
Site Address:	208 Southwood Road, Hayling Island, PO11 9QL		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing detached residential dwelling, replaced by a new detached residential dwelling and associated landscape works.		
Application No:	APP/21/00897	Expiry Date:	15/10/2021
Applicant:	Mr Meehan		
Agent:	Mr Arthurs	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Arthurs Planning and Development		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to an existing, large, detached dwelling located at 208 Southwood Road. The property fronts the beach and promenade with vehicular access taken from Southwood Road between 204 and 206 Southwood Road. The dwelling comprises a New England style house of blue wooden boarding with three gables. The distinctive design currently creates a dwelling of prominence when viewed from the beach and promenade, it being the largest and architecturally most significant dwelling in the immediate area. Its three gabled peaks, with identical window arrangement in each section below, gives a vertical emphasis and the impression to the passer-by that the building is three terraced properties, when in fact it is a single dwelling. The existing image is based on a "beach hut" design which is appropriate to the context of the site.
- 1.2 The site slopes with the south, beach side, being set higher than Southwood Road. The existing dwelling has an undercroft level that provides basement parking from the north, and the dwelling's entrance door is via external stairs on the north elevation. This accesses the "ground floor" but this is raised relative to natural ground level and from the north side is effectively first floor level. On the beach, south side, there is currently a large decked area with timber balustrade across the whole width of the dwelling that is set at this "ground level", which is still above natural ground level, but less so. There is a low boundary wall dividing the site from the beach promenade.
- 1.3 To the west is a low semi-detached bungalow, that is further subdivided internally such that number 204A is a separate 1 bed dwelling in the south-eastern corner of the bungalow, immediately adjacent the southern front half of the application site. This dwelling is also subject of a current planning application APP/21/00720 for a two storey side extension (not as yet determined). Number 204 is the rear, northern half of the eastern part of the semi and also has a shared boundary with the application site, though largely the drive and parking area.
- 1.4 To the east of the application site is an unadopted access road to the beach - this is Havant Borough Council owned land and is gated for Council and emergency vehicular access only, but it is used as a pedestrian path to the beach. It is approximately 9m wide and acts as a separation buffer to the properties to the east, which comprise 1970's style linked detached dwellings with asymmetric roofs. The closest property, number 214, has a blank side gable facing the application site.

- 1.5 To the north of the application site, number 206, is a detached two storey dwelling fronting Southwood Road. The drive serving the application dwelling runs to its immediate west and the car parking area serving the application dwelling abuts its southern rear garden, which is only some 5m long. The separation distance from the rear of 206 and front (north) of the application dwelling is about 20m.
- 1.6 The wider area generally comprises a mix of bungalows, two storey dwellings and flats with a mix of architectural designs, styles and ages. It is noticeable that within the vicinity of the application site the presentation to the beach is generally two storey only with relatively traditional sloping roofs and dropped eaves lines. Where sites have been re-developed or enlarged with 3 floors of accommodation, this has largely been achieved within traditional pitched roof spaces with eaves lines remaining at two storey height. Within this eastern stretch of dwellings fronting the beach the character of the area remains fairly traditional with largely traditional materials - the more contemporary architecture is so far further west on the island.
- 1.7 The site lies within flood zone 2 and 3. The beach directly to the south is a designated SINC.

2 Planning History

01/61536/000 - Proposed change of use of cafe to residential use to form single dwellinghouse, PERM,04/06/2001
04/61536/001 - Demolition of existing building and erection of 1 No 4 bedroom detached house., Withdrawn 28/09/2004
04/61536/002 - Demolition of existing building and erection of 1No. 3 bed dwelling. (Revised submission)., PERM,15/11/2004
05/61536/003 - Installation of flue to west elevation. (Retrospective), PERM,19/10/2005

