

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Leah Turner - Hayling East

No comment

Councillor M Wilson - Hayling East

No comment

Councillor R Raines - Hayling East

No comment

County Archaeologist

The site lies within the archaeologically important area of Hayling Island and contains the remains of a World War II pillbox. However, the proposed house extension is of a limited size and will not be located close to any known archaeological remains. As such, I do not wish to raise any archaeological issues.

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: 10

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Comment	Officer Comment
Please find my objection to the above planning detailed below. Reference document " Design and Access Statement 140 Southwood road Hayling Island PO119QH " A previous similar but less ostentatious design was refused under application Number APP/21/00710 for the following reasons: 1. 1 The proposed development by reason of its two storey scale, bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous addition to the host	Please see 'Planning Considerations' section of the report.

bungalow and its attached neighbour, detracting from the appearance of the premises and harmful to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed development would result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring residential properties (Nos. 138 and 144 Southwood Road), detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties, as well as giving rise to direct overlooking of the attached neighbour (No.138). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

In response to the two points above, there are no changes in the current application that substantially address any of the noted issues. This extension would still be bulky, prominent, incongruous and overbearing and thus contravene Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

The previous application APP/21/00710 did not include a rear balcony. If it did, then this is not visible through the plans available online. Therefore we are now looking at a significantly greater development and potential overlooking issue. The sun comes up to the east and so the addition of a forward standing balcony and its support structure will make a huge reduction in light entering the main living area of 138 Southwood Road.

The addition of 1.7 metre frosted glass to the balcony does not substantially reduce the overlook of my garden and in particular the northern end of the garden of 138 Southwood road that can be screened from the promenade view by putting up a windbreak.

The Balcony structure breaks the 45 degree rule by obscuring light to the main window to the south of 138 Southwood road. Light is also blocked to the adjacent flats.

The planning process being progressive in nature, should not account for the proliferation of balconies along the seafront allowed through previous planning applications to be the basis for subsequent applications. The proposed development by reason of its two storey scale, bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous addition to the host bungalow and its attached neighbour, detracting from the appearance of the premises and harmful to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The plans remain detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties, as well as giving rise to direct overlooking of the attached neighbour (No.138). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011,

Existing street scene and building

The document states "The existing building is divided into two semi detached dwellings. The front elevation of both dwellings is dealt with in different ways with random extensions having been added to both properties. Again at the rear both properties have been extended with flat roof structures and different roof treatments.

The overall effect is a building of poor quality that appears ramshackle from both the viewable elevations (North and South)".

The extensions are not random, they are the result of successful planning applications. I find this statement subjective, inflammatory and disrespectful of the planning process.

In an attempt to sway opinion the application makes a deliberate disparaging and highly subjective statement. The building is neither of poor quality or ramshackle appearance. Both are highly desirable

properties in their current condition and appearance.

The applicant wishes to portray the street scene as ramshackle due to mixed styles of building in order to justify such an overbearing design.

They suggest the buildings are of poor quality and then wish to build on top of this which is completely contradictory.

The document states "Whilst we respect the planning officers opinion, we strongly disagree with the comments and believe that this addition, whilst not conventional does improve an existing building of poor quality . In addition it greatly improves the retained elements of the existing building creating an improved relationship with its neighbouring building".

Highlighted in red above is the opinion of the applicant and their agent. This opinion is not shared by myself. It does not improve the relationship with its neighbouring building whatsoever!

Design approach

The document states "Obviously this is a somewhat challenging design brief as the neighbour does not wish to make changes to their property".

This statement is untrue. I have never been approached by anyone to query whether I would consider making changes to my property. As with the previous planning application, the design brief is based on a lie.

The document states" The rear extension also aims to work with the roofline of both the existing dwellings as if they were one and create a building that is

substantially improved and bought together within the context of the eclectic street scene, especially the rear street scene as seen from the water and public footpath".

"As you face the building in north and south elevation the roofline takes its pitches from the existing roof structure to create an offset pitch which pulls the building together as one".

The proposed plan changes the roofline and highlights the two

properties as separate. It does not make them as one. They are not brought together within the context of the eclectic street scene from any aspect at which the adjoining properties are viewed.

Alternative solutions

This entire section of the design brief (copied below) is poorly written, contradictory and confusing.

The document states: "We feel the design offers a much better solution to the clients requirements that the potential Class AA permitted development solution that would involve adding a storey to the existing original pitched roof part of the building and then replicating the partial pitched roof structure at second floor level.

This would create a higher structure with a poor quality (but compliant) roofline and would have significantly more impact on the street scene due to the original part of the building being further forward on the plot".

