
Site Address:	204A Southwood Road, Hayling Island, PO11 9QL		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing conservatory and outbuildings; proposed two storey side extension with south facing balcony and roof terrace and single storey rear extension.		
Application No:	APP/21/00720	Expiry Date:	22/10/2021
Applicant:	Ms Barnes		
Agent:	Mr Bessant	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	JB Architecture		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to 204A Southwood Road, Hayling Island which is a sub-divided semi detached bungalow fronting the beach. The original semi detached bungalow, comprised numbers 202 and 204; but number 204 had an attached annexe and the site had been occupied as 2 self contained units for a number of years preceding the granting of a Certificate of Lawfulness as two dwellings under 00/64915/000 in August 2000. Number 204 is therefore separated from 204A which is its own distinct planning unit comprising a 1 bed dwelling in the south-eastern corner and forms the current application site.
- 1.2 The red line application site includes the pedestrian side access to the east of 204 and the front garage and parking area off Southwood Road. The occupiers of 204 have a right of access over these shared areas and Certificate B has been submitted accordingly.
- 1.3 The whole semi detached bungalow comprising 202, 204 and 204A has a hipped tiled roof and elevations are a mix of render and cladding. 204A has a rear extension with unusual raised flat roof area which forms a white clad box that sits above the eaves line. To the rear of this, on the south elevation, is attached a small conservatory.
- 1.4 The whole site slopes slightly with the south, beach side, being set higher than Southwood Road. The garden area serving number 204A is located to the south of the bungalow and comprises a paved area set over 2 levels with steps and a decorative arch dividing the area in 2. There is a low boundary wall dividing the site from the beach promenade. There is also a shallow pitched roof shed located in this rear courtyard area, close to the eastern boundary.
- 1.5 To the east number 208 is a large detached two storey dwelling, currently blue clad and comprising 3 gables - but this dwelling is also subject of a current planning application APP/21/00897, for its demolition and replacement (not as yet determined). Both the current dwelling and its proposed replacement are sited close to the shared boundary and include large obscure glazed windows in the side elevation facing 204A.
- 1.6 To the west, the attached bungalow 202, also has a flat roofed rear extension (without the extra height) that extends out approximately the same depth as number 204A's rear extension. Number 202 also has a stepped rear garden and sitting out area in this

southern section adjacent the beach promenade.

- 1.7 The wider area generally comprises two storey dwellings and flats with a mix of architectural designs, styles and ages. There are a number of balconies and terraces on the beach side for the views.
- 1.8 The site lies within flood zone 2 and 3. The beach directly to the south is a designated SINC.

2 Planning History

204 Southwood Road:

00/64915/000 - Application for Certificate of Lawfulness to establish use of property as two self contained units - Issued 29/08/2000 as use of the property as two self-contained dwelling units commenced more than 4 years before the date of this application.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Demolition of existing conservatory and outbuildings; proposed two storey side extension with south facing balcony and roof terrace and single storey rear extension.
- 3.2 During the course of determining this application amended plans were received reducing the access to the flat roof area as a terrace; inclusion of a privacy screen to the west; reduction in number of windows in east elevation with use of obscure glass.

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)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Coastal Engineering

I can confirm that we have no objection in principle to the proposed development from a tidal flood risk perspective, but are able to offer the following comments and advice.

The site is shown to lie partially within the Environment Agency's present day Flood Zone 3, therefore may be at risk from a 1:200 year (0.5% annual probability) extreme tidal flood event. For information, the present day 1:200 year extreme tidal flood level for Chichester Harbour according to the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is 3.4 mAOD, increasing to a predicted 4.5 mAOD by the year 2115 (design tide level), due to the effects of climate change. However, the SFRA is in the process of being updated to be in line with current climate change guidance. The latest guidance for calculating climate change sea level allowances can be found here:

www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances#sea-level-allowances.

The applicant has not submitted a Flood Risk Assessment in support of the application, however, this is not required by the NPPF for proposed developments of this scale.

Though the proposed development will increase the number of bedrooms at the property from 1 to 2, this will not result in a significant increase in the occupancy of the building.

Furthermore, the Design & Access Statement for the proposed development outlines that floor levels within the proposed extension will be set no lower than the existing, in addition to the following flood proofing measures being incorporated, in accordance with EA guidelines for householder and other minor extensions:

- Power sockets and other electrical services will be set a minimum of 500mm above the finished floor level
- Door apertures will be designed to accommodate the future installation of a kite marked floor protection barrier

- If air bricks are used within the below DPC construction, proprietary air brick covers will be purchased by the applicant.

Coastal Partners would also recommend that occupants of the building prepare a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan in accordance with advice from the Environment Agency, as well as signing up to the EA's Flood Warning Service.

