

Mrs T. Pickup

PLANNING APPLICATION

For 7 Salterns Close, PO11 9PL, Ref. APP/16/00403 of 27 May 2016

We object to the above Application on the general grounds of:

- a) Light loss to work and living areas in No 6 Salterns Close.
- b) Amenity loss to the Close.
- c) Property values in the Close.
- d) Overlap with a previously rejected Application.

SPECIFICALLY:

LIGHT LOSS:

There would be no sky viewable to the north east from the No. 6 kitchen, just a blank brick wall. This is a work area where natural light availability is important.

AMENITY:

Salterns Close residents have use of Community Harbourside white land for recreation, boat launching, etc. extending from Salterns House to Wilson's Boatyard. The proposed design would present a slab sided intrusion to views from this land and Mengham Rythe.

PROPERTY VALUES:

The proposed design would intrude, and devalue Close properties. From the sides it has unrelieved blankness. From the north, No.7 would present an inelegant and inconsistent mix of different levels, styles, with flat roof areas and a strange half hip roof. All in full view of the Rythe. As well as being a marginal investment, the proposal may devalue nearby properties. The economic potential for No.7 is heavily affected by the adjacent boatyard, and its public lavatory hard by No.7's east boundary.

PREVIOUS APPLICATION:

On 25 August 1988 an application of similar design, ref. 33300/3 was assessed on appeal for the Dept. of Environment by D F Binnion, Inspector, and rejected.

Finally, the current application claims that the footprint of No.7 has not increased. We were constant visitors to no.7 from 1975 on, and would like to see proof of this.

Yours faithfully,

Mr E Spratt,

Mrs S Spratt

6 Salterns Close, PO11 9PL

23 May 2016

HAVANT BOROUGH
COUNCIL

24 MAY 2016

RECEIVED

Borough of Havant

BOROUGH SECRETARY
P. T. ADAMS, LL B., Solicitor



ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL DEPT
CIVIC OFFICES, CIVIC CENTRE ROAD,
HAVANT HANTS PO92AX
DX 50005 HAVANT

Your Ref:

My Ref: PH/ 11/84/NF

HAVANT (0705) 474174 Ext No. 192
When telephoning please ask
for Mr. Hitchcock

17th. March 1988

Dear Sir,

Town and Country Planning Act 1971 (as amended)
Land at 7, Salterns Close, Hayling Island.
Proposed Development - First floor extension over existing flat
roofed area and two-storey extension at rear
Application Reference 33300/3
Department of the Environment Appeal Reference APP/X1735/A/89/089122
Appeal Starting Date 15th. March 1988
Appellant's name Mr. S.C. Hardy

I am writing to let you know that an appeal has been made to the Secretary of State for the Environment in respect of the above site.

The appeal follows the/refusal of planning permission/ ~~failure to determine a planning application within the time allowed/imposition of conditions on a grant of planning permission~~ by this Council.

The appeal is to be decided on the basis of an exchange of written statements by the parties and a site visit by an Inspector.

Any comments already made following the original application for planning permission (unless they are expressly confidential) will be forwarded to the Department and copied to the appellant and will be taken into account by the Inspector in deciding the appeal. Should you wish to withdraw or modify your earlier comments in any way, or request a copy of the appeal decision letter, you should write direct to the Department of the Environment, Room 13/14, Tollgate House, Houlton Street, Bristol BS2 9DJ, within 28 days of the appeal starting date (above) quoting the appeal reference number.

Yours faithfully



Sent to:- Assistant Borough Secretary (Legal)

The appellant, c/o E.A. Wade Esq., "Four Gables", Manor Road Hayling Island
PO11 0QU
Messrs. E., S. and L. Spratt, 6, Salterns Close Hayling Island PO11 9PL
Department of the Environment, Bristol
Hayling East Ward Councillors (Havant Borough Council)
Planning and Development Committee (Havant Borough Council)
Director of Planning and Architecture (Havant Borough Council)



Department of the Environment
Department of Transport

Common Services

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct line 0272 218 927
Switchboard 272-218811

C/1713/VR/P

DAWINS

E Archie Wade
Four Gables
Manor Road
HAYLING ISLAND
Hampshire
PO11 0QU

Your reference

Our reference

T/APP/X1735/A/88/089122/P5

Date

25 AUG 88

Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPEAL BY MR S C HARDY
APPLICATION NO:- 33300/3

