

---

Site Address: 40 Sea Front Estate, Hayling Island, PO11 9JJ  
Proposal: Single storey rear extension. Raise ridge height of roof with rear dormer to allow for first floor accommodation; revised fenestration and front porch.  
Application No: APP/17/00523                      Expiry Date: 12/07/2017  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Lewis  
Agent: Mr A Dunks                      Case Officer: Emma Chisnall  
              Andrew R Dunks Ltd  
Ward: Hayling East  
Site Visit Date:

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

---

## **1     Site Description**

- 1.1 The application site is made up of a detached bungalow of brick construction with white render along the side and rear elevation with a pitched plain tiled roof. The dwelling does not have accommodation in the roof space and therefore only has windows present at ground floor level.
- 1.2 No 40 is hard-surfaced with paving to the front and side in order to accommodate two parking spaces onsite. A garage is posited to rear east of the application site providing one additional space. The remaining space to the front is moderate in size, laid as lawn and is partially screened by an approximate 1.5m hedge to the front. The amenity space to the rear is laid as lawn and surrounded with a 1.8m timber fencing around the curtilage boundary. Mature trees are present to the rear of the curtilage.
- 1.3 The immediate area is residential in nature with various style dwellings within Sea Front Estate, including detached and semi-detached bungalows with single storey extensions present to the rear.

## **2     Planning History**

None

## **3     Proposal**

- 3.1 Single storey rear extension. Raise ridge height of roof with rear dormer to allow for first floor accommodation; revised fenestration and front porch.
- 3.2 The rear extension would measure approximately 11.5m deep along the shared boundary with No 39 Sea Front Estate, from the existing rear projection of the dwelling, 7.8m in width and 2.85m in height. The extension includes a roof lantern which adds a further 0.3 m in height to this part of the proposal.
- 3.3 The raising of the ridge height would increase the ridge height by 1.5m

## **4     Policy Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

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)

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

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

## **5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

- 5.1 **Arboricultural Officer Comment:** No objections to this application on Arb grounds. One tree can be lost due to its poor condition and the Oak will need to be protected in line with BS: 5837 (2012) if permission is given.

## **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: 2

| <b>Comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>Officer Comment</b>                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| <b>No 38 Sea Front Estate has raised concern over:</b><br><br>Impact of the development on privacy.<br>Suggestion of dormer to the south to remove this impact as well as roof windows in the north to reduce the intrusive impact.<br>Large trees to the rear could be impacted by the proposed ground floor extension. | See Section 7 below under 'Planning Considerations' |
| <b>No 39 Sea Front Estate has raised concern over the single storey extension and increasing the ridge height:</b><br><br>Strongly disagree with the building on the boundary<br>Reduction in light to the property and garden.<br>Visual impact of development<br>Proposed windows removing privacy.                    | See Section 7 below under 'Planning Considerations' |

|                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Open window presented health and safety hazard                                                                                            | Not a planning consideration                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Any new guttering will infringe on my property.<br>Increasing the height will increase the height of the properties to the east and west. |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Development could impact the trees on site and the stag beetle larva.                                                                     | In relation to stag beetles the development would retain rear trees and potential habitat for stag beetles. It is noted that HBIC have not raised issues with protected species in the locality. |
| Access to my property required for maintenance                                                                                            | Noted but not a matter that would constitute a reason to refuse planning permission.                                                                                                             |

## 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) Impact on Trees
- (v) Parking

(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 works propose the raising of the ridge height on No 40 in order to accommodate a first floor living space. This would increase the height to the front of the dwelling by approximately 1.5m. Whilst this would be a significant change to the scale of the existing building, the alteration in itself is considered an acceptable alteration in terms of the character and appearance of the street scene.

7.4 The proposed single storey flat roof addition is located to the rear of the site and would therefore primarily be viewed from adjacent properties and gardens.

7.5 Although there is evidence of rear extensions within the immediate area the proposed works to No 40 are considered to not reflect a typical domestic sized extension and the works proposed at ground floor level to No 40 is particularly deep at approximately 11.5m and width at 7.8m creating an unacceptable mass and bulk on the original dwellinghouse which is contrary to the Borough Design Guide. The works would also extend past existing rear extension along this part Sea Front Estate and therefore it is considered that the development would be materially harmful the character and appearance of the area.

7.6 Paragraph 5.39 of the Borough Design Guide States:

*Single storey extensions, should also be more modest in scale than the main building and should not be allowed to dominate. In general flat roofs are not acceptable. The roof of the extension should mirror that of the main building, in terms of its angle, eaves detail, materials, doors and windows. There may be exceptions to this rule, providing the results do not have an adverse affect on neighbouring properties or the streetscene.*