Environment Agency

None 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

Number of representations received: **7 in total** - 4 on the original submission and a further 3 on the revised plans, with the following issues raised:

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>On Original Plans:</u> <u>Flooding/Water Run off</u> we are concerned that the restricting of the 'run off' by the proposed two storey extension to the east of this property shall drastically reduce the current water capacity creating an increased volume of water to the south of the properties in the event of a sea breach. The 'run offs' to the side of the properties on Southwood Road form an essential part of the current flood defences and restricting the size of these will increase the flood risk; Flooding event early 2021 when 204A got flooded and needed new flooring; sluice getaway to the East elevation that runs down the current pathway and the sea water runs away down into the road, if this pathway for the water is blocked by the 2 storey extension then this is an even bigger flood risk for our property too. The flood risk map shown in the design and access statement indicates the incorrect site. In fact, the applicant site is located further to the east, and clearly in an area of the highest risk of flooding.	Noted - see Coastal Teams consultee comment & section 7 below Whilst flag incorrect, the content of FRA correct
<u>Overlooking/Privacy</u> encroaching on both the living room and garden of our property. The planned roof terrace and living area will over look these areas with direct line of sight into our living room. Our privacy will also be compromised due to the north facing kitchen window looking into our south facing living area. The proposed windows and terrace at	Noted - see section 7 below

first floor would directly overlook neighbouring terrace and garden, at a distance of less than 2m the side windows would also directly overlook the side elevations The first floor extension is an over-dominant addition, resulting in a loss of privacy and amenity There are overlooking issues created by the first floor windows and balconies seriously impacting the neighbour's garden amenity spaces to both the east and west sides. The first floor extension will create shadows and overlooking to the northerly neighbour which seems unacceptable in planning terms.	Noted - see section 7 below
<u>Loss of light/outlook</u> The two storey extension will directly effect light into our living room and garden in the mornings. 2 storey extension as per drawings will fully compromise light into the only south facing window we have of our property. The curved extension protrudes beyond building line to the west, if this was pulled back by 1m it would have a more sympathetic impact to the building line and be less intrusive to neighbours	Noted - see section 7 below Noted - see section 7 below
<u>Design</u> The proposed two storey-side extension on a semi detached bungalow is considered out of character with the bungalow typology, resulting in an unbalanced elevation and massing The proposed development does not appear to include a rationalisation of the boundary treatment to the southern sea facing elevation. This is a missed opportunity to enhance this key public facing frontage and improve the overall balance and design merit of the proposed property. The design of the proposed extension is out of scale with the remaining massing of the shared building, and does not unify, or make a well designed contribution to the existing building.	Noted - see section 7 below Noted - see section 7 below

<u>Party Wall</u> It would appear that the build will be using the party wall, and there is concern as to the additional weight and loading of the roof terrace that will be added.	Not a material planning consideration - matter for Building Regs and separate Party Wall legislation
<u>Access for Construction</u> There is only a shared 1m wide path accessing the site, it is difficult to understand how the materials can be delivered and stored during the build period without resulting in loss of amenity to adjoining neighbours and has the potential highways safety implications; shared access routes for both our properties, we have access to our east facing patio area via the pathway, this also leads to our fire exit door at back bedroom, access to this will be required at all times so there is a concern how works and construction will take place still allowing us safe access and exit as required. Concerns also with any damage that may be caused to our newly cladded exterior to east elevation during construction; privacy during construction with works people passing our living areas; We would like to see a construction plan prior to approval. We will also require access to our front gate and off road car parking space to be kept clear at all times should construction go ahead	Noted - see section 7 below
<u>On Amended Plans:</u> Generally do not believe concerns have been addresses: <u>Overlooking/Privacy</u> Due to the overhanging terrace on the south elevation our property will be overlooked with direct line of sight both into our garden and through the windows. Whilst the roof terrace has now been removed and a privacy screen added the issue still remains; disappointed side overlooking not addressed & essential to protect	Noted - see section 7 below

privacy that all windows which overlook are obscured and that a privacy screen is erected on the side of the balcony. The east facing window on the first floor - shown as clear glass -as well as the terrace would still overlook our south garden / terrace amenity space. This window should be obscured or deleted and an obscure terrace railing of 1.7m in height should be added to prevent this overlooking issue.	Noted - see section 7 below
<u>Light</u> The two storey extension on the east of the plot along with the terrace will effect light in the mornings both into our property and the garden; skyline view and light is still compromised to our only south facing window.	Noted - see section 7 below
<u>Flood Risk</u> We are still concerned that the flood risk has not been fully considered. The existing water run off to the east of the property has been drastically reduced in size which will cause a build up of water on the south elevation in the event of a sea breach. As previously explained this occurred to 200, 202 and 204A in February 2021 as recorded by the environmental agency.	Noted - see Coastal Teams consultee comment & section 7 below
<u>Construction concerns</u> major concerns about the planned process for building works to be carried out. There is only a shared narrow path for building materials, the storage of materials and removal of debris as required for the construction work to take place.	Noted - see section 7 below

