
Site Address:	114 Sea Front, Hayling Island, PO11 9HW		
Proposal:	Proposed first floor and second floor extension over existing ground bungalow.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/22/00182	Expiry Date:	20/05/2022
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Sayers		
Agent:	Mr G Gard	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	ACE Designs		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to a detached bungalow located on Sea Front, just east of Bound Lane. The bungalow has a fully hipped roof of plain tiles, above white rendered elevations. The property has some small additions, including a flat roofed side extension on the east side, and a rear extension. In addition there is an old pre-fab style garage located behind the dwelling, close to the eastern boundary. The bungalow is set back and at a higher level than the road, with the frontage area having been recently cleared and now comprises hard core for the parking of several cars.
- 1.2 To the rear the site has a garden of some 18m in length, with an existing outbuilding towards the northwest corner. The properties in Wyborn Close are sited to the rear, and these are mainly chalet style dwellings (number 6 is 2 stories). Numbers 7 and 8 directly behind have short rear gardens such that the separation between them and the application dwelling is about 25m.
- 1.3 Being on the seafront, the site and area is highly prominent. However, overall the architectural style, design and scale of the buildings on the Sea Front varies enormously from large blocks of flats, care homes, contemporary dwellings and traditional smaller dwellings. This particular bungalow is the western-most one of 3 that are similar in design, although the others have first floor accommodation and gable fronted dormers.
- 1.4 Immediately adjacent the application site to the west, number 116 is a substantial two storey dwelling with large first floor, fully glazed bay window with cabrio velux window balconies in the front roof slope. It is separated from the application site by a generous drive width, and has recently gained planning permission for a single storey extension (APP/21/00880 refers). To the east number 112 is a hipped roofed chalet bungalow that is set further forward and also separated by a wide drive. It has an unusual, flat roofed angular side extension, that has a large glazed window at 45 degrees facing the site. It also has a large flat roofed garage, aligned with the one on the application site.
- 1.5 The site lies within flood zone 2 and 3. The beach opposite is a designated SINC.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Proposed first floor and second floor extension over existing ground bungalow.
- 3.2 The proposal would involve removing the existing roof and building above the existing footprint to create a first and second floor. The re-configured dwelling would be of contemporary design with a steeply pitched, gable fronted roof, with extensive glazing within the front gable of the first and second floor. The resultant dwelling would have a ridge height of 9.4m with part single storey and part 2 storey level eaves line. Within the first floor southern gable end would be recessed balconies to both the first and second floors. Within the side roof slopes two lines of velux windows are proposed and these are shown as being set such that their internal cill height would be 1.7m above floor level.
- 3.3 During the course of determining this application, the rear elevation has been amended to include a hipped element above the second floor, and the originally proposed detached garage has been omitted from the proposal. Materials would be a mix of brick and render, with grey tiles and aluminium windows and doors.

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

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

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

[n/a](#)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control

None received

Community Infrastructure

CIL Liable as the proposed extension is more than 100 sqm:
<http://www.havant.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy-charging-schedule>.

The applicant has indicated they wish to make a claim for extension relief. In order for relief to be granted, a CIL Form 9 must be submitted and acknowledged prior to commencement of works.

County Ecologist - Initial response

Designated Sites

The site is within 20 metres of the Beachlands East Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) and within 130 metres of the Hayling Island Beach SINC, both areas designated in part for the presence of coastal vegetated shingle – this habitat is listed as a Habitat of Principle Importance under the NERC Act 2006 and is particularly susceptible to the impacts of recreational disturbance. The site is located within 150 metres of the Solent and Dorset Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and falls within the Solent SPA buffer area. There is a Primary Support Area listed in the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy located along the beach within 500 metres of the site (H105). The proposals include an additional 4 bedrooms and therefore additional residents in close proximity to the designated areas – this would have the potential to result in increased visits to these sites, which could result in additional disturbance to their qualifying features. A mitigation strategy is required to address these potential impacts. As the proposals will result in additional overnight stays, a mitigation strategy is also required to demonstrate nutrient neutrality in line with HBC's Position Statement and Mitigation Plan for Nutrient Neutral Development (updated May, 2022).

Protected Species

The existing building is covered with clay roof tiles, a feature with potential to support roosting bats. Given the nature of the structure and the known presence of several species of bats in the local area, there is a reasonable chance of roosting bats being present. There are also records of reptiles in the local area and the habitats on site could support other species of nature conservation interest.

I would therefore recommend, in the first instance, that the applicant commissions a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) survey of the site: this should include an assessment of the potential for the site to support protected species

Officer Comment:

As householder extensions only, with no net gain in number of dwelling units on the site, no mitigation for recreational disturbance or water quality is required.

