
Site Address:	7 Salterns Close, Hayling Island, PO11 9PL		
Proposal:	Rear first floor extension to increase existing living accommodation.		
Application No:	APP/16/00403	Expiry Date:	22/06/2016
Applicant:	Mr Hardy		
Agent:	Mr Murray	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	I J Murray Associates		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is located at the head of Salterns Close which is a cul-de-sac off Salterns Lane at the eastern side of Hayling Island. The road is characterised by a mix of single storey and two storey dwellings of varied architecture and spacings, set in modest plots. Number 7 is the eastern most dwelling on the northern side of the Close, and the plot extends to the foreshore of Chichester Harbour to the north. The site falls within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and the surrounding land to the north and east is covered by a number of conservation designations including the Chichester Harbour AONB, Ramsar, SAC, SPA and SSSI. The site falls within the identified Coastal Zone by policy DM9. There are trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders adjacent the foreshore within the adjacent plot at number 6, but none within the application site. Immediately to the east is a marina and boatyard, accessed off Marine Walk to the south.

The application dwelling is a substantial two storey detached dwelling of brick and render finish beneath a tiled roof. The dwelling has a forward two storey gable projection at its eastern end, and a two storey side extension to the west. It is set back from the highway having a drive for the parking of up to 3 vehicles. To the rear the property has a significant flat roof rear extension (some 11.5m deep) which in part encloses a swimming pool. There are some old external spiral stairs leading up to the flat roof, implying it has in the past been used as a balcony - but at the time of the site visit (20/5/16) there were no safety rails round the edge and it did not appear to be used for sitting out.

The rear garden is enclosed with a 1.8m high fence on the western boundary and a high evergreen hedge to the east. To the north the site is open to the foreshore. To the west number 6 is a detached bungalow having rooms in the roof and a dormer in its eastern elevation facing the application site. The properties are separated by approximately 3.5m comprising a side path to Number 7 and a narrow drive to number 6. Number 6 sits further forward than the application site and has a large detached outbuilding comprising living accommodation to the rear, which is built up to the shared boundary.

2 Planning History

33300/3 - First floor extension at side and two storey at rear - Refused 23/11/1987 and Dismissed at Appeal on 25/08/1988

94/54655/001 - Retention of structure to provide covered areas around swimming pool

at rear - Permitted Sept 1994

99/54655/003 - First floor side extension (west) - Permitted 26/08/1999

PAP/10/00953 - Construction of Sea Defence Works. (Retrospective application.),
PERM,03/03/2011

PAP/11/01268 - Discharge of Condition No. 1 of Planning Permission PAP/10/00953.,
REF,24/10/2011

3 Proposal

The current proposal seeks permission for first floor additions above the existing flat roofed rear extension. A 7m deep x 5.4m wide addition on the western side is proposed together with a 7.7m wide and 2m deep extension across most of the remaining rear elevation. The western 7m deep projection would have a half hipped end and pitched roof with crown top, following the existing eaves line. Full height opening doors are proposed in the north elevation enabling access to the remainder of the flat roof as a balcony. The 2m deep extension would be flat roofed.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Particularly Chapter 7 Requiring Good Design

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS12	(Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB))
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)
DM9	(Development in the Coastal Zone)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
-----	--

Borough Design Guide SPD 2011
Residential parking and Cycle Provision SPD 2010

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre note the presence of Golden-samphire habitat within 50m of the site

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: 3

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary: Object to loss of light and sky from kitchen, outlook to brick wall; Salterns Close residents have use of the Community Harbourside white land for recreation, boat launching and proposal intrusion to views from this land and Mengham Rytte; devalue Close properties; similar proposal in 1988 refused and rejected at appeal.

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) Planning history and previous appeal
- (iii) Impact upon the streetscene and character of area
- (iv) Impact upon residential amenity
- (v) Flood risk

(i) Principle of development

The application site is identified on the Proposals Map as the last dwelling within the defined Urban Area under policy CS17. The surrounding foreshore and land to the east lies within the Countryside and AONB and is subject to conservation designations. As a proposed householder extension contained within the existing residential curtilage, the principle of the development is however considered acceptable, subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Planning history and previous appeal

The planning history and previous appeal at the site is noteworthy. Under ref 33300/3 planning permission for a first floor extension at side and two-storey at rear was refused in November 1987 for 3 reasons: height and depth affects the outlook from and light available to and privacy of neighbours; two storey height across whole width of plot would detract from visual amenity and spatial character of area; flat roof at two storey height along part of rear elevation would be out of character with existing dwelling and site backing onto Chichester Harbour AONB. Unfortunately due to the age a copy of the detailed plans are not available, though a site location plan shows the roof plan to extend out on the western side.

