
Site Address: 14-16 Sea Front, Hayling Island, PO11 9HL
Proposal: Loft conversion with front and rear dormers and external staircase to rear elevation to create first floor access.
Application No: APP/13/00646
Applicant: J & C Clark
Agent: Mr I Murray
Expiry Date: 23/08/2013
Team: Team 1
Case Officer: Stephen Andrews
Ian Murray Architectural Services
Ward: Hayling East

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site is an end-of terrace shop with flat above which lies on the seafront at Eastoke Corner, just outside the Local Centre at Rails Lane, but inside an area identified in the Local Plan (Core Strategy) Proposals Map for the development and improvement of tourism facilities. The site occupies a prominent position within the sea front, with active frontages/shop windows at ground floor and in several neighbouring buildings e.g antiques, amusement arcade, tourist retail. The building of which it forms part has a hipped roof at either end. To the west, beyond an access drive, is a flat roofed-two storey building, with other hipped-roof buildings beyond.

2 Planning History

04/70008/000 Construction of escape staircase from first floor living area. Approved 7/01/2005

3 Proposal

The proposal is for a loft conversion with front and rear dormer windows, with access formed by an external staircase to the rear. This will enable separate access to the flat space above without need to access via the shop, and to this extent appears to enable the formation of a separate unit.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Development Engineer - No response

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: 13

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary: Objection

The proposed stairs would encroach over the boundary, causing limited access for the neighbour.

- It will restrict neighbouring right of way and look very ugly
- The value of our property will reduce
- Essential light will also be reduced.
- Noise when the staircase is in use. causing our dog to bark at all times, day and night.
- Stepping on the staircase will be most distressing, especially for the dog as is not used to any movement after 10 pm.
- Neighbour is considering re-instatement of a filled-in window. Proposal would lead to loss of privacy to this room and inconvenience to the neighbour.

Comment:

In consideration of neighbouring amenities, the external staircase is a slender structure and whilst it would occupy part of a yard between the neighbour's door and the street, it is not considered that the impact in terms of visual impact, privacy and noise would be so serious as to warrant refusal on this point, the new stairs would occupy an area already used for access to the rear of the premises. The possible re-instatement of a removed window is to a neighbouring wall not alongside the staircase but separated by part of the access yard. In any event it is doubtful that much weight could be attached to the objection based on a future possibility.

In terms of ownership, the applicant has confirmed that they own the site within the red line of the submitted plans. As this application is recommended for refusal for other reasons, there would be opportunity for the applicant to correct this (if it is in fact wrong) in any future application. Notwithstanding this, any blocking of a neighbouring right of way would fall outside the scope of planning considerations, but would be subject of other legal recourse by the neighbour.

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) Impact on Neighbours
- (iii) Design & Impact on Streetscene

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The site lies in the identified urban area where the principle of development is acceptable subject to policies including CS16 of the Local Plan, which requires high quality design, with regard of context and neighbouring amenities. These are considered below. It is noted that the site lies at the edge of an area of floodrisk but this does not appear to include the site.

(ii) Impact on Neighbours

7.3 As considered above, the impact on neighbouring amenities by reason of the staircase is not considered to be unacceptable, it is a relatively slender structure. Any noise associated with its use is likely to be momentary and is away from most of the existing openings to the neighbouring property. The proposed dormers are well away from the neighbouring property and contained within the U-shaped configuration of the building. Any loss of light is considered to be minor.

(iii) Design & Impact on Streetscene

7.4 Considering the impact from the rear, the new flat roofed rear dormers would be contained largely within the U-shaped roof-plan of the existing building and limited in terms of visibility outside the site by reason of the two-storey building to the west, partly by the separate building within the yard and to some extent by reason of distance to the neighbouring dwellings some 45-55m to the north.

7.5 The proposed use of a half-hip roof design in replacement of the existing hip end at the western end of the building, would create an unbalancing of the overall terrace, but in itself is not considered to be so out of keeping as to be unacceptable. However, the proposed flat roof dormer to the front roofslope is a large addition to a prominent roofslope which is part of the seafront area, well used by the public and holidaymakers. It would introduce an alien design element to the front of this terraced building with no architectural reference to the rest of the front of that building. Although the building to the west has a flat-roofed first floor, this is part of the overall design of that building, whereas the large flat roofed addition proposed here would be an isolated alteration to the roof of the terrace of shops. Given the size and prominence of the proposal it is considered to be harmful to the character of the building and streetscene, contrary to policy CS16.

8 Conclusion

In summary, whilst there is merit in the provision of increased accommodation, the impact of the front dormer is considered to be unacceptable. For this reason the application is recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to refuse permission **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/13/00646

for the following reason:

- 1 The proposed flat-roofed dormer window to the front elevation by reason of its large size, design, external appearance and prominence is considered to be an unsympathetic addition to the building and would lead to an over-dominant and unbalanced appearance in relation to the existing terrace of properties. It would also constitute an intrusive addition in the streetscene. Accordingly it is contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.