
Site Address:	45 Bath Road, Emsworth, PO10 7ER		
Proposal:	Single storey extensions with alterations to existing dwelling; installation of flue on north elevation.		
Application No:	APP/19/00567	Expiry Date:	12/08/2019
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Broad		
Agent:	Mr Barlow	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	The Steven Barlow Partnership		
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site relates to a residential dwelling located on the west side of Bath Road, adjacent the Mill Pond. Originally the building was a U shaped stable block that has historically been converted to a single story dwelling and has a one and half storey rear extension. It is constructed of a mix of red brick and white render, beneath a plain tiled roof. It is set back from Bath Road and in an approximate linear arrangement with neighbouring properties. The front curtilage of the site is enclosed by a brick and flint wall. The property has a side drive, to the north, and to the rear is a private grassed rear garden which contains some mature TPO'd trees.

Number 44 immediately to the north is a substantial two storey dwelling having an outlook both over the Mill Pond and south over the application site. This property has a primary living room (dining room) with sole window facing south and the existing single storey northern wing of the application site. The relevant separation between properties is about 8m and there is a dividing wall that varies in layout and design but includes sections of "hit and miss" checkered style brick laying to allow light through.

The site lies within Emsworth Conservation Area and Flood Zone 2 and 3.

2 Planning History

01/52773/004 - Crown reduce by 30%, crown raise and remove overhanging branches over house of 2 Silver Birch trees (T4 + T5) at 45 Bath Road subject to TPO 887., PERM,22/11/2001

97/52773/002 - Prune lower branches of Silver Birch (covered by TPO 887) overhanging rear garden of No 46 Bath Road, WD,17/02/1997

97/52773/003 - Reduce and thin crown of Silver Birch (T5) by up to 20%, thin crown of Silver Birch (T4) by up to 20% and crown lift both trees to 3 metres on northern, eastern and western sectors and 4 metres on the southern boundary, PERM,14/03/1997

08/52773/005 - Application to crown reduce by 30% three Silver Birch trees (T1, T4 & T5), cut back to previous pruning points subject to TPO 887., PERM,22/09/2008

APP/12/01121 - Reduce height of 1No. Silver Birch (3 stems in group) by 4m to previous pruning points, subject to TPO 887., PERM,07/12/2012

APP/16/01274 - Crown reduce 1No. Prunus (Flowering Cherry) by 1.5m within Conservation Area Emsworth., RNO,18/01/2017

3 Proposal

Single storey extensions with alterations to existing dwelling; installation of flue on north elevation.

During the course of determining the application amended plans have been submitted lowering the height of the forward projection and reverting to use of plain tiles - such that the proposal now involves:

The bringing forward of the northern most gable end by about 1.2m and widening it by 1.1m with offset pitched roof above a glazed gable end and a covered verandah. The height of this gable projection would increase by about 0.8m and at its western end is changed from hip to gable, and the eaves height would only marginally increase. The internal floor height of this gable wing would be increased with platform level/snug at rear rather than the originally proposed mezzanine floor. The southern gable wing would also be altered by removing the enclosed rooms beneath the roof to create a verandah - the roof profile above would remain. A single storey side extension to the north to form an enlarged porch is also proposed - this would have a footprint of some 2.8m width by 6m in length. The property would be renovated with changed fenestration arrangement and materials - it is proposed to use a mix of brick, burnt larch cladding, oak frame to gable ends, and dark aluminium windows, although the original use of slate for roof has been amended to reuse the existing plain tiles.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Chichester Harbour AONB Joint SPD, May 2017

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))
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)

The policies contained within the Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 Pre-Submission Draft 2019 and the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan, Submission Version April 2019, are also both material considerations as emerging policy. They can be afforded limited weight.

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Emsworth

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

No objection

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Thank you for consulting The Chichester Harbour Conservancy concerning the above

planning submission. The Conservancy is a non-statutory consultee.

The landscape of Chichester Harbour was recognised as nationally important when it was designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in 1964, through the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949. The Conservancy was established by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy Act of 1971. The purposes of the Conservancy are the responsibility for navigation and the conservation of nature. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act of 2000 formerly established the Conservancy as the Joint Advisory Committee for the AONB, with the purpose to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the landscape.

