

20 SANDY BEACH ESTATE, HAYLING ISLAND, PO11 9RG

CONSTRUCTION OF SECOND FLOOR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL LIVING ACCOMMODATION AND BALCONY; FIRST FLOOR REAR BALCONY OVER GROUND FLOOR FRONT EXTENSION; CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE TO LIVING ACCOMMODATION

PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

NPPF paragraphs 14 and 115; CS12 and CS16 Adopted Havant Borough Local Plan. Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan 2004-2009: BD1: Appendix 3: Policy B3. Chichester Harbour AONB Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions.

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY'S COMMENTS

An application for a second storey extension was refused in 2012 due to concerns regarding the impact of the extension on the AONB. The report recommending refusal of that application read as follows:

20 Sandy Beach Estate is a two-storey flat roofed property within a development of matching 'art-deco' style properties arranged in a circular form on the southeastern end of Hayling Island. No.20 sits within the row on the eastern side of the estate, which lies just outside the AONB but backs onto the Sandy Point Nature Reserve and AONB. Views of the first floors and roofs of the buildings, the majority with white-painted elevations, are obtainable from the coastal footpath which leads around the east and southern edges of the Sandy Point Nature Reserve, which contains only low coastal shrubs.

The application proposes to erect a second floor above the existing flat roof of the building, with a curved metal clad roof. It is also proposed to erect a first floor rear terrace and balcony over the existing detached garage. The first and second floors would be clad with 'Eternit' weatherboard (synthetic). The second floor extension would increase the height of the building, providing a large study, while the first floor accommodation would be rearranged. The second floor would incorporate very large windows on the rear facing the harbour, while the first floor would be changed to a row of glass patio doors leading onto the terrace and balcony, which would be surrounded by a stainless steel and glass balustrade.

We are concerned about the proposed increase in height and bulk as a result of the second floor extension, which would bring the existing building significantly higher than the remaining properties in this row, would introduce a curved roof at odds with the surrounding 'art deco' flat roofs, and would square off its silhouette in an exposed position visible from the AONB. This increase in height and bulk coupled with the large amount of



glazing proposed on the rear elevation would make the building significantly more prominent and intrusive as viewed from the AONB, and would result in an incongruous addition to this row of properties. It is therefore contrary to Policies CS11, CS12, CS16 and DM9 of the Havant Core Strategy 2011. Recommend Refusal.

To address the concerns regarding the previous design, the architect proposed a revised scheme with a pitched roof but this was discouraged as an unsympathetic approach given the predominance of flat roofs in the Sandy Beach Estate. The application now proposes an extension with a mono-pitch roof, a reduced footprint, repositioning of the first floor extension to mitigate impact on neighbouring properties and a reduction in the width of the extension.

The proposed mono-pitch presents an angled roof where there is a predominance of flat roofs and this will be clearly visible from the public beach. It also has the effect of accentuating its height, which on the front elevation results in a disproportionate height comparative to the existing building. In a street scene where most of the properties are two-storey with flat roofs, it is important that any variance of this is treated with great care and sensitivity so as not to harm the overall character of the area. Whilst a contemporary glazed second floor extension may be acceptable in principle, the plans at this stage do not convince that the proposal will be at ease with the house or the wider area and that it would instead appear awkward and weaken the strength of the flat roofs which are such a defining characteristic.

If the application dropped the mono-pitch to a flat roof there would likely be no objection and it is recommended that this amendment be sought but otherwise it is recommended that the scheme currently presented be refused.

DATE CONSIDERED

22/07/13

CONSIDERED BY

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.