- 7.7 Paragraph 5.41 also goes on to state *"Rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building. They also need to have particular regard to neighbouring properties and should not cause an adverse affect, such as overshadowing"*.
- 7.8 It is considered that the proposed development by reason of its size and flat roofed design would represent an extension to the existing modest bungalow that is out of character with the host property and harmful to the visual amenities of the area.
- 7.9 The development is therefore considered to be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 The single storey flat roofed rear extension would extend along the shared boundary with No 39 Sea Front Estate some 11.5m with a height of approximately 2.8m. It is considered that the resulting height and depth hard up to the shared boundary with No 39 would be particularly dominant and oppressive when viewed from the living space along the side and rear elevation. The development would reduce light levels into this habitable space and create some over-shadowing particularly in the morning as the sun rises. Concern has been raised by the neighbouring dwelling to the west about the development being built up the boundary line and the visual impact this would cause as well as a reduction to light and issues.
- 7.11 It is considered that the increase of the ridge height being raised by 1.5m with its additional resulting mass and bulk would add to the impact on No 39 increasing the potential for the works to cause harm to amenity levels. Concern has also been raised by the same neighbouring dwelling to the west that this would lead to an impact on light levels, outlook and cause over-looking, a loss of privacy.
- 7.12 The depth of the single storey rear extension would also impact the outlook and light levels reaching the habitable room in position to the rear of No 41 Sea Front Estate. Although a 0.9m gap is maintained between the proposed extension to No 40, No 41 itself effectively forms the shared boundary. The depth of the extension (extending to the rear of No.41) would reduce light levels into this habitable space and create over-shadowing particularly in the afternoon and early evening as the sun sets.
- 7.14 Paragraph 5.43 of the Borough Design Guide States that:
- "The design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours. Obstruction of light and outlook from an existing window can be mitigated against if the extension does not result in the centre of the existing windows being within a combined plan and section 45 degree overshadowing zone."*
- 7.15 Paragraph 5.44 goes on to say: *"To assess this, on the window wall elevation an angle is drawn diagonally down at 45 degrees from the near top corner of the proposed extension. An angle of 45 degrees is then drawn back from the end of the extension toward the window wall. If the centre of the main window of the adjoining property lies on the extension of both these lines, then the extension will probably cause a noticeable reduction in sky light received by the window."*

- 7.16 It is considered that the resultant built form by reason of its combined height and depth being in such close proximity to the shared boundary would encroach within the 45 degree line and thereby would create an unacceptable reduction in outlook and be over-bearing in nature to No 39 and No 41 Sea Front Estate. There would also be a reduction in light levels particularly to No 39 which has side and rear windows impacted by the development.
- 7.17 The applicant and agent making this proposal have been informed regarding these concerns and a request was made by the case officer to reduce the rear extension in depth in order to remove the un-neighbourly impact caused to No 39 Sea Front Estate and No 41 Sea Front Estate. However, no amendments were offered to be made in order to address concerns and therefore the proposal would fail to accord with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan and the Borough Design Guide SPD.
- 7.18 It is noted that two objections have been made by neighbouring dwellings in relation to the proposal expressing a shared concern over the development's potential to cause overlooking from the proposed dormer windows. However it is considered that the dormer windows would not result in significant over-looking to No 39, 41 or the dwelling to the rear as they would be primarily face down the rear garden of No 40 and be set well off the properties further to the north. .

(iv) Impact on Trees

- 7.19 Concern has been raised by the neighbouring dwellings that the development proposed at No 40 has the potential to impact the trees in position within the rear amenity space. One tree to the east side boundary would be removed as a result of the development. The Arboricultural Officer has been consulted in relation to this and has raised no objections with regards to the scheme however, should, planning permission have been recommended a condition would be needed that the Oak tree onsite be protected with fencing in line with BS: 5837 (2012).

(v) Parking

- 7.20 The application site proposes the removal of two bedrooms at ground floor level with the installation of one master bedroom at first floor level. As the development would reduce the amount of bedrooms at No 40 there would not be a requirement for parking spaces to be increased on-site and therefore the current provision of two spaces is considered adequate in order to comply with the Borough Parking SPD.

## **8 Conclusion**

- 8.1 It is therefore concluded that the rear extension by reason of its depth and width along the shared boundary with No 39 Sea Front Estate and in close proximity to No 41 Sea Front Estate would result in the loss of light, overshadowing, overbearing effect and loss of outlook to the living space of both these dwellings. The unacceptable harm caused to the neighbours amenity alongside the material harm caused to the character of the area as a result of the development would be contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and Havant Borough Design Guide SPD.

---

## **9 RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/17/00523 for the following reasons:-

- 1 The rear extension would by reason of its size, depth and siting result in an un-neighbourly development to the harm of the residential amenities of the occupiers of No's 39 and 41 Sea Front Estate. In particular the development would have an overbearing effect, cause a loss of outlook and have a detrimental impact on light to the living space of the adjoining properties to east and west. The unacceptable harm caused to neighbour amenity as a result of the development proposed would conflict with Policy CS16, Part 1(e) of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, paragraphs 5.39, 5.41, 5.42, 5.43 and 5.44 of the Havant Borough Council Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
  
- 2 The rear extension would by reason of its scale, mass, bulk, design (including the extensive front roof), depth and width result in an extension that would dominate the existing modest dwelling and be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policy CS16 Part 1 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and paragraphs 5.39, 5.40, 5.41 and 5.42 of the Havant Borough Council Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.