
Site Address: 81 Sea Front, Hayling Island, PO11 0AW
Proposal: Front ground floor and first floor extensions, side first floor extension, addition of a second floor and general remodelling.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/23/00939 Expiry Date: 29/01/2024
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Essenhigh
Agent: Mr I Murray Case Officer: Robert Riley
Ward: Hayling West

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The Application site, is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse located on the south side of Sea Front on Hayling Island. The application site, contains a paved front driveway fronting onto Sea Front road and to the rear of the application site is the properties garden and beyond that open publicly accessible land leading to Hayling beach beyond. The external walls of the application site feature white render with the roof being brown/grey concrete tiles to the pitched roof.

The application site, is located in a mainly residential area but with open land to the south leading to the beach. The character of the road is a mix with generally two storey detached and semi-detached dwellinghouses with brickwork and render designs and nearby apartments of varying scales and heights.

2 Planning History

94/58995/000 - Increase height of existing boundary wall from 2.6 to 3.4 metres on west boundary, PERM,21/04/1994

3 Proposal

The proposal to the application site involves 4 main elements:

Front ground floor and first floor extensions
Side first floor extension
Addition of a second floor
General remodelling.

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

CS16 (High Quality Design)

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

No comment received

Councillor Brenda Linger - Hayling West

No comment received

Councillor Julie Richardson

No comment received

Councillor Paul Gray

No comment received

County Archaeologist

Thank you for your consultation. In view of the small scale of the proposal I would not raise any archaeological issues,

Natural England Government Team

No comment received

Portsmouth Water Company

Portsmouth Water have reviewed the application for APP/23/00939 and have no concerns regarding impacts to groundwater quality, as the location is outside our Source Protection Zone boundaries.

Therefore, we do not recommend any planning conditions to be included on the planning permission.

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

No comment received

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre

Within 50m Notable and protected species - Early Meadow-grass, Sheep's-bit, Mossy Stonecrop, Childing Pink, Lyme-grass, Upright Chickweed, Sand Cat's-tail, Bulbous Meadow-grass, Heath Pearlwort, Suffocated Clover, Dune Frescue, Marram, Sea Bindweed, Dodder, Sand Couch, Sea Rocket, Bur Chervil.

Within 50m - Priority Habitat - Low Dry Acid Grassland

Within 50m - SSSI - Sinah Common.

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: 12

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

The representations received are 1 objection (several representations from same source); 3 Neutral Comments

Comment	Officer Comment
Objection: How do I access the plans so we can see if the side extension over looks our property. What are you doing about the existing wall, the guttering over flows into our walk way, causing a big puddle when it rains, are there any windows planed that will over look our garden, and how many stories are you planning as we will loose light if over 1 floor The proposed building plans our going to totally dominate our view from our garden our property is a mews property 1 story high and you want to put a property ground floor 1st floor and a second floor, this is going to totally dominate over our home. We will loose light and privacy Officer Comment: <i>In relation to the amended plans, the following comments have been received:</i> I have pictures on my phone showing how green our garden gets in the winter through lack of light getting into our garden, I cant see how to post the pictures on here. But our neighbours want to build one story higher and closer and a dull grey paintwork, it's	 Guttering is not a planning consideration and the guttering was confirmed by the agent to drain into the applicants garden. The works would install a second floor, with a stepped back design from Bay view Mews. The west elevation includes 1 first floor window on the closest part of the first floor this serves an en-suite and would be conditioned to be obscure glazed. Balconies would include screens to avoid overlooking Loss of private view is not a planning consideration, there would be no decrease in privacy from the development due to balcony screens. Due to the step back design it is not proposed to adversely affect light sources and the mass and bulk is considered acceptable. See part 7 of this report. The proposed development is stepped back at first and second floor level to reduce impacts on light and mitigate mass and bulk.