In its role in managing the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), The Conservancy has considered the submitted proposal against the Conservancy's planning guidance and principles - including The new Chichester Harbour Management Plan (2019-2024), The Chichester Harbour Planning Principles (Management Plan version 2019), and The Chichester Harbour AONB Joint SPD (May 2017), adopted by both Chichester District Council and Havant Borough Council. The Conservancy's Planning Consultative Committee considered this proposal at its meeting on 15 July 2019 at Eames Farm, Thorney Island, and resolved that Havant Borough Council, as Local Planning Authority (LPA), be advised that Chichester Harbour Conservancy makes the following comment in relation to the above application.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Recommendation – No objection

Should the LPA be mindful to grant planning permission, the Conservancy hereby recommends the following stipulations are applied:

- 1- A schedule/samples of materials to be agreed prior to construction / as indicated on application forms / to match the existing on site
- 2- For glazed surfaces, the use of coated surface glass that is non-reflective to mitigate external reflective glare which might also assist with keeping heat in and radiation out for the respective seasonal changes.
- 3- Any and all roof lights of the building should be fitted with working internal screen blinds to reduce light spillage during evenings and night-times (dark skies policies)
- 4- The front boundary wall to Bath Road shall be retained and maintained as a screen at all times

The proposal is therefore considered not to be detrimental to the character or the appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Officer comment re suggested conditions:

1. *materials - agree*
2. *non reflective glazing - long distance views of gable glazing will be possible from water, even above wall, so agree*
3. *roof light screens - given that this is an urban area with a street light directly outside site, then do not consider this to be necessary*
4. *would need conservation area consent to demolish wall so repeating as condition is unnecessary*

Conservation Officer

Background

No. 45 Bath Road is a detached, chalet style bungalow property that is located within the Emsworth Conservation Area. This section of Bath Road is predominantly made up of interwar housing, which varies widely in design. They are included within the conservation boundary due to their position facing onto the Mill Pond.

No. 45 is more unusual in that it features an enclosed front garden area, instead of an open frontage and driveway like the neighbouring properties. The garden is enclosed by an attractive 1.8m high (approx.) flint wall with brick detailing. This is identified in the most recent Conservation Area Appraisal as an attractive feature within the area, worthy of

retention.

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.

Proposal

Side extension incorporating mezzanine floor; alterations to existing dwelling; installation of flue on north elevation.

Assessment

The side extension would be to the north elevation, adjacent to No. 44 Bath Road. It would bring the front elevation on this section slightly closer to the front boundary with the highway, however this would mainly comprise an open veranda. The roof height of the side extension would be greater and as a result, the property would no longer appear symmetrical on the front elevation. The smaller extended section on the front elevation would also be altered to remove the existing kitchen area and include a further veranda.

The materials would be updated to include horizontal timber cladding, modern fenestration / glazing and slate roof tiles.

Overall, the existing property (not including the front boundary wall) is considered to be of low architectural merit. The proposals would introduce a contemporary remodelling of the property. This is not uncommon on this section of Bath Road with contemporary designs evident at No's 48 and 50 on a larger scale.

It is considered that although the increase of roof height to the forward projecting northern section would unbalance the symmetry of the dwelling, this would not be overly harmful given that the overall improvements to the property would enhance its appearance with the streetscene and visual context of the conservation area. Also, the increase in height is not so significant that the unbalancing effect would be highly noticeable, given that the property is set so far back into the plot. Overall it is considered that the proposal would accord with the relevant national and local planning policy in that it would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

To conclude the use of good quality materials will be key to the successful integration of these proposals. As such the following conditions should be attached to any permission given.

- Material samples to be submitted

Conservation Officer - on amended plans

From a heritage perspective I have no concerns with the revised design, which I feel will still enhance the conservation area.

