

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Fully delegated Officer decision from Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Recommendation – Objection: unsympathetic extension to host dwelling, with too much glazing facing Chichester Harbour, contrary to Policies CS12 and CS16 of the Development Plan and the Joint CHAONB SPD.

I made a 'virtual' site visit on 7-6-20 using Google earth/streetview and The Conservancy's archive photography from the creek. Regard has been had to the Policy framework* below.

This site is outside the AONB but has the potential to affect its setting. The rear wall of this hipped roof chalet bungalow (dormer at front only) is some way away from the Harbour shoreline but the garden is open so the dwelling (whose proposed extension would bring it closer to the harbour) is clearly visible from the water.

The street is not homogenous in the appearance and architecture of its dwellings, with a barn-hipped chalet bungalow to one side of the site and a monopitched two storey dwelling to the other side.

Having regard to the *Policy framework below, this application for an almost full width, flat/monopitched roofed rear ground floor extension is proposed. It would seem that and existing lean-to conservatory and two outbuildings are to be demolished and removed from the site to be able to build out the new extension. The design and access statement says that part of this flat roof will be used as a roof terrace for the enlarged first floor bedroom, owing to part of the roof being monopitched (presumably to allow more light into what will be a rather deep floorplate). The monopitch roof would have a pronounced oversailing projection beyond the rear wall.

There would be no fenestration to either side of the extension, but the rear elevation would contain two double door/full height glazed sliding doors with clerestorey glazing above it.

It is noted that whilst parts of the plot are within flood zones 2 and 3, that part where the extension is proposed is within flood zone 1 and the agent sets out resilience measures to be used in construction.

Whether the roof terrace would affect either neighbours' amenity, The Conservancy will leave to the Council to determine.

There is no objection to an extension and rear dormer window in principle and the desire to improve the internal configuration of the dwelling is understood. Given that the roof area is already developed, the likelihood of any roof voids being able to sustain a bat roost is probably fairly limited. If the Council is ultimately minded to grant permission, an informative is suggested relating to protected species.

However, in order to retain a narrow slit window to the master bedroom, facing the Harbour, the extension has been off-set. This would have the unfortunate affect of unbalancing the currently symmetrical silhouette facing the Harbour with the balustrade

to the roof terrace over-running the hip profile.

Setting the extension in to match the other side and having a uniform flat roof with perhaps two lantern-lights in its surface instead of clerestorey glazing could help to improve symmetry, but the over-all amount of glazing in proportion to the elevation is considered to be excessive.

Policy framework

NPPF - 1-3,6-12, 28,38-42,47-48, 54-56, 91, 102, 105-106, 109-110, 124-128, 130-131, 148-150, 155, 163-164, 166-167, 170-172, 174-175, 180, 184-185, 189-197, 200-202, 212-213; **NPPG** – ID 6-8, ID26; **HBLP** – CS11, CS12, CS16, DM8, DM9; **HBLPA** – AL1-AL2; **Emerging local plan** - DR1, E1, E3-E5, E15, E19, E22; **CHMP** – 1-2; **SPD**.

NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework – (March 2012)

Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East

No comment

Councillor M Wilson - Hayling West Ward

No comment

Councillor R Raines - Hayling East

No comment

Environment Agency

No comment

Hampshire Wildlife Trust, Beechcroft House

No comment

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: 5

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment
No comments received	

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) Impact on the AONB
- (iv) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (v) Protected species
- (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 This proposal comprises a pitched roof dormer at first floor level to the rear elevation roof slope, alterations to the front elevation and a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing garage and conservatory. Alterations to the principal elevation include changes to the door and windows which are judged to be an acceptable modification with no harmful impact on the streetscene. The proposed dormer would serve a bedroom and would be larger than that on the front roof slope, with the ridge set at close height to the existing ridge of the main roof slope, however would not be visible from the public realm. It would comprise a doorway leading from the bedroom on to the flat area of the roof of the proposed single storey rear extension below to form a balcony area. This balcony would set out approximately 1.5 metres and, following concerns of impact on privacy to the neighbouring properties to the east and west would incorporate an obscured 1.7 metre high privacy screen on the western side, with clear glass balustrading to the rear and east.