1. As you know I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal. This appeal is against the decision of the Havant Borough Council to refuse planning permission for a first floor extension over an existing flat-roofed area (modified proposals) at No 7 Salterns Close, Hayling Island. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by other interested persons. I inspected the site on 1 August 1988.
2. The appeal site comprises a detached property situated on the northern side of the residential cul-de-sac of Salterns Close. The eastern part of the dwelling is 2-storeys in height with a pitched roof. This section has a bathroom and integral garage on the ground floor and a bedroom at first floor level. The western part of the dwelling is single storey in height, however, with a flat roof. This single storey part which contains a kitchen at the front and lounge and dining area behind, extends some distance beyond the rear wall of the 2-storey section. The rear garden extends to the north up to a grassed area with some trees and a slipway running down to an estuary known as My Lords Pond, which lies within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. A detached house, No 6 Salterns Close, lies to the west of the site while a boatyard fronting My Lords Pond adjoins the greater part of the eastern boundary. The garden of the house at the end of Salterns Close adjoins the southern part of this boundary.
3. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings and consideration of the representations made, I have come to the conclusion that the main issues in this case are firstly, whether the proposed development would depress to an unacceptable extent the level of amenities at present enjoyed by the residents in the adjoining house to the west, No 6 Salterns Close, and secondly, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.
4. On the first issue, I observed that a path separates the single-storey part of No 7 Salterns Close from the western boundary fence which is about 1.8 m high. The adjoining house, No 6, is then separated from this fence by its vehicular accessway. The glazed side door, kitchen window and study window of No 6 face this vehicular accessway and you have pointed out that Nos 6 and 7 are separated by a distance of about 4.57 m (15 ft). It appears to me that the study window of No 6 would not be opposite the proposed extension of No 7 while the east-facing dormer window in the roof of No 6 would also be some distance from the proposed extension. In my opinion



Recycled Paper

the proposal would be unlikely to lead to a significant reduction in the daylight or sunlight reaching this dormer window and the study window.

5. You have also stated that the bedroom window in the west wall could be omitted and replaced by a window on the east slope of the roof. It seems to me that this amendment could be secured by a condition on a planning permission and that consequently the privacy of the residents in No 6 would not be seriously affected.

6. In view of the distance between the proposed extension and the eastern wall of No 6 and the visual effect of the existing panel-type boundary fence and the single-storey part of No 7, it seems to me that the proposed extension at first floor level would not be an unduly dominant feature in the outlook from the kitchen and study window of No 6. Nevertheless, having viewed the appeal site from within the kitchen of No 6, I consider that the proposed development with its 2-storey western elevation would result in a marked reduction in the daylight and sunlight reaching the door and window in the kitchen of No 6.

7. You have argued, however, that the daylight reaching the kitchen window of No 6 would have been regarded as adequate had No 7 been originally constructed as a 2-storey house up to its present limits. You have also referred to the reduction in the daylight reaching this kitchen caused by the annexe to No 6. I take the view, however, that as No 7 was built with its single storey part it is not unreasonable for the Council to have regard for the level of amenities at present enjoyed by the occupiers of No 6, based on the orientation and existing layout of their dwelling and its relationship with No 7 as existing. Kitchens are well used and adequate daylight and sunlight reaching these rooms makes a considerable contribution to the amenities of a dwelling. In my judgement, on this first issue, in view of its effect on daylight and sunlight reaching the kitchen door and window of No 6, your client's proposal would result in material and unacceptable detriment to the level of amenities at present enjoyed by the residents in No 6 Salterns Close.

8. On the second issue, I note that at the rear of No 7 Salterns Close, the proposed 2-storey part on the west side would extend well forward of the proposed flat roof which would have a length of about 4.5 m (15 ft) and a width of 1.52 m (5 ft). With this relatively modest area of flat roof in relation to the total plan area of the extended dwelling, in my opinion the proposal would result in a house predominantly with pitched roofing in views towards the rear elevation. It appears to me, therefore, that the section with the flat roof at the rear of the dwelling would not be an unduly significant feature in views from areas to the north, east and west, including views from the foreshore, Tournier Bury woods on the northern side of My Lords Pond and the boatyard to the east of the appeal site. Furthermore, trees within the site and to the west near the estuary would give screening in more distant views from the north and west. I consider, therefore, that the flat-roofed part of the proposed development would be unlikely to have a marked adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which adjoins the appeal site.

9. It appears to me that the housing development in Salterns Close has the character and appearance of a fairly spacious residential area. Well spaced bungalows extend along the southern side while houses on the northern side do not stand unduly close to one another, often being separated by single storey garages. When viewed from Salterns Close, the western single-storey part of No 7 contributes to the clear separation between the 2-storey part of the house and the 2-storey dwelling of No 6, while the east-facing sloping roof of No 6 with its dormer window leads visually and satisfactorily to the single-storey part of No 7. The character of reasonably spacious development prevails therefore in this part of the cul-de-sac. Although you have drawn attention to the boatyard to the east of No 7, it

seems to me that this yard does not form an unduly significant feature in the street scene. Indeed the view of masts from the highway tends in my view to emphasise the rather spacious character of the housing in this part of Salterns Close.

10. The proposed development would give a 2-storey elevation to the highway, however, across nearly the entire width of the site. The present separation between the 2-storey part of No 7 and the house, No 6, would be greatly reduced. With its west wall 2-storeys in height, in my opinion the proposal would be a harsh and unsympathetic intrusion in the present attractive street scene. I consider that the proposal would have a marked adverse effect on the existing character and appearance of this residential cul-de-sac.

11. In my judgement, the proposed development is therefore open to material planning objections on both issues. I have had regard for all the other matters raised in representations including the existing bedroom accommodation in No 7 Salterns Close. I am satisfied, however, that these are outweighed by the considerations which have led to my decision.

12. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Sir

Your obedient Servant

D F BINNION BSc(Hons) CEng MICE DipTP MRTPI
Inspector