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 on host property and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking & Construction Management
- (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 on host property and impact on the character of the area

- 7.3 The host building comprises a fully hipped roofed bungalow that has no roof alterations i.e. no dormers or roof lights, and is subdivided into 3 dwellings, the application site being the south eastern corner, in a prominent position facing the sea front. The proposal would result in a two storey extension attached to the eastern side of the front south-eastern corner of the bungalow. The first floor addition would sit on the eaves line of the bungalow with the first floor side elevation projecting some 2m above the eaves of the bungalow. With the shallow pitched above, the overall extension would sit approximately 1m above the ridge of the bungalow. The proposed extension has been designed with curved featured ends at the north and south. At the south, beach side, the curved extension would project some 1.7m beyond the front facade of the bungalow with a further 1m roof overhang and terrace that would wrap around the curve.
- 7.4 It is considered that the siting, height and design of the proposed extension bears no relationship with the host building and would add an incongruous two storey addition to the immediate side of the front quarter of a single storey bungalow. The linkage to the eaves line of the bungalow would be jarring and visually impact the otherwise continuous eaves line and roof of the host bungalow. The projection of the two storey element out of the roof of the bungalow would result in a juxtaposition of building mass that would be jarring and uncohesive and detrimental to the spatial setting and design of the existing whole bungalow.
- 7.5 As a semi-detached bungalow, albeit further internally subdivided, the proposed addition would unbalance the external symmetry and visual appearance of the whole bungalow. It is acknowledged that the existing rear extension with white clad box rising above the eaves line is already a visually incongruous feature, but its replacement with a larger similar concept addition moved round 90 degrees to the side, is not considered a good design solution. In this prominent position adjacent the beach promenade, the design is considered inappropriate and harmful to the amenities of the area.
- 7.6 Policy CS16 requires all development to be of a high quality design and in particular clause c) requires the heights, massing, building lines, proportions etc to reflect local context. This policy is supported by the Borough Design Guide SPD, 2011, which specifically deals with extensions to dwellings at chapter 5 and para 5.35 states: *"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 Emerging Policy E1 also reiterates the need for high quality design and in particular seeks a positive relationship between existing and proposed buildings, streets and spaces. It is considered that the proposed extension does not comply with any of

these design policy criteria and would not appear subservient to the host bungalow and would in fact add a totally new, dominant design as an 'add-on' to the front corner of the bungalow. This alien and contrived addition does not blend with the host bungalow in any way at all, and would be contrary to both policy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide SPD and emerging policy E1.

- 7.8 In wider street scene terms it is acknowledged that the surrounding pattern of development is largely two storey in profile. In principle, if the whole bungalow were to be developed, then the increase to 2 storey may be appropriate (subject to detailed design etc). But the extension of just the front quarter of the bungalow with a projecting 2 storey addition is not considered a sympathetic or appropriate design solution. The proposed extension would appear as a 'squeezed in' two storey development between a bungalow and the larger 2 storey property to the east with resultant cramping of the spatial setting of the site.
- 7.9 Overall the design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate to the context of the whole bungalow and would represent an incongruous addition, visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, contrary to Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy) and the Borough Design Guide SPD and emerging policy E1.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 Because the original bungalow has been further subdivided the application site has a tight relationship with both the side properties (numbers 202 and 208) but also the northern half of the same semi - number 204. The layout of number 204 is such that their living room window faces due south and this provides much of the light and outlook to a living room. The proposed two storey side extension would largely fill the area to the side of 204A which would block the outlook from this window. Whilst the separation distance would be some 10m, nevertheless due to the slight slope, which would make the extension appear higher relative to number 204, the mass and bulk of the proposed extension would be overbearing and obliterate the skyline, result in overshadowing of this intervening area and create a sense of enclosure to occupiers of number 204. It is also noted that the first floor window proposed in the curved north elevation would be a large feature window serving the kitchen. From this large habitable window a direct line of sight would be possible down into the south facing living room window of number 204. This would result in direct overlooking and a loss of privacy. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would be harmful to the amenity of the occupiers of number 204 by way of loss of outlook, light, skyline and overlooking.
- 7.11 The attached property to the west, number 202, has its private sitting out area up to the shared boundary with number 204 which is divided by a close boarded fence. The proposed curved terrace, because it projects forward of the rear facade of 202, would be within 3m of the shared boundary. Whilst the amended plans have provided a 1.7m high privacy screen on the due west section preventing access to the flat roof; nevertheless the siting of the curved terrace would enable someone to lean up to railings and have a direct view down into the adjacent sitting out area of number 202. This would be un-neighbourly and cause a sense of overlooking and loss of privacy. It is noted that these sitting out areas are immediately adjacent the beach promenade and hence it could be argued that they are not "private" spaces with the public able to walk past. But it is considered there is a difference in public passing by and a neighbour at an elevated position able to sit out for prolonged periods and look down into the same space. It is considered the latter is more intrusive and as such the