This seems to suggest that while the design is of higher quality than a Class AA permitted development solution, its roofline is non-compliant and should therefore not be allowed. If the enlargement is not a Class AA permitted development with the addition of a storey, it must be a loft conversion and that being such contravenes planning rules on the following points:

- Greater than 50 cubic metres
- Exceeds height of existing roof
- Includes balcony
- Original roof eaves are not maintained or reinstated
- Enlargement not set back from original eaves by at least 20cm
- Roof enlargement overhangs wall of original property.

The western portion of the roof overhangs 138 Southwood road. (see A102 FIG 2) This is a direct infringement and expansion of the boundary of 140.

The proposed works would require extensive access across my property and a significant chance of causing

damage to 138 Southwood road during construction. I do not believe that the foundations or dividing wall were built to accomodate construction above. The wall between the two properties is of single skin construction and therefore major structural works would be required in order to support another storey extension. Ref floorplans A102 Figure 2, The construction of the west elevation would require breaking into my south facing sloped roof to make a join to their structure. [Redacted text] To conclude, I urge you not to accept this planning application. I do not accept [redacted text] 140 are of ramshackle appearance and of poor quality. The huge overbearing design of this application will dramatically affect the light to the main living area of 138. The balcony and loft extension will provide huge overlooking potential and remove all of the potential privacy within the garden of 138. This proposal in no way improves the street scene or creates anything positive for its neighbour 138 or surrounding properties. For all the points raised above this is not a viable application.	
I object to this application on the following grounds. The 3D drawings are missing important details and do not accurately represent the neighbouring property to the East who's windows will be overlooked by the proposed application [redacted]. Furthermore, the proposed 2nd story will create a loss of light [redacted]. The building this application relates to is and will be very close to the property's Eastern boundary and that neighbouring residence so I believe this application to be a bulky and excessive overdevelopment of a somewhat confined plot/space, making it overbearing for its neighbours.	Please see 'Planning Considerations ' section of the report.
As with previous recent applications for this address, this one shows little consideration to neighbouring properties. Blocking light and views to the neighbouring residents. The huge glass frontage a great hard reflective	Please see 'Planning Considerations ' section of the report.

surface like a city tower. Out of context, on this stretch of the seafront and in stark contrast to the properties along this stretch of Hayling seafront. It will put this property out of financial reach of most that have grown up on the Island. An over the top design that will only serve the owner to the detriment of the community.

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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Parking
- (v) Flood risk

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

7.3 This scheme is a resubmission following the refusal of the previous proposal APP/21/00710 which was refused for the following reasons :

1. The proposed development by reason of its two storey scale, bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous addition to the host bungalow and its attached neighbour, detracting from the appearance of the premises and harmful to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development would result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring residential properties (Nos. 138 and 144 Southwood Road), detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties, as well as giving rise to direct overlooking of the attached neighbour (No.138). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

7.4 The differences between this proposal and APP/21/00710 which was previously

refused include the following :

- A barn hip roof has been added to the roof of the north facing gable (highway facing)
- 1.7 metre high screening has been added to the balcony on the east and west elevations
- The high level windows on the west side elevation serving the first floor have now been removed

7.5 Please refer below to the assessed made in relation to APP/21/00710 :

7.4 This proposal comprises a single storey extension to the front elevation and a first floor extension located towards the rear of the property which is adjacent to the sea front. The front extension would have a flat roof and would come level with the adjoining property, no 138 and would create an enlarged kitchen space at the front of the property. There would also be an extension at ground floor level to the side to create larger ground floor bedrooms , bringing the building line up to the side boundary. The rear first floor extension would have a pitched roof which would come approximately 1 metres above the existing ridge of the roof and would be set back from the front elevation by approximately 10 metres. The first floor extension would have a depth of approximately 10 metres back towards the rear where it would form a balcony at first floor level. The roof slope would be in continuation of the adjoining property which forms the other half of the bungalow . The two storey element would have a raised eaves level and over hanging roof to the rear above the balcony. The west elevation would feature high level windows which would serve the first floor living area and bathroom. There would be no first floor windows on the eastern elevation and glass panels to the rear elevation with bi-fold doors at first floor level. Proposed materials include brickwork and render, both to match existing.

7.5 The appropriateness of this proposal has been assessed in conjunction with the host dwelling and immediate surroundings . The proposal would consist of a ridge height and eaves level raised considerably above the main roof, half of which would belong to the neighbouring side, which would remain unaltered at single storey level. Whilst this would be set back towards the rear , this would still remain a visible feature from the streetscene and would be highly visible from the beach to the rear . Whilst the set back and continuation of the roof slope with the neighbouring property have been noted , the proposal would still result in a prominent unbalancing of this pair of 'beach shack' style properties. With no 140 forming a full two storey property to the rear, this would jut out considerably above the single storey rear element of the adjoining no 138 resulting in a mismatch in heights and styles. Whilst there is some variation in building design along Southwood Road , there are none which have had such a drastic alteration of what was previously a modestly sized bungalow whereby the building is split into two differing building styles. In addition the two storey side elevation in its massing would appear out of keeping when viewed from the west particularly as it rises above no 138.