The Inspector dismissed the appeal and the decision concluded that the extension would not lead to a significant reduction in daylight reaching number's 6's dormer window or ground floor study window. Privacy could be protected by omitting windows in the west elevation. Due to the separation distance of some 4.5m and the presence of the boundary fence, it was further noted that the first floor extension would not be an unduly dominant feature in the outlook from the kitchen and study window. However it was considered that there would be a marked reduction in the daylight and

sunlight reaching the kitchen door and window of number 6.

With respect to the proposed flat roof element to the rear this was noted to be a relatively modest area in relation to the total plan area which is predominantly pitched roof. This was concluded as not being an unduly significant feature in views from the north, east and west and due to screening would not have a marked adverse effect on the character and appearance of the AONB. Finally the spacious character of the Close was noted with clear separation between 2 storey elements; it was noted that the proposal would give a 2 storey elevation to the highway and result in the loss of separation having an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the cul-de-sac.

Subsequently planning permission was granted in August 1999 under ref 99/54655/3 for a first floor side extension to the west. Again no plans are available except the site location plan showing a hipped roof plan. This is assumed to be that as constructed on site.

The current scheme clearly has similarities to the dismissed appeal scheme and the relevance of the Inspectors comments are considered a material consideration. However those comments were made nearly 29 years ago and the proposal must be assessed against current policy and criteria, which include the Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iii) Impact upon the streetscene and character of area

The proposed rear extensions would not be directly visible from Salterns Close and as such would not have an impact on this street scene. However, in this case, since the site is also open to the foreshore to the north, then there are public views into the site from the water and foreshore, also making the rear elevation visible. The rear garden has a depth of over 50m and as a result of this separation distance the views of the dwelling are in fact relatively long distance. The architectural style of dwellings fronting the foreshore is mixed and most are designed to enjoy the views with balconies.

The proposed first floor rear extension includes a half hip and crown top, as well as a flat roof element. These roof features keep the overall roof height down and as previously noted by the 1988 Inspector still result in a predominantly pitched roof dwelling. It is also noted that from the lower level of the foreshore and water, looking up towards the site, the flat element of the roof would not be overly prominent and would be seen against the backdrop of the main pitch of the house. The roof design and proposed extension is not considered to be harmful to the views from the north and the Chichester Harbour AONB and would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the AONB.

(iv) Impact upon residential amenity

The proposed extension would add a further 7m deep first floor extension beyond the existing 4.5m wide first floor side extension. This would result in a 11.5m deep two storey flank wall having an eaves height of 5.3m high sited within 1m of the boundary with number 6 and within 3.5m of the side of number 6. (Note the previous Inspector noted a separation distance of 4.5m but the current plans scale at only 3.5m.) Notwithstanding the Inspectors comments about the previous extension not being overly dominant and detrimental to outlook, the current proposal is considered to represent a bulky and oppressive addition. The mass and bulk of the additional 7m long first floor flank wall in such close proximity to the everyday side entrance and

habitable kitchen of number 6 is considered to be particularly overbearing. The outlook from the kitchen window and door would lose the existing skyline and sense of space and instead be hemmed in by a significant two storey wall.

This flank wall would also result in a significant loss of daylight to the main habitable kitchen of number 6. This loss of light was previously considered a marked reduction having an unacceptable detrimental effect on the amenities at present enjoyed by the residents of number 6.

The proposed plan also includes two windows in the west elevation facing number 6. These are shown on the plans as being set 1.7m above floor levels and therefore would be above eye height to reduce the potential for direct overlooking. However, in reality, the presence of these windows directly adjacent the kitchen and outbuilding of number 6 would result in a perception of being overlooked, adding to the harm of the bulky extension to the residential amenity of the occupiers of number 6.

Therefore, the length and height of the proposed extension, so close to the side boundary is considered to have an overbearing and dominant effect, detrimental to the light available to, and outlook from number 6. This is considered contrary to Policy CS16 clause 1. c) and e).

(v) Flood risk

The site lies within flood zones 2 and 3 where new residential development would not normally be supported. However the proposal is for first floor alterations to an existing dwelling so the risk to occupants is considered minimal.

8 **Conclusion**

The proposed first floor extension is considered harmful to the amenity of the occupiers of number 6 and considered contrary to policy. It is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/16/00403 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed first floor extension, at 7m deep close to the western boundary, would result in a dominant and overbearing addition, adversely affecting the outlook from, and light available to, the occupier of the adjacent residential property at number 6. This would be detrimental to the residential amenity currently enjoyed by these residents, and is considered contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.