
Site Address:	196-198 Sea Front, Hayling Island		
Proposal:	Revision to internal layout with additional loft conversion and extension, two storey rear/side extension, two storey revised entrance and roof viewing pod.		
Application No:	APP/14/00042	Expiry Date:	19/03/2014
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Snell	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Murray	Case Officer:	Rachael McMurray
	I J Murray Associates		
Ward:	Hayling West		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site comprises two joined up units (No's. 196-198 Sea Front) which forms part of a group of three properties, which once formed one large dwelling known as Seacourt House. It is located close to the Hayling Island seafront, with No. 194 which once formed the main residence, fronting onto Sea Front. A driveway, accessed from Sea Front, provides access to No. 196/198 which sits to the rear of No. 194 and used to form the servant quarters to the main house (No. 194). No. 200 is adjoined to the rear of the application site and uses the same access derive. The grounds of the property have been subdivided so that the private amenity space of No. 194 sits mainly to the front and side of the dwelling and the amenity space for No. 196/198 sits to the west, which forms the 'rear' of the dwelling. The amenity space to No. 200 sits to the north of No. 196/198. To the north of the whole site, lies the Seacourt Tennis Club which is accessed from Victoria Avenue.

Internally the house contains two staircases and several internal rooms on three separate floors. The existing entrance is through an outbuilding located on the eastern elevation next to the parking area. There are several projecting gable sections and chimneys. The driveway provides parking for four to five vehicles. The rear / side garden is enclosed by a 2m high fence. To the west of this is a vacant plot which has planning approval for a new dwelling.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

The proposal comprises an overall redevelopment of the dwelling to achieve modernisation and reconfiguration. The main proposed changes are as follows:

1. Two-storey extension to north elevation

A two-storey extension is proposed on the north elevation. At ground floor level it would extend out by 3.4m at the longest point and 1.6m at the shortest point to bring it up to the shared boundary with No. 200. This would then extend up to the first floor however this would be only be to a depth of 2.4m. The roof to this first floor section which is currently two gable ends, would also be extended out by 2.4m and the existing windows would be moved forward into the extended gable ends. There would

be two roof light windows in the west facing roof elevation. This would allow for more accommodation in the roof space above the new first floor extension.

2. Revised entrance on east elevation

This would involve the removal of the east elevation which currently includes two windows at first floor and a single door and two windows. The east elevation would be replaced with a full height oak framed glazing panel and two double length oak framed roof light windows in the east facing roof slope. This would then provide the main entrance into the entrance atrium which internally, would include the glass lift shaft and lift to access the upper floors.

3. Roof extension to the south elevation

The roof would be extended out on the south facing roof slope in the form of a gable end which would be identical to the projecting gable end section on the most easterly facing roof elevation.

4. Extension to the roof accommodation and new viewing pod to be located on existing roof

A roof void between two gable sections would be built over and the gable sections opened up in the middle to allow for an open plan space within the roof space. Within this space there would be a spiral staircase, which would lead to a circular glazed viewing pod which would extend above the existing ridge.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies
NPPF

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF
CS16 (High Quality Design)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist:

A response from the Tree Officer has not been sought as the only TPO tree is in the adjacent site and is considered by the case officer that the proposed works are a sufficient distance away from the site of the tree so as not have any impact. The tree is however, adjacent to the shared driveway into the site and therefore it would be considered reasonable to impose a condition to request a method statement to show how the tree would be protected from construction vehicles entering and leaving the site.

Development Engineer:

No objections

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

One representation was received against the application and the points raised are summarised below.

i. There are no significant objections to the proposal which seems sympathetic to the existing property.

ii. Windows A, B and C on the western elevation of the observation pod are significantly higher than the existing windows on the west elevation and will result in overlooking of No. 202. They will also allow views into the roof lantern of the recently constructed extension at the rear of No. 202.

iii. These windows should be obscurely glazed or at least to 1.8m above the finished floor level within the viewing pod.

A response to these objections was provided by the Agent. They advised the following:

- The distance of 40m and the angle of the view from the viewing pod, would not allow for direct overlooking of No. 202.
- The view is already available on the same elevation at the same height from three existing velux windows in the adjoining part of Seacourt House and had a large velux windows in an office window which is in regular use.
- Planning has been approved and site clearance work will start this spring on a building that will be between these two points.

A further response was then provided by the objector:

i. Based on the information provided by the agent, it is accepted that the lines of sight from the proposed development will not impact on the privacy of No. 202 and therefore no objection is raised to the scheme.