County Ecologist - on submitted Bat Survey

The application is accompanied by a Phase 1 Daytime Bat Assessment (J Denton, August 2022) and a Phase 2 Bat Survey (J Denton, August 2022). Key findings: based on the presence of a small number of gaps/crevices on the exterior of the dwelling, the building was considered to offer low potential for roosting bats. A single evening emergence survey was carried out in August 2022. No bats were observed roosting within the dwelling. No further works are necessary.

If you are minded to grant permission, and in acknowledgement of the fact that several bats were observed flying within the site, can I suggest that the recommendations for controls on lighting are secured by condition. External lighting has the potential to result in impacts to foraging/commuting bats.

Southern Gas Networks - stage 1

None received

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: 13 representations in total - 7 on the original plans and a further 5 on the amended plans.

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>General comments:</u>	
<u>Hours of Work</u> Over the bank holiday weekend of Good Friday and the Easter holiday break, the occupiers commenced works on their property at 07:16 on Good Friday, 08:30 on Saturday, and continued works into Sunday and throughout the weekend. Involved the use of a digger and a dumper truck, making loud clunking noises; being a Bank Holiday Council officials unavailable	Some clearance and preparatory works took place over the Easter Bank Holiday weekend - none of which required planning permission, but applicant has been advised of need to respect reasonable working hours; neighbours have been advised of need to report un-reasonable noise nuisance to Environmental Health
<u>Safety issues</u> allegedly a gas mains pipe was breached; gas smelt and repair attempted - could have been one spark from an extremely serious incident; if a self build then responsibilities under CDM (2015) regarding construction design plans, principle contractors, principal designers, management of the build, and the general safety to others; Recent fire at site	Not planning matters - neighbours advised to contact the Health & Safety Executive; Building Regulations approval will be required and will ensure appropriate standards are met Not a planning matter
<u>Business from site</u> several deliveries a day at times, and materials are being delivered for works required at other sites. Works vehicles such as rangers and vans come and go frequently; An average day at present will see approx 7-15 deliveries. Also massive boat against boundary wall (6 wheeled trailer)	Not relevant to the consideration of a householder extension application; should any business that needs permission be operated from the site then would be a matter for Enforcement team to investigate
<u>Intensification of site</u> approximately 8 people living there at	

present, with the proposed plans indicating further living space - this will become a very busy and noisy property, certainly not in keeping with the current tranquillity and ambiance of the location; 7 bedrooms proposed, with many vehicles	Site remains a single family dwelling
<u>Garage</u> The garage height at 6.5 metres tall is totally unacceptable, actually unbelievable, totally out of proportion with the surrounding neighbourhood dwellings and outbuildings; will hinder outlook, from all windows; will completely over look and overshadow. Proposed garage seems more like housing accommodation with a great number of windows which would be very close to and overlook; Adverse effect on daylight and sunlight; no privacy as the garage windows overlook my Bedroom, Dining Room/lounge area/kitchen, breakfast room and my bathroom/toilet.	The garage has now been omitted from scheme
<u>Comments on Extension/Proposal:</u>	
<u>Overlooking/loss of privacy</u> alterations so vast will cause overlooking and loss of privacy with views into rooms; window positions, even if frosted, when opened will allow clear sight to rooms and garden; windows to rear create a viewing gallery leaving little privacy to rear or sides	See section 7
<u>Overshadowing</u> adverse effect of losing light/over shadowing and loss of sunshine to my property will not only darken my rooms it will also cause gas heating to be turned on for longer periods as won't be able to rely on the warmth from the natural sun light.	See Section 7
<u>Scale and Character</u> overbearing to the visual impact on the character of this particular part of the seafront area; site part of 3 modest bungalows by same builder, setting unique character to the street scene; density, layout & height ludicrous; 7	See Section 7

bedrooms will bring considerable noise and disturbance; proposal excessively large and out of keeping with the plot and location	
<u>Nitrate Neutrality</u> the many bedrooms (up to 10 with summer house and garage used for sleeping) means an increase in humans having a negative impact on Nitrate Neutrality.	HBC's Position Statement does not require mitigation for householder extensions, only when there is a net gain in number of dwellings. This site remains a single family dwelling
<u>Loss of natural habitat</u> destroyed the natural habitat of The male Stag beetle, which is a protected species; loss of grassed areas for parking could result in loss of nationally rare orchid, Autumn Ladies Tresses which is found in area;	See section 7
<u>Highways/access</u> The boats alone hold up the seafront traffic when they are being maneuvered onto and off the driveway	See section 7
<u>Overdevelopment</u> over-development going from a single story bungalow to a large 3 storey house.	See section 7
<u>Additional comments on amended plans</u> main building will still be 3m higher than the existing building; large number of windows to both side elevations, and rear still result in loss of privacy; Despite the rear of the building appearing to be raked back at first floor level, depending on the floor height this still may be looking down into neighbouring properties; Dwelling will be out of character with properties in the immediate vicinity; not in scale and appearance with neighbouring properties; will irrevocably and irreparably alter presentation of seafront; marked increase in square meterage; designed with multiple occupation in mind; increased occupation leads to	 See section 7 - cross section provided showing internal height of side windows See section 7 - street scene/section plan provided