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Demolition of existing detached residential dwelling, replaced by a new detached residential dwelling and associated landscape works.
- 3.2 The proposal is for a replacement dwelling which would have the same footprint width and be sited in the same position, but it would extend 1.4m deeper to the south, and include a linked detached garage to the north-western corner. The eaves line would increase in height by 0.3m and the roof profile would be a large "crown top" ie largely flat with side slopes, having an overall height the same as the existing dwelling. The proposed dwelling would be set over 3 floors with a basement level including a sunken swimming pool with retractable flat roof above. The first floor with outdoor terrace would comprise the main living areas with bedrooms in the second floor. Internally the levels of the proposed dwelling differ to the existing dwelling. Five bedrooms plus an office (or 6th bedroom) are proposed.
- 3.3 Externally the proposed dwelling would be constructed with a contemporary appearance using render and large expanses of glazing in dark aluminium frames, feature metal louvres, and with the side roof slopes being zinc effect standing seam. A large terrace/deck with glass balustrade would be sited across the south eastern frontage, set at a level equivalent to 6.51m AoD. Detailed cross section plans have been provided relative to datum levels in order to assess the levels across the site.

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)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

E22	(Amenity and pollution)
DR1	(Delivery of Sustainable Development)
E20	(Drainage infrastructure in new development)
E1*	(High quality design)
E19	(Managing flood risk in new development)
E14	(The Local Ecological Network)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control

none received

Crime Prevention

none received

Environment Agency

No objection - The proposed replacement dwelling shows no change to its vulnerability classification with no sleeping accommodation on the ground floor.

Flood resistant and resilient measures are proposed in the FRA for the new development which will also reduce the risk of flooding to people and the property

Advice to both LPA & applicant provided - including need for Environment Permit

Hampshire Highways

no concerns that the development will have a detrimental impact on the wider highway network; since there is no change to the vehicular access, HCC's standing advice should be referred to in the first instance.

Waste Services Manager
non received

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: 7

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
I have some concerns regarding the build. The balcony sun terrace at present overlooks anyway, would this be even higher once the property is built? glass balcony would need obscured glass.	Existing decking set at approx 5.25m AoD; proposed would be higher at 6.51m AoD. Noted & agreed
Regards to double garage, this is going to be rather big I presume would this impact on light along the pathway; also its already a wind tunnel because of the size of building would this make this the same? can they not put the garage the other side?	Noted - see section 7 below
As long as all relevant windows are obscured on the west elevation there is no problem with this.	Noted - see section 7 below
Having a moving roof? how noisy would that be? regarding pool as it is being dug down into lower ground how will this effect the foundations to adjacent property, also the pump room for the pool? possible flooding?	Foundations a Building Regulations matter; Party Wall act would be relevant
I do object to very high fences/brick walls or trees being placed along the full length or parts of the west elevation. low level shrubs are fine.	Noted
An improvement on the current property and will enhance the local area?	Noted

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.

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

7.3 The submitted Streetscape Plan (Drawing Number 206) demonstrates that the proposed north and south elevation of the replacement dwelling is of the same overall width and height as the existing dwelling. The east and west side elevations would be deeper by 1.4m. Notwithstanding the similar overall external dimensions, the change in design and articulation of the proposed dwelling would have a significant effect on the visual appearance of the site. Currently the use of three gables and traditional overhanging eaves line helps to retain a varied skyline and reduce the mass and bulk of the dwelling in street scene terms. The existing central connecting pitch between the gables is set back sufficiently that it is not visually apparent when viewed from the ground - the angle of vision is such that the eye only sees the gables with peaks and troughs between breaking up the roofline. As noted at para 1.1 above, the existing dwelling has the appearance of 3 terraced dwellings, with a vertical emphasis, giving it an appropriate domestic scale and rhythm that is well related to the surrounding pattern and character of development including the adjacent bungalow and two storey development.