going to make our garden worse, and being a mostly one story building it is going to dominate our home and garden. It is totally unacceptable, we bought this property to enjoy our retirement now all that is going to be ruined. I hope you are going to compensate us for lack of light, and having to live next to a huge great monstrosity of square boxes on top of each other painted a dull depressing grey.	It is considered that due to the proposed step back design that these works would not significantly increase loss of light. The walls on the western side are shown as white render to the ground floor and light coloured Ecoscape Silver Birch composite slatted cladding to first and second floor.
Neutral Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application. We have no objections the plans submitted but wish to highlight a point regarding the first floor balcony eastern elevation. Currently this side is constructed with decorative concrete blocks, which offer a considerable degree of mutual privacy for occupants of both 81 and 79 Sea Front, and some reduction of sound transmission. It appears that the plans as submitted would use glass panels for this balcony and for that of the proposed third storey. We would greatly appreciate the use of obscured glass panels for the eastern elevations of both balconies in order to maintain a degree of privacy for occupants of both houses, especially as the proposed third storey would provide additional overlook of 79 Sea Front. Thank you for considering these comments. The main concern is overlooking/loss of privacy. The existing first floor balcony completely overlooks the gardens, and when standing, you can see directly into our property's bedroom. The existing dividing wall does offer some, but little privacy. A full height opaque glass screen on the western end of this balcony would be very much appreciated to further ensure privacy. The second floor glass surrounded balcony would overlook the gardens	Comments noted, the glass screens of both floors were confirmed to be at level 4 Pilkington opaqueness, and confirmed to be 1.7 metres tall. A condition is recommended to ensure the construction and retention of these features. Comments noted, the glass screens of both floors were confirmed to be at level 4 Pilkington opaqueness, and confirmed to be 1.7 metres tall and plans were amended in order to account for a western elevation balcony on the first floor western elevation. A condition is recommended to ensure the construction and retention of these features.

even more, although privacy internally probably won't get compromised, but you may be able to see through the roof into the conservatory. Again, a full height opaque glass screen on the western end of this balcony would be very much appreciated to further ensure privacy. If the balcony glass is changed to full height and opaque on the western sides, then I do not object	
Our property and garden are adjacent to the West elevation of the proposed extension. There is already a 1st floor balcony on the existing building which partially overlooks our garden. The addition of a new 2nd floor balcony could have a negative impact on our privacy. There are glass screens shown on the West elevation of both balconies, from the plans its not clear if these screens are opaque glass. As long as these two glass screens are full height as shown and are opaque we would not have any objection to the application	Comments noted, the glass screens of both floors were confirmed to be at level 4 pilkington opaqueness, and confirmed to be 1.7 metres tall and plans were amended to add a obscure balcony on the western elevation of the first floor. A condition is recommended to ensure the construction and retention of these features.

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) Ecology
- (v) 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 the addition of a new second floor with balconies to the first and second floor, front ground floor and first floor extensions side first floor extension and general remodelling. The proposals, would change the property to be a flat roof property instead of the existing pitched roof design.

Proposed extensions and second storey dimensions

- 7.4 The front ground floor extension, would accompany general remodelling to the ground floor. The works would move the location of the garage from the eastern side of the principal elevation, to the western side of the principal elevation, the garage would have a depth of approximately 8.3 metres and a width of approximately 5.5 metres, this is considered acceptable. The first floor front extension, would accompany general remodelling to the first floor, and would involve an enlarged open plan dining room/kitchen. The first floor front extension would have a depth of approximately 2.6 metres and a width of approximately 4.6 metres. The side first floor extension to the application site would feature a width of approximately 1 metre and a depth of approximately 11.1 metres. The second storey addition was amended in order to reduce the width, it would have an approximate height of 2 metres to the base of the overhang and a proposed maximum height of 2.5 metres to the ridge line above the first floor. It would feature an approximate width of 7.6 metres and an approximate depth of 6.2 metres.

Character and street scene

- 7.5 This proposal would alter the appearance of the host dwelling to a considerable degree, the extensions, additions of balconies and third storey alongside the alterations to the materials and glazing would result in a modernised aesthetic providing an uplift to the existing dwellinghouse. It is noted there is a considerable degree of variation in the streetscene in terms of building style and heights on Sea Front road on nearby dwellings. The nearby properties of No.79 Sea Front and the Bay view Mews apartments bare similarity to the light white and beige shades of the modern and contemporary proposed materials of No.81 Sea Front and it is not considered that these materials would appear out of character. Additionally as noted on a site visit, balconies are seen on the next door No.79 Sea Front but not to the proposed scale of No.81.
- 7.6 With regards to the flat roof design, it is normally considered by the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD that extensions should look to the existing building in terms of design style. With the proposals it is not considered that the extensions and additional storey would be in accordance with this, in particular with the change from pitched to flat roof design and the addition of an additional storey. Notwithstanding this the proposals effectively completely re-model the existing dwelling and with the existing mix of character and the proposed contemporary and attractive uplift it is not considered that the proposals would negatively harm the character and appearance of the area in and is therefore considered acceptable with regards to its design.

Scale mass and bulk

- 7.7 The building is designed such that the mass and bulk is set back from the western side at first floor level. The second floor is also set in so that it is set back from the first floor. The second floor was also amended to further reduce its footprint and impact. This is considered to reduce the visual sense of bulk from the proposed works and on balance makes this issue acceptable upon the streetscene and in relation to adjacent properties.