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 the design and effect on the streetscene

(iii) Effect on the neighbouring properties

(i) Principle of development

- 7.1 The site is located within a defined urban area whereby development is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to other development management considerations.

(ii) Appropriateness of the design and effect on the streetscene

- 7.2 The proposal comprises an overall redevelopment of the dwelling to achieve modernisation and reconfiguration of the internal spaces so that it works better as a family home. The property forms part of a what was once a much larger house and therefore the proposed external changes are fairly minimal and in keeping with the character of the overall building. The main change to the east elevation would be the full height oak framed glazed section which allows views into the internal atrium. Whilst this would appear more modern than the existing examples of fenestration, on both the application property and then two adjoining properties, the fenestration proportions would be similar in terms of width and thickness of frames which provides a sense of cohesiveness. This also applies to the two roof light windows in the eastern facing roof slope. This element would not be visible from the street scene.
- 7.3 The proposed gable extension on the south facing roof slope would match exactly in terms of scale and design to the existing gable section on most forward eastern elevation and others on the overall building and would therefore be appropriate to the character of the building. This would be visible from the streetscene however, it would not have any harmful impacts.
- 7.4 The two-storey extension on the north elevation would not detract from the character of the main dwelling or have an adverse impact as it is essentially a continuation of the existing north elevation. The ground floor element would infill an existing gap between the house and the side boundary with No. 200 which is the section of Seacourt House attached to the north of the application property. This would not be highly visible from the streetscene.
- 7.5 The building over of an existing roof void to extend the roof accommodation would not adversely affect the character of the main house as it would not be visible. The viewing pod, which would extend above the existing roof ridge height, would form a modern addition to the property. Due to its circular design and glazing, it would not blend in as such with the character of the existing dwelling however, it would be presented in its honest form which is a viewing tower on top of the roof. It would be partially visible from the streetscene. However, it would be located 17m back from the south elevation of Seacourt House, which in itself is already setback from the highway. Therefore the view of the pod would be minimal within the streetscene. Overall, it is considered that it is fairly modest and low key and as such, would not have an adverse impact on the dwelling or the streetscene.

(iii) Effect on the neighbouring properties

- 7.6 The roof extension to the south elevation and the new entrance glazing would not have any impact on the neighbouring properties. The extension on the north elevation of the property would bring it closer to the boundary with No. 200. However, it would have the same impact as the existing north elevation albeit 2.4m closer which is not considered to have so much a greater impact on the amenity of the occupants of No. 200 so as to warrant a reason for refusal. It should be noted that no objections were

received from neighbouring occupants.

- 7.7 With regards to the viewing pod, an objection was received from the owners of No. 202 in that it may result in an overlooking of their property. However the agent provided photographs from other vantage points on the existing roof to show what the views from the viewing pod are likely to be. These showed that views into the roof lantern on the rear extension would not be possible given the distance. Also, No. 202 is already overlooked (albeit at a 40m distance) by the existing windows in the west elevation of the application property and No. 194. Given these two considerations, it would not be considered reasonable to refuse the application on grounds of overlooking.
- 7.8 At present, No. 194 has a roof light window in part of the north facing roof slope, opposite to where the existing roof gully would be infilled. This would mean that the roof light would suffer a loss of light. However, the agent is going to place a new roof light window in the built up section of roof which would measure 800mm x 1400mm (see email dated 17/3/14). This would still allow for the light to penetrate into the roof light belonging to No. 194 and allow light into their landing area.

8 **Conclusion**

The application contains several different elements however, overall these are considered to relate well to the main house, not have an adverse impact on the streetscene and would not adversely affect the neighbouring properties. Therefore the application is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/14/00042 subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date on which this planning permission was granted.
Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 Unless otherwise specified on the plans or application form received on 15 January 2014, the external materials to be used shall match in type, colour and texture those on the existing building.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 3 A method statement shall be provided to explain how the tree located within the rear garden of No. 192 Sea Front shall be protected during the construction period.
Reason: To protect the health of trees to be retained in the interests of amenity and having due regard to policies CS11.4 and CS16 of the Havant

Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Existing plans - Drwg No. - A108
Proposed GF plan - Drwg No. - A100
Proposed FF plan - Drwg No. - A101
Proposed second floor plan - Drwg No. - A102
Proposed view room - Drwg No. - A106
Proposed elevations and views - Drwg No. - A104
Existing elevations and views - Drwg No. - A109
Site sections and location plans - Drwg No. - A107
Existing elevations - Drwg No. - A110
Proposed elevations - Drwg No. - A105
Proposed site plan - Drwg No. - A103

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.