
Site Address:	7 Salterns Close, Hayling Island, PO11 9PL		
Proposal:	Rear first floor extension. (Resubmission).		
Application No:	APP/16/00719	Expiry Date:	08/09/2016
Applicant:	Mr Hardy		
Agent:	Mr I Murray	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Mr I Murray		
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-east.

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 visits (20/5/16 and 15/8/16) 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. No 6 also has a large detached outbuilding comprising living accommodation to the rear, which is built up to the shared boundary. Number 6 sits further forward than the application site and the properties are separated by approximately 3.5m comprising a side path to Number 7 and a narrow drive to number 6.

An internal inspection of No 6 showed it to have a ground floor kitchen with dual aspect adjacent the application site - a side door and window above sink in the eastern elevation facing the application site as well as a window in the north elevation - the outlook and light available to this northern window is however already compromised by the presence of the outbuilding which is very close - therefore the main outlook and light comes from the eastern elevation. Upstairs the bedroom with

the dormer facing the application site also has another window to the north.

2 Planning History

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

94/54655/001 - Retention of structure to provide covered areas around swimming pool at rear, PERM,

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

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

APP/16/00403 - Rear first floor extension to increase existing living accommodation., REFUSED 21/06/2016

3 Proposal

This is a revised application for first floor additions above the existing flat roofed rear extension following the refusal of APP/16/00403 and has reduced the depth of the rear extension on the western side from 7m to 4m.

The current proposal seeks permission for a 4m deep x 5.3m wide addition on the western side, together with a 7.6m wide and 2m deep extension across most of the remaining rear elevation. The western 4m deep projection would have a half hipped end and pitched roof with crown top, following the existing eaves line. The previous rear opening doors and balcony use of the flat roof has been omitted in preference for standard windows in the rear elevation. A first floor side window is proposed which would serve a bathroom and is shown as obscure glazed. The 2m deep extension would be flat roofed.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

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)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Environment Agency - No objection - proposal falls within scope of Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA) and details of proposed finished floor levels compared to existing should be provided, and flood proofing measures

Chichester Harbour Conservancy - site not within but abuts AONB; site prominent from AONB and easily seen from high tide water albeit shoreline trees provide some screening; no increase in building silhouette would result; no deleterious effect on AONB or purpose of its designation

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary: Repeat previous objections to APP/14/00403 and note plan inconsistencies - Object to loss of light and sky from kitchen, outlook to brick wall; Loss of amenity as before (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 Rythe;) devalue Close properties; suggest extension to north side; have eye health issues so light critical

Comment: the value of properties is not a material planning consideration and the use of the white land for recreation would be unaffected by this proposal. Other matters will be considered 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) 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 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.

Both the scheme recently refused (APP/16/00403) and the current scheme clearly have 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 Chichester Harbour Conservancy have raised no objection, noting that the silhouette of the building would not be increased. 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 4m deep first floor extension beyond the existing 4.5m wide first floor side extension. The discrepancies in the plans noted by the objector appear to relate to the large eaves overhang shown on the roof plan but not floor plan and the relative positions of the existing 3 ground floor side windows. These 3 windows appear not to be drawn entirely accurately in their spacings which is slightly misleading in using them as a visual means of assessing the proposed 4m extension. The proposed west elevation appears to show the extension finishing in line with the southern end of the northern most of the 3 windows - but in reality it is considered the 4m would extend deeper than this, and would extend almost up to the eaves overhang of the outbuilding at No 6.

Notwithstanding this detailed discrepancy it is considered the submitted plans are adequate to determine and would result in an 8.5m 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.) Having assessed the proposal from within No 6 it is considered that the reduction to 4m deep (from previous 7m) would still have an adverse affect on the outlook and light available to No 6. At 4m deep the extension would still infill the length to the outbuilding at No 6 and create a dominant 'corridor' along the rear half of No 6.

In terms of outlook, the view from both the kitchen and upstairs dormer bedroom would be onto a significant brick wall with one obscure glazed window. This would be oppressive, losing the existing skyline and sense of space. As a result there would be a feeling of being hemmed in and the proposal is considered to represent a bulky and overbearing addition, harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6.

With respect to light, it is accepted that both rooms are dual aspect and the light loss to the first floor room is unlikely to be significantly reduced - however the ground floor kitchen relies on light from the easterly direction and the height and proximity of the proposed flank wall is considered to have an adverse effect on the natural daylight available by taking away the existing skyline.

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 outlook from both ground and first floor windows at number 6 and would also reduce the daylight available to the ground floor kitchen at number 6. This is considered contrary to Policy CS16 clause 1. c) and e).

The proposed plan also includes a window in the west elevation facing number 6. This window is shown as being frosted, but if permission were to be recommended then it is considered that it should also be fixed close where below 1.7m above floor level to avoid any direct overlooking.

(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/16/00719

for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed first floor extension, at 4m deep close to the western boundary, would result in a dominant and overbearing addition, adversely affecting the skyline and outlook from both the ground and first floor windows at number 6 adjacent, and the light available to the ground floor kitchen 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.