

alteration to existing roof line to new pitched roof; render and cladding to elevations; new double garage and car port and retention of existing outbuilding.

During the course of determining this application amended plans were received that were accurate and scalable, correcting the initial submission. An updated Flood Risk Assessment was also received.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

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)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

E22	(Amenity and pollution)
E5	(Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)
E1*	(High quality design)
E13	(Historic environment and heritage asset)
E3	(Landscape and settlement boundaries)
E19	(Managing flood risk in new development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

n/a

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Mill Lane and Langstone

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer

Object

Location:

The site is located on the main Langstone Road which connects Havant to Hayling island. This particular stretch of Langstone Road sits in between the boundaries of two conservation areas – Langstone to the east and Mill Lane to the immediate west and north of the application site.

The application site comprises a detached dwelling, set within a triangular shaped plot and which sits at an obscure angle to the streetscene. The north boundary is adjacent to a public footpath which leads to Mill Lane and is characterised by mature vegetation and landscaping.

The property is of traditional brick and tile construction with a fairly plain and simple architectural style compared to the neighbouring property to the south which is a substantial Edwardian villa. There is a detached garage located at the front of the site with a corrugated metal roof.

Legislation / Planning Policy: When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken into consideration.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Conservation Area, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in February 2019 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications. The 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2', states at paragraph 4:

'The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic, and artistic interest' and provides at paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 that in order for the Local Planning Authority to make decisions in line with legal requirements, the objectives of the development plan; and, the policy requirements of the NPPF, great importance is placed on understanding the nature, extent and level of the significance of the heritage asset.

The revised NPPF (February 2019) sets out in Chapter 16, the core principles relating to development affecting Heritage Assets that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions in the following paragraphs:

'184. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field

evaluation.

190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

191. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Considering potential impacts

193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

With regards to local planning policy, the following are relevant:

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for development that:

Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological

sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states 'Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site'.

Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that conserves and enhances the historic assets of Havant. It also states that application which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets are expected to provide a Heritage Statement that:

1. Describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise and where necessary original survey, at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal.
2. Sets out the impact of the development on the heritage assets and mitigation that is proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage asset, including where possible positive opportunities to conserve and enjoy heritage assets.

Assessment:

Whilst the scale and height of the main property would not change significantly as a result of the proposed extensions, the proposal would constitute a complete visual remodelling of the property. This is through the complete change of materials from traditional brick and tile to brown render, red cedar cladding and anthracite roofing. Policy CS16 allows flexibility for unique and modern design approaches however, these do need to be of high quality and in some way, respond to local character.

The property sits immediately adjacent to the Mill Lane Conservation Area (CA) which is characterised by large detached dwellings set within a verdant, semi-rural setting. The majority of properties within the conservation area are of traditional design, comprising traditional style materials. Some forms of cladding have been introduced in Harbourside however, these are mainly with a toned down natural finish and read as part of the coastline setting / landscape.

The application site is located at the entrance to the Mill Lane CA and is therefore within its setting. The setting of a conservation area contributes to its significance as a heritage asset. Any development proposals here therefore must meet the test of Section 72 of the TCPA which is to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the area.

It is understood that pre-application advice was sought back in 2016. The plans provided at the time were not those now being proposed however, modern materials were also included on that scheme. The general advice at that time from the Landscape Officer was as follows:

'The current dwelling is not deemed of particular merit and the generous area of well screened rear garden is noted – hence there appears scope for enhancement and expansion, provided that the proposals are appropriate to

the context in terms of scale and appearance.

Views from Langstone Road to the North / North-East of the site are well screened by existing mature vegetation along Solent Way, but the existing dwelling is clearly visible from the Langstone Conservation Area – notably alongside the attractive Edwardian façade of no. 34 Langstone Road when viewed from the Langstone High Street vista. The large rear garden also appears to be well screened around the site boundary.