Materials

- 7.8 The external walls would be constructed with three materials; White K render, Ecoscape Silver Birch composite slatted cladding and Real stone cladding Knossos Natural stone. It is proposed that on the ground floor the garage on the front and east

elevation would be clad with Real stone cladding Knossos Natural stone with the rest of the ground floor featuring white K render. On the first floor, the external walls would feature both Ecoscape Silver Birch composite slatted cladding. On the second floor the external walls would feature Ecoscape Silver Birch composite slatted cladding. The proposed materials to form the windows and doors and facias will be dark Anthracite. The roof would feature a flat roof pattern on all floors, and would be installed with alwitra evalon single ply membrane. These proposed materials are considered to be both modern and contemporary and provide an attractive uplift for the dwelling.

Balconies

- 7.9 This proposal involves the use of balconies on both the first and second floors to the rear. Balcony screens are proposed to be installed on the eastern and western sides of both the rear balconies on the first and second floor. These balcony screens for the eastern and western elevations are confirmed by the agent to be 1.7 metres tall and at least level 4 obscurity on the Pilkington scale and are therefore considered acceptable as they would reduce overlooking concerns. The plans were amended, to install a 1.7 metre opaque balcony on the first floor western elevation, this would decrease overlooking from what is presently there and is considered to reduce overlooking concerns of the works. A condition to secure the screening and its retention is recommended.

Room usage of the proposed dwelling

- 7.10 The proposals also include the rearrangement of the internal space, providing 5 bedrooms in total. The rear first floor balcony would be accessed by the dining/sitting room. A garage is also proposed to be installed on the western end of the front elevation of the site which would have dimensions of approximately 8.3 metres and a width of approximately 5.5 metres. The door would be located on the east elevation to access the hall. The second floor is proposed to be used as a viewing lounge that would lead onto the second floor balcony.
- 7.11 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

- 7.12 To the western and eastern sides of the application site are properties No.79 Sea Front and the Bay view Mews apartments. Site visits were undertaken at Nos 7 and 3 Bay View Mews and the shared courtyard in order to understand the impact the works would have on each of the apartments.
- 7.13 It is noted that there was one comment in opposition to the proposals and 3 comments neither in opposition or support of the plans.
- 7.14 It was noted on the site visits that the properties to the northern side of Sea Front would not be significantly affected due to a sufficient separation distance. The proposals to the application site would involve the installation of windows on the northern elevation on the second floor, the windows would face the public realm and front gardens and receive screening from trees and foliage, it would additionally have a separation distance of approximately 45 metres from Nos 290 and 292 which

therefore makes the proposed works to install windows acceptable.

No. 79 Sea Front

- 7.15 To the east of the application site is No.79 Sea Front. The proposed works to No.81 Sea front would result in the property being approximately 0.6 metres from the common boundary, this is approximately the same as the existing distance and is therefore considered an acceptable impact as the dwelling would not feel any closer. There would be a window on the first floor eastern elevation that would receive less shielding due to the works, this would be screened by a 1.7 metre obscure balcony so would be considered an acceptable impact of the works. The amended plans feature balcony screens to be installed on both the first and the proposed second floor of the application site, on both the western and eastern elevation balconies, they are proposed to be 1.7 metres tall and to be at least level 4 Pilkington scale obscure glazing and are therefore considered to offset overlooking concerns upon No.79 Sea Front on both floors eastern elevation. The Northern elevation works would not increase overlooking due to the windows facing the public realm. There would be an increase in doors on the first floors southern elevation serving the sitting room, this would face No.81's rear garden and would receive shielding from boundary treatment and trees and is not considered to increase overlooking of No.79.
- 7.16 The existing maximum height of No.81 Seafront is approximately 7.3 metres this would be proposed to be increased to approximately 8.1 metres. The increase in height would reflect the removal of the pitched roof in order to install a 2nd floor and flat roofs. No.79 Sea Front in the streetscene provided by the agent is of a similar height to the proposed height of No.81 Sea Front. The setback design of the proposed 2nd storey helps to reduce the apparent mass and bulk of the proposed development when viewed from the east.
- 7.17 With regards to the extensions, the proposed garage is not considered to feel overbearing upon No.79 due to a sufficient separation distance and trees providing shielding. The first floor side elevation is fully shielded by the existing dwelling and would not impact No.79. The front extension on the first floor would be considered acceptable, due to its small scale and that it would face no neighbouring windows, and that it receives shielding from trees.
- 7.18 Overall, the impact on no 79 is not considered to be harmful and is considered acceptable.