increased noise and traffic; scale of build lead to loss of natural light to garden, impacting vegetation and wildlife; at night time increased light pollution will affect nocturnal hedgehogs, bats and view of stars/night sky If this planning application is to be approved, we would request that all side and rear windows are frosted and not clear, so that privacy remains.	Site remains a single family dwelling Within urban area, extensions to an existing dwelling would not make any significant difference to stars; but see section 7 re bats Would be unreasonable to limit light to rooms & section demonstrates roof lights above eye height- see section 7
<u>Outbuilding</u> Do changes made to summer house meet planning regulations	Applicant advised of permitted development rights
<u>Noise/Business</u> Ongoing noise from works, with lack of respect or consideration for the neighbouring properties; continue to receive what appears to be deliveries and that this is being used as a business address.	A matter for either Environmental Health or Enforcement teams to investigate if complaints made
<u>Subsidence/Flood Risk</u> Concern over extra weight of increased property and possibility of subsidence and increased flood risk;	Covered by need to meet Building Regulations standards

Further comments received from previous author also requesting that no future garage be allowed to be applied for
response - removal of Class E Outbuilding PD rights considered unnecessary as site large enough to accommodate and criteria of Class E such that heights etc would be appropriate in this residential area

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) Highways and parking
- (v) Ecology
- (vi) Flood Risk
- (vii) CIL

(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. The

proposal is for extensions to the existing dwelling, utilising the existing footprint - it is notable that no ground floor additions are proposed at all, the footprint of the existing building would remain. The first floor above would be squared off and in part slightly overhang the recessed areas of the ground floor at the front and rear, and the roof would cat slide over the rear western side addition. The existing flat roofed eastern side porch/conservatory would remain as a flat roofed addition. Therefore the impacts of the proposal arise from the additional height and windows, and associated change in external appearance, and not from any ground floor enlargement or encroachment closer to any boundaries.

