

Comments for Planning Application APP/19/00974

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/19/00974

Address: 5 Spinnaker Grange, Hayling Island, PO11 0SJ

Proposal: Single storey rear extension with balcony area to first floor.

Case Officer: Lesley Wells

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am very conversant with the environs of Spinnaker Grange and been a frequent visitor to No.3, the adjacent property to No.5, the subject of the Planning Application for which I have a couple of objections.

The first objection is that this latest intended single storey extension to No.5 is an overly brutal, modernist structure with massive roof overhangs, emphasising massive and dominating parapet walls, which make it higher than most such extensions. It is, therefore, totally unforgiving for a domestic dwelling in Spinnaker Grange and more suited to industrial buildings or garage forecourts. It is thus not suited to the environs of and not in keeping with Spinnaker Grange, which overlooks an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. (References 1, 2)

It is also obvious that in the case of No 5 and No 3 Spinnaker Grange, the angles of the properties relative to each other mean that rear extensions here can only severely impinge on property privacy.

Accordingly, the second objection to No.5's proposed extension is that not only does its size and massive design dominate the landscape in the area of No.3 and the AONB but it severely compromises the privacy of No.3's plot. Even its axis of ground floor window view is directed to overview No.3. The proposed frosted glass screen to the balcony design only partially acknowledges this issue but the screen is not dimensioned and, by its nature, lacks building construction permanence. (Reference 1,2 and 3)

The Applicant's Design Statement cites a recent extension to No.17 as a design precedent but in the case of No.17, this precedent is false as the size of extension is smaller and the geography with its neighbours is completely different. No.17's extension and balcony is small and without the

problem of overlooking any of its neighbours.

This Application must be refused.

References:

1. Havant Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document. Core Strategy Policy CS16 1e
The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

2. Chichester Harbour AONB Joint SPD dated 16 May 2017(Joint HBC 17 July 2017)

14.1 In the design of an extension to an existing dwelling it is important to respect or complement the style of the main house.

14.3 rear and side extensions should be carefully designed to avoid impact on neighbouring properties, ensuring that there is sufficient amenity space left for the house

15.1 Careful thought should be given to the siting and scale of the ancillary buildings so as to avoid impact on neighbouring properties and dominance over the dwelling. The setting should not be intrusive in the landscape or in Public view from land or water.

33.3 Extensions should have similar roof angles to the main house

3. Chichester Harbour AONB SPD 16 May 2017 (Joint with HBC 17 July 2017)

11.3 The position within the plot is very important to consider, not only the siting of the house or extension, but also to make sure the privacy and amenities such as light of neighbouring properties are preserved