7.4 However the proposed contemporary design would lose that articulation and replace with effectively a flat roofed development of very boxy design with horizontal emphasis. The only recessed element adding any elevational interest would be the small recess at second floor level in the south elevation. Otherwise the proposed design would present to the key south elevation as a flat facade with flat roof above spanning 11.6m. The albeit small increase in eaves height of 0.3m, combined with the loss of traditional overhang detail, would give a perception of increased height and silhouette, and bulkier side elevations. The combination of these small increases and use of large expanses of flat roof is considered to result in a very boxy and dominant building mass that would dominate the streetscape in this highly prominent position adjacent the beach.

7.5 The "crown top" roof design would result in a loss of skyline about the property which in turn would add to the silhouette and apparent scale and dominance of the building. Given the context of the site adjacent a small semi detached bungalow, the sheer mass of the proposed building, that would lack any rhythm, would be over-dominant and out of character with the surrounding development. The eaves line of adjacent properties, including those to the east (whose asymmetric roofs give a single storey eaves line and appearance) are all modest in scale and appearance. The existing three gabled building already dominates the view from the beach and it is considered that its further enlargement in the manner proposed would be unacceptable in street

scene terms.

- 7.6 The adopted Borough Design Guide SPD, 2011, encourages good design with a sound understanding of the local pattern of development (Section 4.2). Table 4.1 advises on the need to look to adjoining properties first and under "3. Detail and Materials - Rhythm and patterns, key features and detailing" on page 30 it shows an example of a long monotonous roofline that should be avoided as not complementing the surrounding area. Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy, 2011 also encourages High Quality Design and requires development to respect local context and clause c) seeks the characteristics of the locality to inform the design of heights, massing, plot widths, materials and proportions etc.
- 7.7 Emerging Policy E1 also reiterates the need for high quality design that also draws inspiration from local context. It is considered that the existing large dwelling on the site successfully integrates with the domestic scale of the area through the use of the three gabled 'beach hut' aesthetics with less bulky roofline. Whilst the LPA do not object to contemporary architecture per se on such highly prominent beach sites, nor use of modern materials, nevertheless that architecture still needs to be respectful of the scale of its surroundings. It is considered that the use of large expanse of flat roof with loss of articulation results in an overly dominant design that would be out of character with the immediate setting of the site and contrary to both policy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide SPD, and emerging policy E1.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.8 The change to internal levels and resultant increase in height of outdoor decked terrace area would impact neighbouring properties. Number 204A to the immediate west is currently a low profiled bungalow with its outdoor space over 2 levels adjacent the application site. (Note APP/21/00720 for 2 storey extensions to 204A in this intervening area is recommended for refusal). The existing outdoor terrace at 208 sits above ground level at about 5.25m AoD and this already results in some direct overlooking into the adjacent private amenity space. The proposed replacement terrace would sit at about 6.51m AoD ie some 1.26m higher. Although now largely offset to the east with the intervening swimming pool retractable roof, nevertheless this increased height would add to the ability to overlook down into adjacent private spaces. Glass balustrade is proposed, but not specified with opaque side screens.
- 7.9 The proposal also includes a second floor balcony that would be large enough for sitting out on. Generally most second floor openings in the area are Juliette style only and the introduction of a 14.8m wide by between 1m and 2m deep balcony at second floor height of 9.51m AoD, would further increase the perception of being overlooked by adjacent properties. Due to its length it would be possible to stand in the centre area and look down sideways to adjacent properties. Overall it is considered that the proposed design with both terraces would give rise to a loss of privacy to neighbours, harmful to their amenity and contrary to policy CS16.
- 7.10 It is further noted that the rooflight windows proposed for the side roofslopes would be set with low cill levels, well below internal eye level and thus have the potential for direct overlooking. The property to the west is a low bungalow comprising both 204A and 204 and it is considered that these rooflights would add to a sense of being overlooked with associated loss of privacy by the occupiers of both dwellings.
- 7.11 The proposal also involves obscure glazed windows in the west elevation facing the side of number 204A and 204, which would replace similar existing obscure glass

windows. Although slightly larger, overall considered adequate to maintain existing levels of amenity between dwellings.