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

- 7.3 The existing bungalow is sited between a very large two storey dwelling and a chalet bungalow. A section and street scene plan has been provided demonstrating that the proposed overall ridge height would be similar to that of the 2 storey dwelling to the immediate west, number 116. The use of a gable fronted, steep pitch roof, is such that from the beachfront street scene, the added height relates to the apex only and a large sense of space and skyline would remain about the roof scape. This would maintain a sense of separation to the adjacent properties and not be overly oppressive or dominant in street scene terms.
- 7.4 Furthermore, the eaves line has been kept as low as possible with an overhang, which visually anchors the appearance of the dwelling down, and is more respectful of the height of the chalet bungalow to the east, number 112. Overall, the profile and silhouette of the enlarged dwelling is considered to be respectful of the sites immediate setting - and would appear as a logical link between the mass and bulk of the dominant 2 storey dwelling at 116 and the lower chalet bungalow at 112.
- 7.5 It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in a complete alteration of the visual appearance of the site, with contemporary glazed facade, render finishes, grey roof and aluminium windows and doors. Third party representations object to the loss of the traditional bungalow, that currently sits adjacent to other traditional dwellings, particularly in terms of their materials ie plain tiled roofs, red bricks etc. However within the wider Sea Front road, contemporary designs and materials are present. The site is highly prominent and it can be argued that modern designs add vibrancy and interest to the seafront area. Since the area is not a Conservation Area, and there are other contemporary designs along the Sea Front road, then it is considered that the loss of the more traditional architecture and materials could not be substantiated as a reason for refusal.
- 7.6 Third party comments also note the increase in floor space and potential overdevelopment of the site. However the footprint is not increasing, and therefore an 18m rear garden depth would remain. It is considered that the plot size can readily accommodate the scale of development proposed and still provide adequate amenity space and parking etc for future occupiers.
- 7.7 Overall, it is considered that the alterations proposed would result in a contemporary design that would add visual interest to the street scene on this prominent seafront site. The detailed height, scale and design is considered to sufficiently respect the pattern of adjacent development and spatial characteristics of the area. Therefore the design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the street scene and is considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy) and the Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.8 The adopted Borough Design Guide SPD, 2011 recommends a minimum back-to-back separation of 20m for two storey dwellings with an additional 4m per storey, in order to maintain reasonable relationships and protect amenity. In this instance the back to back separation with the properties in Wyborn Close is at least 25m, which meets the standard. However the original gable ended rear elevation with large and dominant windows at first and second floor was considered to be potentially overly dominant and lead to a sense of overlooking by the occupiers of the dwellings to the rear. Amended plans have been submitted adding a large hip to the rear elevation and reducing the size of the first floor window openings. As a result the rear elevation would appear as a relatively standard two storey dwelling in terms of height of eaves line, with 3 first floor windows (one serving a bathroom and therefore obscure glazed). There would be an additional velux window above in the rear hip end.
- 7.9 Third party comments request all the first floor rear windows to be obscure glazed, but this is considered unreasonable and inappropriate for the living accommodation (bedrooms) that the other 2 first floor rear windows serve. In this established residential area, first floor windows are common place and the back to back separation distance is sufficient to meet standards. Whilst it is acknowledged that the development would introduce first floor windows, this would be commensurate to the standard pattern of development in established residential areas. Any loss of a view from the added height is not a material consideration, but the use of the steeply pitched roof would minimise any harm to the outlook from the properties to the rear.
- 7.10 In terms of the side roof lights, these are all set in the front two thirds of the roof slope, with an internal cill height of 1.7m which is above the average eye height. As such they would sit approximately adjacent the neighbouring elevations and roof slopes, and not over the rear gardens. The only view out would be upwards to the sky, and not down to neighbouring private rear gardens. As such they are considered acceptable as clear glazed opening windows and it is not necessary for them to be obscure glass, it wouldn't achieve any increased privacy. It is however recommended to remove permitted development rights for any further roof alterations to protect neighbouring amenity. The proposed front balconies would be recessed and enclosed to the sides, with the only angle of vision possible being forward, to the sea. Overall, with conditions, neighbouring privacy and amenity would be protected from the design detail.
- 7.11 In terms of any overshadowing, as a higher building there would be some additional shading. But due to the orientation, this is unlikely to significantly affect the properties immediately adjacent. It is only when the sun is low early in the morning and late evening, that some additional side overshadowing may result. The overshadowing during the majority of the day would fall on the applicants own rear garden, but be unlikely to extend 18m to have any adverse effect on the properties to the rear. Similarly, the steeply pitched roof rising away from the neighbours, with existing generous side separations is unlikely to result in any direct loss of sunlight to the side windows of the neighbours.
- 7.12 Overall it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity from loss of privacy, overshadowing or outlook, and the development would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Highways and parking

- 7.13 No change to the existing access arrangements are proposed and the site would remain a single family dwelling that would not adversely impact highway safety. In terms of parking, as a 4+ bedroomed dwelling, 3 on site parking spaces would be required, to meet the adopted Parking SPD. The originally proposed garage has been withdrawn from the scheme due to concerns over its height and impacts on neighbouring amenity, but nevertheless the site frontage is of ample size to accommodate at least 3 vehicles. The proposal is therefore considered compliant with policy DM13 and the Parking SPD.

(v) Ecology

- 7.14 During the course of determining this application, third party comments alerted the presence of bats and other protected plants in the area. As an existing residential dwelling and well used garden area, the upward development would not unduly impact the presence of any protected flowers or plants. In terms of the bats, the applicant commissioned a phase 1 and 2 survey which found no bats emerging from the existing dwelling. Bats were however observed commuting across the site and hence it is recommended to condition any external lighting to minimise disruption to foraging bats. The County Ecologist concurs with this view.

(vi) Flood risk

- 7.15 The site lies within flood zones 2 and 3 and as minor household development the flood risk assessment within the Planning Statement notes the property is raised 900mm above road level, which is above the projected 1:100 year flood event. The existing internal floor level would be retained and as upper floor extensions arguably the safety of future occupiers in the event of a flood is improved.

(vii) CIL

- 7.16 The proposed extensions would result in a net gain of residential floor space over the 100sqm threshold, and is therefore CIL liable. Self-build residential extension exemption is also being claimed.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The contemporary scale, siting and design of the proposal is considered appropriate for this Sea Front site, and is considered to be respectful of neighbouring development and 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/22/00182

(A) 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 external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, or 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.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order, no other alterations to the roof of the dwellinghouse, including insertion of additional roof lights, as permitted by Part 1, Class C of the 2015 (as amended) Order shall take place without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 Any external lighting shall not exceed 2000 lumens (150W) and should be downlighters only, to ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the recommendation for the restriction of artificial lighting as detailed in the Phase 2 Bat Survey (J Denton, August 2022).

Reason: To provide ecological protection and enhancement in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, NPPF, NERC Act 2006 and Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011

- 5 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.