of a Juliet balcony which could be installed to the existing rear elevation under permitted development. It is judged that the proposal would not increase the level of overlooking to this property.
- 7.10 A 45 degree angle test was carried out as recommended in the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD, which verified that the proposed two storey rear extension would fall outside the overshadowing zone of this property. However, it is considered that the proposal which would be situated close to the boundary would significantly increase the overall bulk of Fieldside and this would be highly overbearing to the occupiers of this property, particularly when using the rear amenity space. As such, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on this property which is contrary to the advice laid out in policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide.

Impact on Chaddersley, St Peters Road - side/south

- 7.11 This property is a two storey detached property and lies to the south of the application site on a plot of a similar size. The southern elevation of the single storey extension is 7 metres from the northern elevation of this property with the two storey element of the proposal a further 3.3 metres away.
- 7.12 There are no side windows in the two storey extension and whilst there is a balcony, it is only open to the western elevation. Given the 10 metre distance between the northern elevation of this property and the southern side of balcony and its design, it is considered any additional overlooking of the rear amenity area of this property would be limited.
- 7.13 The single storey extension is only slightly larger than the existing and there is one high level window in the southern elevation. It is deemed this neighbouring property is a sufficient distance away for any impact to be negligible.

Impact on 1 St Peters Avenue and Abbots Leigh, St Peters Road

- 7.14 These properties are opposite the application site and the proposed extension is to the rear. There is a distance in excess of 30 metres between the front elevation of these properties and the front elevation of the application site. It is therefore deemed any impact would be negligible.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed two storey and single storey rear extension is considered excessively large and its proximity to the boundary would result in an overbearing presence on the occupiers of the neighbouring property to the north at Clamshells. As such, the application is contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011 and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00773 for the following reason

- 1 The proposed extension would by reason of its height, mass, bulk, design and proximity to the boundary result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring property at Clamshells, St Peters Road, harmful to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.