The Havant Borough Design Guide states that extensions should :

5.35 In general, an extension should not be bigger than the main building and therefore should appear smaller in mass and height. Extensions should look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such ridge, verge and eave finishes, head and cills, brick coursing, dressings and quoin work. The positions and proportions of solid wall to opening of windows and doors is also important. The roof form and slope should also reflect that of the main

building.

7.7 Policy E1 of the submission local plan [since withdrawn by the Council] states that planning permission will be granted for development that "v. Produces a positive relationship with and between existing and proposed buildings, streets and spaces; " - in this case the proposal is not deemed subservient within the context of the host building which is judged to include the other half of the building (no 138).

7.8 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy).

- 7.6 The partial hipping of the roof as proposed is not considered to mitigate against the general design issues of this proposal - whilst it partially softens the appearance of the second storey additions from the highway, the extension is still deemed inappropriate within the context of the host dwelling, adjoining property and wider character of the locality.
- 7.7 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.8 Please refer below to the assessed made in relation to APP/21/00710 :

7.9 To the east of the application site is no 144 Southwood Road which is an apartment building which is split into 5 flats . Adjacent to the application site there are three windows at first floor level which, based off historic plans serve 2 bedrooms to the rear first floor flat and one serving a kitchen to the flat located towards the front of the building. At ground floor level is a bathroom and kitchen window belonging to the ground floor flat. The first floor windows currently benefit from sea views with outlooks towards the west . This proposal would completely block any view out of the rear set side elevation window , also blocking out light to this room due to the close proximity of the buildings to one another with a gap of approximately 2.3 metres. The proposed first floor extension is judged to stop just forward of the middle window at no 144 , also believed to be a bedroom (an internal site visit has not been undertaken to confirm the current use of these rooms) however is deemed to cause impact in the form of loss of outlook and light. It of note that a fairly recent proposal in Hayling Island to add a first floor extension which impacted a side elevation window of a neighbouring property with sea views referenced APP/19/00129 was dismissed at appeal due to impact on outlook on said window.

7.10 To the west of the application site is the adjoining property, no 138 Southwood Road. This forms the other half of the bungalow. The proposed extension would be located in very close proximity to no 138 and therefore is judged to have some overbearing impact to the rear patio area at no 138. The proposed balcony would increase overlooking down towards no 138 , adding to the overbearing nature and across to properties to the east and west. It is noted that some properties have step out balconies and this is a common feature in seaside locations however the balcony would allow for unrestricted views towards the rear of properties sited to the west of the application site.

Policy CS16 'High quality design' of the Havant Borough Local Plan states that development should not "cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking" - this proposal is therefore deemed contrary to Policy CS16.

This proposal would result in harm to the outlook of windows and subsequent blocking of light at no 144 Southwood Road, it would appear overbearing to the adjoining property, no 138 by virtue of its increased height, close proximity and first floor balcony offering increased overlooking and is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

7.9 This current proposal has removed the west facing high level windows - whilst this may be positive in diluting some level of perceived overlooking from properties to the west , these were high level windows previously and therefore did not result in an overlooking issue . The addition of the 1.7 metre high screening to the east and west balcony sides is considered to mitigate against the overlooking issue towards no 138. The screening is not considered to result in overshadowing towards the rear of no 138. Despite the overlooking concern being resolved, the remaining issues remain which include the impact on the windows at no 144 and overbearing impact on 138 due to the close proximity and height to the attached single storey dwelling.

7.10 This proposal would result in harm to the outlook of windows and subsequent blocking of light at no 144 Southwood Road, it would appear overbearing to the adjoining property, no 138 by virtue of its increased height and close proximity and is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking .

7.11 The proposal would not result in the creation of new bedrooms and therefore no additional parking is required on site. If the upstairs area were to be turned into a bedroom an increase from 2 to 3 bedrooms does not require any additional parking allocation as outlined in the Havant Parking SPD.

(v) Flood risk .

7.12 Much of the proposal would be set at first floor level although there would be ground floor additions to the front of the property. A flood risk assessment has been provided with this application which states that flood mitigation measures will be incorporated where appropriate.

8 Conclusion

8.1 The proposed development by reason of its two storey scale, bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous addition to the host bungalow and its attached neighbour, detracting from the appearance of the premises and harmful to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposed development would result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring residential properties (Nos. 138 and 144 Southwood Road), detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00068 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed development by reason of its two storey scale, bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous addition to the host bungalow and its attached neighbour, detracting from the appearance of the premises and harmful to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed development would result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring residential properties (Nos. 138 and 144 Southwood Road), detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.