The single storey rear extension would have a total depth of approximately 5 metres, a width of 9 metres, set in slightly off the western side wall. The roof would be flat close to the rear elevation wall of the existing property, sloping upwards forming a monopitched roof towards the rear elevation wall of the extension creating increased head height at ground floor level. There would be no windows on the side elevations of the extension, although an additional doorway on the side (east) elevation and on the rear elevation, high level windows and large bi-fold style doors leading out into the rear garden. Materials proposed include tile and brickwork to match existing.

Much of this proposal would be sited to the rear of the property, although would remain visible from the creek which leads off Chichester Harbour. Impact on the AONB which is sited in close proximity is assessed in the section below. In design terms this extension is not judged to be particularly subservient in design, with the raised monopitch roof and glass exterior to the rear facade. Despite this, it is set at single storey and is not judged to be particularly prominent when considered within the context of the site and the built form of the surrounding area, with an eclectic variation in building designs, including glass to the rear elevations.

The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building 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) Impact on the AONB

This application site is not located within the AONB, however it is sited within reasonable proximity - approximately 300 metres outside of it and therefore the Chichester Harbour Conservancy have been consulted in regard to this application. An objection has been raised in relation to the potential impact of the design on the AONB, in particular from the amount of glass proposed to the rear elevation, the lack of symmetry to the rear extension and the monopitch roof. These concerns have been raised with the applicant. On balance it was judged that the proposal would be sited out of visual distance from the AONB, due to the topography of the area, and screened by the two storey property to the east. Although the proposals would be taking place to the rear, which has an open boundary leading onto the water, there would be a reasonable separation with the garden space. In terms of the design, although it is agreed that the appearance would be improved by widening the extension across the slit window, the reasoning behind this was to retain space to manoeuvre a boat round the side of the property and due to the waterside location this was judged to be acceptable, on balance. In other design terms, the immediate area comprises many differing styles of property, in height, materials and design, many of which incorporate large glass exteriors facing towards the water. The potential impact of glass surfaces on the surrounding landscape is noted in the Chichester Harbour SPD section 19. For the reasons above it was judged that the minimal impact on the AONB would not justify a refusal, however a condition has been added requiring the glass proposed to be non-reflective.

(iv) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.4 To the east of the application site is no 39 Eastoke Avenue, this is a two storey property, set back closer towards the water than no 37. There is 3 metres distance between the properties and approximately 6 metres from the balcony area to the side elevation wall of no 39. There is not judged to be any harmful impact to the amenity of this property. The proposed balcony is not judged to impact the privacy of this property as the outdoor private amenity space and conservatory are set away, screened behind fencing and mature hedging. The first floor window on the side elevation at no 39 would be sited above the height of the balcony.

To the west of the application site is no 35 Eastoke Avenue which is a two storey property sited on the boundary with no 37. After reviewing photographs and videos supplied by the applicant it was judged that the proposed balcony area could overlook the private amenity space at no 35, potentially including rear elevation windows. Subsequently a 1.7 metre high screening has been provided on this side.

There are no neighbouring properties towards the rear.

- 7.5 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking 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). It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(v) Protected species

This site is adjacent to the Langstone SSSI and is judged to have the potential to impact protected species. An informative has been added in this regard.

(vi) Flood Risk

The main property is sited within Flood Zone 1 , although the remainder of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 . The Design & Access Statement sets out resilience measures to be used in construction.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00286 subject to the following 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:

Design & Access Statement received 08.04.2020

Flood Risk Assessment received 07.07.2020

Amended existing and proposed floor plans 100-1

Amended existing and proposed elevations 101 REV 03

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The glazed surfaces on the proposed rear (north west) elevation replacement windows as shown on approved plan number 101 REV 03 , shall be fitted with tinted and non-reflective glass and be maintained at all times thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area, to mitigate the impact of glazing viewed from Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and having due regard to policies CS11, CS12 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan policies D1 and D2, Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Joint SPD 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 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.

- 5 Before the use of the balcony hereby approved commences the approved screen on the west elevation shall be erected in the approved position as shown on drawing No 101 REV 03 and thereafter retained and maintained in that position.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No. 35 Eastoke Avenue and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the flood resilience measures as set out in the Design and Access statement received on the 08.04.2020.

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development and having due regard to policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.