Whilst there are no adverse comments regarding the rear extension, I suggest the frontage expansion will require some further elaboration / design development. The existing garage appears to be retained within the scope of the initial sketches, but I suggest there is scope to replace this and recess further into the site to reduce the appearance / improve parking provision (particularly noting there is insufficient space to park a car in front without obstructing the public highway footway).

I emphasise that proposals will need to demonstrate consideration of the existing site context / character and proportionate scale with adjacent built form. I note that brick remains the prevalent material within the surrounding built form context, with render very much less so. Given the context of the adjacent Langstone Conservation Area, it is recommended that the frontage elevation glazing arrangement (and use of any roof glazing) should be appropriately restrained.

The current scheme subject of the application has reduced the level of glazing on the front elevation however, I do have concerns with the proposal relating to the materials and the quality of the design. Overall, the property will appear highly incongruous as a result of the complete change in materials and modern / industrial finish. The windows openings on the front elevation are too small and appear oddly positioned within the elevation. I feel that the property as proposed would detract from the character of the conservation area for which it sits at the entrance of.

I also have concerns over the large outbuilding which would replace the existing garage. This is significantly larger than the existing structure and due to its size, will be set at an awkward angle to the house and the streetscene. It would also be constructed of modern materials and would further detract from the setting of the conservation area.

The existing property does have scope for modernisation and enlargement however, the sensitive location needs to be given further consideration. I would suggest a more equal balance of modern and traditional materials and the reduction in size and repositioning of the garage would be an improvement to the scheme.

Overall, with regards to the impact on the nearby designated heritage assets, that being the Mill Lane and Langstone Conservation Areas in this case, it is considered that the impact would be result in harm on the setting of the Mill Lane Conservation Area in particular. Overall is considered that the scheme as proposed, would not meet the test to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion – OBJECTION

Landscape Team

The dwelling is visually prominent from Langstone High Street and influences the context of the conservation area so I would agree this site is sensitive.

The materials palette and style must take influence from the existing surrounding built form, which is deemed to be brick and from a landscape perspective I would not support the use of render in this area.

The height of the garage seems excessive and is deemed to be too dominant in relation to the house and the proximity to the highway. Again looking at the elevation drawing it seems to be over 2 stories high which we would not support.

In short we need more details of the proposals (i.e. building materials and any landscaping) to ensure appropriateness.

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: 5

Number of site notices: 1 - displayed by applicant due to Covid restrictions

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Comment	Officer Comment
OBJECTION to the rather poor quality of the drawn material submitted in support of the Application.	Agreed - accurate revised plans submitted
The Flood Risk Assessment, by GTA Civils Ltd dated August 2011, relates to a different building project. and is out of date.	Agreed - revised FRA submitted
This proposal is not in keeping with the neighbouring buildings and does not pay regard to the adjacent Conservation Area. The absence of a Landscape Proposal is also a significant omission. We urge you to reject this application.	Noted - see section 7
A replacement garage is planned, but it is of such scale it appears to be more of an industrial unit than accommodation for a domestic motor vehicle. And, being close to the boundary with the highway is the dominating feature on the site.	Noted - see section 7

The choice of materials and their juxtaposition is in complete opposition to the nearby vernacular.	Noted - see section 7
The extensions, half the area of the existing house, are to be constructed using a system of Structurally Insulated Panels, including the new roof of pre-coloured steel sheets; and applied cladding materials over the existing brick building would result in the appearance being completely different to the original house.	Noted - see section 7
This proposal is visually inappropriate for this important location on the main road between Havant and Hayling Island.	Noted - see section 7
No mention of the fact that 32 Langstone Road is also known as 'Langstone Dairy' and, according to the previous owner, has stone floors under the present floor covering in what was the dairy. In the 1911 census for 'Langstone Dairy' Mrs Fay is a 'dairy woman', known to have rented grazing at Southmere and Southmoor and to have run a daily milk delivery. Although the property is of no particular architectural merit it is part of Langstone's agricultural history and occupies a prominent site between two conservation areas. Any extensions should use natural materials externally, such as brick and real slate and not materials, such as red cedar cladding, which is not used here in buildings visible from the public realm and can fade unevenly and look blotchy when wet with rain. The replacement garage seems to be rather prominent and at an awkward angle. It is usual to try and set the garage on a level with the house or set it further back. The design of the proposed extensions needs revisiting so as to ensure that the design and materials are of suitable quality..	Information & history noted Noted - see section 7 Noted - see section 7
Welcome the plan to enlarge the old Langstone Dairy, to convert it into a modern family home, thus reflecting the size of the other properties along	Noted

