
Site Address:	228 Sea Front, Hayling Island, PO11 0AU		
Proposal:	Conservatory to front elevation.		
Application No:	APP/17/00332	Expiry Date:	24/05/2017
Applicant:	Mr J Magee		
Agent:		Case Officer:	Emma Chisnall
Ward:	Hayling West		
Site Visit Date:			

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 No 228 Sea Front is situated within a terrace block containing flats and commercial units in Hayling Island. The dwelling is situated at ground floor level and is constructed of a red facing brickwork with a polycarbonate flat roof. The amenity space to the front is moderate in size and is hard-surfaced with a mixture of paving and gravel. The curtilage boundary around No 228 is constructed of low brick wall and between the application site and Sea Front Road a communal parking area is available which serves No 228 and the other flats within the terrace.
- 1.2 No 228 is situated to the north of Sea Front Road which is off the main junction of Beach Road. The area is situated in a high density location which contains a mixture of residential and commercial units with the Funland Amusement Park to the east.

2 Planning History

None

3 Proposal

Conservatory to front elevation.

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

Development Engineer - Highways

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: 15

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
I have read through the said proposal for the small building work & have been in discussion with my neighbour & have no objection to said plan going ahead (230)	
I support John Magee and his family with this application. As his neighbour I can confirm that John has been open and honest concerning his desire for this extension - from when I first moved into my own property above his apartment. Furthermore, I am confident the extension will be structurally sound and in keeping with the aesthetics of the building and surroundings (230A)	

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 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 No 228 and the flats contained within the application site have a similar visual appearance when viewing them from Sea Front Road. A conservatory to the front of the application site would alter the visual amenity of the dwellinghouse and potentially the neighbouring flats. However following a site visit it is considered that the proposed conservatory would not look significantly out of place due to the moderate size of the proposed works and that along Sea Front Road there is a mixture of development available within a very varied streetscene.

7.4 The plans submitted show the extension to be modest in size and in proportion to the main dwelling extending out by approximately 1.4m to the front and by 2.5m in width.

The proposed conservatory shall be set in from the east and west elevation and has been proposed to be developed with a flat roof which should ensure the visual impact of the development is reduced further.

- 7.5 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) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.6 It is noted that two neighbouring flats have submitted letters of support in regards to the proposed development at No 228 Sea Front.
- 7.7 Although it is noted that the amenity space to the front of No 228 is limited the works should maintain an approximately 2.8m gap between the works and curtilage boundary. The applicants are happy with this reduction and it is considered that the amount of space left should leave a sufficient visual gap that is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.8 Although the works propose windows to be installed on both side elevations as well as an entrance door on the western side it is considered that the impact caused to the neighbouring flat to the west and the neighbouring commercial unit to the east should be limited and acceptable. This is in part due to the works being proposed to be set off the side elevations but also because the development would over-look front amenity space only which is considered to not be private amenity space as it can be viewed from the streetscene. It was noted following a site visit that fencing is in position between No 228 and the commercial unit to the east which should provide adequate screening of the works and reduce the potential for over-looking and a loss of privacy further. It is also acknowledged that a letter of support from the neighbouring dwelling was made regarding the proposed development and therefore on balance the impact caused as a result of the development is considered to not be significant and would therefore not warrant a refusal of the planning application.
- 7.9 The development proposed to No 228 is set back from the front boundary and is separated from the highway by the existing car parking area to the front of the dwellings. This is considered an acceptable distance which should ensure the apartment blocks opposite No 228 are not significantly impacted by the proposed works and can be considered acceptable.
- 7.10 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to 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.

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/17/00332 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:

Site Location Plan: Unique Plan Reference p2b/134514/184908

Proposed Block Plan: Unique Plan Reference b36b/134514/184905

Existing and Proposed Elevation Plan: Drawing A

Proposed Side Elevation Plan: Drawing B

Proposed Ground Floor Plan: Drawing D

Photographs of application site submitted 27.03.2017

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.