No.7 Bay view Mews

- 7.19 To the west of the application site is No.7 Bay view Mews. The proposed works to No.81 Sea Front would not change the existing separation distance. On the site visit to the apartments it was noted that No.7 would be the most affected by the proposed works.
- 7.20 There would be 2 additional windows on the first floor western elevation, one would serve an ensuite bathroom and was confirmed to be obscure glass and would not increase overlooking, and the other window was proposed to serve the kitchen area, due to its position towards the front of the property on its eastern side it is considered that it would face out onto the frontage of both No.81 and the Bay view Mews Apartments, additionally it receives significant screening from large trees around the boundary line. In consideration of this, the works in regards to the windows are not considered to increase overlooking.

- 7.21 With regards to the extensions, the first floor front extension is not considered to feel overbearing in relation to its separation distance to the Bay view Mews apartments, the proposed garage is not proposed to have a significant impact upon the apartments due to the fact it is single storey and with the shielding received from trees at the boundary line. The first floor side extension would bring the first floor closer to No.7 but due to its small width of approximately 1 metre it is considered not to increase a sense of overbearing. It should also be noted that the existing pitched roof to the side would be removed.
- 7.22 In regards to balconies, both the 1st and 2nd storey are proposed to have balcony screens on their western and eastern elevations, in regards to the confirmation that they would be obscure and 1.7 metres tall it is considered that this aspect of the works would not increase overlooking.
- 7.23 In regards to scale, it is considered that the addition of the second storey adds significant bulk to the dwelling. It was noted on the site visit that the addition of the second storey with the flat roof design would have a significant presence on No.7 Bay view Mew, it was noted that the works of the second storey would be readily visible to this dwelling. The setback design of each storey, helps alleviate, bulk concerns upon No.7, and the agent amended the plans for the second storey to narrow the second storey on the western elevation. This is considered on balance to alleviate the concerns of an overbearing scale, due to shielding received from the set back design and the amended plans reducing width on this elevation. The alterations at first floor level are also set back from the ground floor which helps to reduce their impacts. In relation to light it is noted that the orientation of the properties is such that No.81 is on the western side of the Bay View Mew. As a result morning sunlight is the most impacted as from midday there would be no change to the existing position. The setback to first and second floors would result in an acceptable relationship in terms of light.

No's 3-6 Bay view Mews

- 7.24 On the visit to No.3 Bay view Mews it was determined that due to existing boundary treatment with No.4 Bay view Mews the view of No.81 would be screened. Therefore the proposed works to No.81 Sea Front would not lead to a loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking concerns and privacy concerns and is therefore considered acceptable. it would have a limited increase in the sense of bulk towards No.3, however as this would only be visible at the rear end of the garden it was not considered that it would have a harmful impact upon No.3.
- 7.25 On the visit to Bay view Mews, the shared courtyard was visited in order to understand the impacts upon the residential apartments, it was ascertained that Nos 4, 5 and 6 would have acceptable impacts upon them due to separation distances and the boundary treatments of the apartments in regards to the scale. It is not considered due to balcony screening that there would be an unacceptable increase in overlooking of these properties.
- 7.26 Overall in relation to impacts on neighbouring properties it is considered that the development would on balance and subject to appropriate conditions have an acceptable impact on residential amenity.

(iv) Ecology

- 7.27 The application site, is within 50 metres of notable and protected species and the SSSI, however, having regard to the domestic scale of the proposal, it is not considered that this development would have a harmful impact on protected species or sites.

(v) Flood risk

- 7.28 The application site is partly located in a Flood Zone 2 however, the proposed works fall within the definition of 'minor development in relation to flood risk and does not require a consultation or further action. There is no increase in bedrooms and the FRA confirms flood resilient measures are to be incorporated.
- 7.29 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have an 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 that one letter of objection was received with respect to the scheme.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area, and would have a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00939

(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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing Number: A101: EXISTING SITE & LOCATION PLAN
Drawing Number: A111 V7 AMENDED SITE AND LOCATION PLANS
Drawing Number: A113 V7 AMENDED ELEVATIONS
Drawing Number: A112 V7 AMENDED FLOOR PLANS
Drawing Number: A114 V7 AMENDED SITE SECTIONS
Design, Access and Materials Statement
Flood Risk Assessment

Also Considered:

Drawing Number: A115 V7 AMENDED FRONT SITE VIEWS
Drawing Number: A116 V7 AMENDED REAR SITE VIEW

Drawing Number: A117 V7 AMENDED SITE OVERVIEWS PLANS
Drawing Number: A120 V7 AMENDED STREET SCENE ELEVATION

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms / supporting information 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.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the en-suite window in the first floor on the west facing elevation shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5 Prior to first use of the balconies hereby permitted on the first and second floors, balcony screens to a height of 1.7m above finished balcony floor level incorporating textured glass with obscuration level no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) shall be provided to the eastern and western sides of the balconies and retained as such thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6 No roof areas shall be used as balconies other than those shown on Drawing No's A113 V7 and A112 V7.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.