Langstone Road, however I have a few reservations about the details: I wonder if the garage has to be quite so high, quite so large and quite so far forward on the site. I note that it is being moved back a little from its present position but were it to be rather further back it would dominate the dwelling less. The finishes selected also concern me. The pre-formed steel strip roofing while not seen anywhere else in the two CAs which No 32 sits between, will completely change what was a simple brick and slate village dairy built in 1880 into something unrecognisable. The same is true I believe of the red cedar cladding to the upper story. Although this does appear on Tidelands, 4 Mill Lane it is not there visible from the public realm, whereas here it is in a very prominent position. If cladding is considered appropriate perhaps green oak would be more acceptable.	Noted - see section 7 Noted - see section 7
--	---

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 design and impact on the character of the area and Conservation Area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking
- (v) Flood risk

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area by policies AL2 and CS17, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria. It is however close to the edge of the urban area, the boundary of which runs along the eastern side of the Langstone Road at this point, and includes Mill Lane, but not the open area and field to the north. This boundary continues unaltered in the emerging local plan, policy E3.

7.3 The location of the site adjacent to, and potentially affecting the setting of, both Mill Lane and Langstone Conservation Areas, requires greater care in the consideration of the details to comply with the statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area and Conservation Area

- 7.4 It is acknowledged that the verdant copse to the north of the site and the hedged boundaries, do partly screen the existing traditional brick dwelling when approaching from the north. From this direction the existing dwelling is only partially visible above hedge lines and therefore unobtrusive in its contribution to the character of the area and has a neutral effect on the setting of both Conservation Areas. Similarly, whilst an old pre-fab garage, the frontage garage is modest in scale and visually discreet. However when viewed from the south, the open drive allows oblique views into the site and it is this vista that is more prominent.
- 7.5 The proposal involves 3 elements: first the two storey infilling of the north-eastern recessed area of the dwelling, with new 30 degree steel profile roof across the whole dwelling and modernisation through changed fenestration proportions and use of render and red cedar cladding; secondly the erection of a frontage garage carport having a maximum footprint of 10.6m x 7m with height of 4.9m; and thirdly the retention of the outbuilding. These will be considered in turn.
- 7.6 With respect to the proposed alterations to the dwelling, the principle of the infilling of the first floor recesses to 'square off' the first floor, and the 3m single storey rear extension, would in their own right be unlikely to have any adverse impact on the character of the area. However it is the associated external alterations and proposed re-modelling of the dwelling with altered roof pitch, fenestration arrangement/proportions and materials that would combine to totally alter the appearance and character of the property in such a way as to be harmful to the character of this otherwise traditional and relatively prominent site. In particular the change to the proportion of the windows and introduction of square openings on the east and west elevation and the introduction of high level horizontal openings at first floor in the south elevation, results in a loss of traditional vertical scale and proportion of fenestration. Together with the lowered roof pitch, the altered visual appearance of the dwelling would be tantamount to a new contemporary bespoke dwelling, which given the particular character and setting of the site, is considered inappropriate. In this sensitive site the external design needs to be driven by local context to blend with the local vernacular and retain the traditional proportions.
- 7.7 Such a contemporary design with steel profiled roof and cedar cladding materials would make the dwelling visually conspicuous and very noticeable, particularly when viewed from the south. This would affect its contribution to the setting of both Conservation Areas, no longer being discreet. The cladding and steel roof would also be visible above the hedge line, impacting users of the public footpath immediately to the north. Overall it is the cumulative effect of the visual change arising from altered roof pitch and window proportions, and the use of modern materials that is considered to be harmful to the character of the area and would not preserve or enhance the character of Mill Lane Conservation Area in particular, but also to a lesser degree Langstone Conservation Area.
- 7.8 With respect to the proposed garage, being sited at the front it would be particularly visually prominent in this key location at the entrance to Langstone. The scale of the proposed structure is considered over-large and dominant. At nearly 5m high with double up and over garage doors, in addition to the lean to car port, the structure would be of a bulky design that would not appear subservient to the main dwelling or number 34. This would also be constructed of modern materials and in such a