- 7.12 In terms of other impacts on neighbours, the introduction of the proposed garage to the north, which would be set within 0.5m of the shared boundary, would add a further continuous enclosing boundary wall. Its maximum height would be about 2.7m but it would effectively represent a further elongation of the west elevation, with resultant wall being nearly 25m in length. The garage would sit alongside the pedestrian path that provides the only entrance to number 204A and also adjacent the living and kitchen room windows of 204. It is considered that this could result in a tunnelling and enclosing effect, resulting in a loss of outlook and light, detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of these properties.
- 7.13 There is also a frontage dwelling, number 206 whose separation distance to the north elevation of the application sites is about 20m. Whilst this is minimal (the adopted Design Guide SPD would seek a separation distance of 24m for the additional storey) regard must be had to the fact that this is an existing relationship. However, the bulkier design with loss of skyline about the roof profile would further impact the outlook from this property.
- 7.14 Third party comments also query whether the retractable swimming pool roof would be noisy in operation as it would be sited close to the shared boundary. This is unknown, but its operation is likely to be only occasional. Given the recommendation for refusal on other grounds, details of the mechanics of the roof have not been pursued for further consideration with respect to noise.
- 7.15 Overall the proposed replacement dwelling is considered to have an adverse impact on the amenities the occupiers of 204A, 204 and 206 and would fail clause e) of Policy CS16 which seeks to protect the amenity of neighbours from privacy, outlook, overlooking etc. Emerging policy E1 also seeks to protect amenity of neighbours from issues such as overshadowing, loss of privacy, outlook, overlooking etc and hence it is also considered that the proposal would be contrary to this emerging policy E1.

(iv) Parking

- 7.16 As a 5/6 bedroom dwelling the site requires 3 on site parking spaces to meet the adopted Parking SPD, 2016. There is ample space on site to provide this, as well as on site turning to enable use of the long drive in a forward gear only. There is therefore no objection to the proposal on highway or parking grounds.

(v) Flood risk

- 7.17 The site lies within flood zone 2 and 3 and would remain a single dwelling. As such its vulnerability classification would not change. The plans do not propose any sleeping accommodation in the basement and the FRA includes flood control and mitigation measures such as provision of removable flood gates, raised electrical sockets, non-return toilet valve etc. On this basis the EA raise no objection but do advise that the works would still require an Environmental Permit - an Informative could have been added had the recommendation been for approval.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 This is a highly prominent site surrounded by modest dwellings. The design of the proposed replacement dwelling is considered overly bulky and dominant that fails to

respect the rhythm and pattern of development in the immediate area. The loss of the articulated roof profile and domestic scale of the existing property and use of extensive flat roof, would have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the area, detracting from the appearance and character of the site and its context. In addition the proposed extension would result in harm to neighbouring amenity from overlooking, loss of outlook, privacy and light. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Council Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011; emerging policy E1 of the Submission Havant Borough Local Plan; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00897

(A) for the following reasons

- 1 The design of the proposed replacement dwelling, which incorporates use of extensive flat roof, is considered to result in an overly bulky and dominant development, out of scale and keeping with the pattern and character of the immediate area. In this highly prominent site, the boxy design with lack of articulation and increased silhouette, would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD; emerging policy E1 of the Submission Havant Borough Local Plan, 2021 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The detailed design and levels, including raised terrace, second floor balcony and second floor side windows, would likely give rise to direct overlooking of adjacent properties, particularly number 204A and 204, resulting in a loss of privacy, to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of these properties. In addition the elongated west elevation would result in a tunnelling and enclosing effect, harmful to the outlook from, and light to, the same neighbours. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD; emerging policy E1 of the Submission Havant Borough Local Plan, 2021 and the National Planning Policy Framework.