proposal would increase the sense of being overlooked.

- 7.12 The property to the west, number 208, currently has a large terrace at its 'ground floor' - but that level sits artificially higher than the ground floor level of number 204A. As a result there is some existing direct overlooking into the rear garden area of 204A from 208. But the proposed extension and associated curved terrace to 204A would be at their first floor level ie slightly higher than 208's terrace. As a result, and being within only 1m of this shared boundary, there would be further cross overlooking between terraces. The current planning application for the replacement dwelling at 208 sites the replacement terrace further to the west, with intervening roof over a swimming pool, and as a result the impacts would likely be lessened. But nevertheless the close proximity of the proposed terrace to the shared boundary at first floor level without any privacy screen, would lead to some further loss of amenity to the occupiers of 208.
- 7.13 The proposal also involves obscure glazed windows in the east elevation facing the side of number 208, which also has obscure glazed windows in its side elevation facing the application site. This is considered adequate to protect amenity between both dwellings. However the windows in the curve of the proposed terrace are noted as being clear glass with third party comments objecting to possible overlooking from these windows. This would be marginal as the object of such feature windows would be for the sea views, and whether the angle of vision from within the room would actually lead to overlooking back to either number 202 or 208 is considered unlikely. The recessed nature of the windows beneath the roof overhang would further limit their perception of dominance and potential for overlooking.
- 7.14 Overall the proposed extension is considered to have an adverse impact on the amenities of all 3 immediate neighbours 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 & Construction Management

- 7.15 The site takes vehicular access from Southwood Road but then only has pedestrian access past 204. The red lined site location plan indicates that both the garage and space off Southwood Road serve 204A. On that basis there would be sufficient parking to serve the extended 2 bedroom dwelling which would require 2 spaces to meet the adopted Parking SPD, 2016.
- 7.16 Third party comment have also raised concern about potential disturbance and damage during construction. Due to the siting of the application site, builders would have to walk all equipment and materials past the side elevation of the frontage dwelling, 204, via a 1m wide pedestrian path. This would cause noise and disturbance and loss of privacy to the occupiers of the frontage dwelling. Whilst construction works are only temporary, nevertheless the particular siting and arrangement of this case presents a real issue and concern to neighbouring amenity. It is considered that if permission had been recommended, then in this instance a Construction Management Plan should be conditioned on this householder application, detailing areas for storage, access arrangements, hours of working etc, in an attempt to minimise disturbance to the occupiers of 204.

(v) Flood risk

- 7.17 The site lies within flood zone 2 and 3 where, as minor development, the Environment Agency's standing advice should be followed. The submitted FRA within the Design & Access statement indicates that floor levels will be set no lower than existing levels and flood proofing, such as raised power sockets, doors to accommodate protection barriers etc. This is considered sufficient to protect future occupiers.
- 7.18 However third party comments refer to the side area of 204 and 204A being a valuable 'run off' area for flood water and over-topped waves which would be largely lost if the development went ahead partially infilling this area. As a result the Council's Coastal Team were consulted about this particular issue but raise no objection. Without objection from either the EA or the specialist team it would be difficult to refuse the application for this reason.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development, by reason of its two storey scale attached to part of a single storey bungalow, would be an incongruous addition, detracting from the symmetry, appearance and character of the whole bungalow, harmful to the visual amenities 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/21/00720 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed development by reason of its two storey scale attached to part of a single storey bungalow, would be an incongruous addition to the host whole bungalow resulting in a jarring and visually unbalanced development in a prominent location, harmful to the visual character and appearance of the host building and its context. 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 siting and height of the side extension proposed would result in an overbearing building bulk detrimental to the outlook and light available to number 204 Southwood Road, creating a sense of enclosure, harmful to the amenities of the occupiers of number 204. In addition, due to the site's tight relationship with adjoining development at 204, 202 and 208, the proposed siting of windows and terrace, would give rise to direct overlooking and loss of privacy to all adjacent 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.