prominent location the roof materials would but would be incongruous and visually harmful to the otherwise traditional street scene.

- 7.9 With respect to the outbuilding that has already been erected on site, this needs planning permission because it is sited too close to the boundaries to meet the permitted development criteria under Class E. It is however considered acceptable. It retains more traditional proportions and roof pitch to result in a structure of appropriate scale and its modern materials are sufficiently set back in the plot to be screened and not visually prominent from any public vantage point.
- 7.10 Overall the extensions to the dwelling and garage carport are considered to be harmful to the setting of the heritage assets, the two Conservation areas, and the character and appearance of the area and street scene. The proposal would fail to meet the statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area, and would also be contrary to policies CS11, CS16 and DM20.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.11 The siting of the application dwelling is angled relative to Number 34 with a separation of southern elevation to shared boundary of about 13m. The existing dwelling has no first floor windows in the south elevation and hence there is currently little perception of being overlooked. The current proposal does introduce two high level first floor windows in this elevation. Whilst the proportion of these windows is objectionable to the overall design of the dwelling (see section above) nevertheless if they were genuine high level windows with cill heights set above 1.7m from internal floor level, then there would be limited direct overlooking and associated loss of privacy. If the application had been recommended for permission, this could have been conditioned.
- 7.12 In terms of the proposed garage this would be set back by some 9m from the highway and therefore sit behind the majority of the side elevation of number 34. The height of the garage is considerable but the actual harm to the outlook or overshadowing of number 34 would be limited, given the separation and orientation.
- 7.13 Overall it is considered that the proposal will not result in any adverse effect on outlook, overlooking or loss of light and would have limited and acceptable impact on the property immediately adjacent to the application site, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.13 The proposal would remain a 3 bedroom dwelling so only 2 on site parking spaces are required to meet the Parking SPD. The proposed garage and car port could meet that requirement. As currently proposed the garage is set back sufficiently from the highway to enable a vehicle to pull off the highway without blocking the flow of traffic or pedestrians whilst the driver opened the garage door, which on this classified road is a highway safety consideration. Although the size and design of the garage is objectionable, nevertheless there are no objections from a highway or parking consideration.

(v) Flood Risk

- 7.14 The site lies within flood zone 3 and as a householder application for extensions

constitutes a 'minor development' according to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The flood risk assessment indicates that the ground floor level would be constructed to 4.7m AOD and the risk to lives would not alter from existing.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the cumulative effect of the changed roof profile, window proportions and modern materials for the proposed alterations to the dwelling would harm the setting of the Mill Lane Conservation Area in particular and the visual appearance and character of the area. Furthermore by virtue of the size, height, bulk and materials, the design and siting of the proposed garage and car port would be an incongruous and overly prominent structure in the street scene, contrary to policies CS11, CS16 and DM20. Therefore the proposal is recommended for refusal.
- 8.2 It is however noted that the Local Planning Authority raise no objection to the existing outbuilding on the site and the reason for refusal will not relate to this element of the proposal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00767

(A) for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed development, by virtue of the cumulative effect of the changed roof profile, window proportions and use of modern materials would be harmful to the setting of Mill Lane Conservation Area and fail to meet the statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area. The external appearance of the proposed alterations would be at variance with and unsympathetic to the visual character of the area and street scene, contrary to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed garage and car port development, by reason of its size, height, design, bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous feature within the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. The use of steel profiled anthracite roofing would also be visually inappropriate to the context of the site and harmful to the street scene and setting of Mill Lane Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.