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: 3

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 28/06/2019

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
On Original plans:	
Object to: The height of the present single storey barn is not identified in the proposal drawings or description. By scale interpolation it would appear that the existing two single storey gable-ended (barn) structures have each a roof ridge height at 7.8 metres. The proposal is to replace the northern (barn) with a replacement building having a ridge height at 9.9 m, being the same as the adjacent two storey extension. In addition, the new north facing flanking wall and roof is to extend beyond the present building line. Referring to TSBP drawing EO3, proposed south elevation, by scale interpolation this would appear to be a forward advance on the building line of 1.2 m. Although this is described as the open veranda area it is complete with side walls and roof making it 'de facto' an extension to the building line. Our objection is that the proposal is for an over-massive, overbearing structure relative to the site and situation, and which would affect the light and outlook aspects of no 44. No 44 was built with the main aspect south facing over the barns which were a part of the property. The proposed new build on the site of the demolished north (barn) would have an intrusive and out of proportion proximate effect and impact on south aspect rooms of no 44, i.e. two ground floor and three first floor rooms. We consider that what looks inappropriate from our proximate position will also appear odd from the Promenade, from Bath Road and Bridgefoot Path. (Emsworth Conservation Area 3.13 refers). In addition, there is a proposed mezzanine level with a west facing window looking over our property with	Noted and agree - amended plans seek to overcome

a loss of privacy. The apparent purpose of increasing the new build floor level by 0.6m is so as to get a marine view from the new lounge glass gable end. We can see no case for increasing the new build roof ridge height by more than the 0.6 m (1.5m less than is proposed) given that the new build lounge would have a full height vaulted ceiling. There would be no privacy intrusive mezzanine if the new roof line was at 8.4 m. The new veranda should not have an associated wall and roof structure beyond the current building line. We think that the tiling of a new roof should seek to match the existing roofs by, for example, recycling the existing weathered roof tiles. We believe our objections are in line with HBC Emsworth Conservation Area March 2010, re/Urban Form and Buildings: 5.6 The design of new buildings ... be sensitive to the scale and character of the site and area ... respect and maintain building lines ... within the Conservation Area. 5.3 The original characteristics of buildings (in particular ... roof coverings) should be respected and retained and reinstated.	
I comment as a Chartered Surveyor and the son of the owners of the adjoining property The construction to the north side fronting the boundary with 44 Bath Rd is effectively a two storey construction of a significant flank wall which extends beyond the existing building line by virtue of the open covered area facing east/north, this would create a very imposing wall and roof structure effectively removing light and outlook aspects for 44 bath Rd to the advantage of 45 Bath Rd. When considering the reason for the increased ground floor level of 0.6	Noted and agree - amended plans seek to overcome

metres to the proposed development at 45 Bath Rd being, to enable sea views over the retained front garden wall, I see no reason why the existing single storey roof line and wall height should be increased by any more than the proposed increase in the ground floor level namely 0.6 metres.

The proposed two storey height construction is noted to accommodate a mezzanine first floor to enable views over the rear garden. This mezzanine and its aspect would in effect enable views over 45 Bath Rd driveway and the gardens to 44 Bath Rd and other neighbours gardens. The two storey height would be superfluous to 45 Bath Rd obtaining their sea view as they have gained this by virtue of the raised ground floor, unless 45 Bath Rd wish to then further extend their internal mezzanine at first floor level which would be outside of Planning Control, rather it would be only subject to Building Control Regulations.

In summary. The wish for 45 Bath Rd to enable sea views can be accommodated within an increase in their ground floor and corresponding existing roof height level of 0.6 metres. The proposed new two storey extended roof and wall heights to the northern and eastern boundaries with associated internal mezzanine would create an imposing overlooking structure to the detriment of the neighbouring properties and superfluous advantage of the proposed development at 45 Bath Rd.

In reference to the existing/proposed elevation drawings submitted, these do not provide the actual existing roof and floor levels for the proposed development area and are miss leading as they to relate to the existing rear extension levels only.

Re notification on the amended reduced plans was undertaken and a letter of support forwarded via the agent.

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 upon the streetscene and Conservation Area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Flood risk issues
- (v) Highways and parking

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within the built up area of Emsworth where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. The location of the site within Emsworth Conservation Area 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) Impact upon the streetscene and Conservation Area

The application dwelling sits to the western edge of the Emsworth Conservation Area; this part of the Conservation Area is defined by the early 20th Century and inter-war housing that surround the Town Mill Pond. The Emsworth Conservation Area appraisal defines the western side of the Town Mill Pond where the application is located as “suburban in character and thus very different to the overall 18th Century character of the rest of the Conservation Area to the east. Although of modest design the appearance of these houses is enhanced by the waterside location. They are nonetheless, in their own way, complimentary to the Mill Pond, providing an uncomplicated backdrop”.

Most properties on this western side of Bath Road have open frontages but the application site features an old flint boundary wall with brick detailing. This is identified within the Conservation Area Appraisal as an attractive feature, worthy of retention. The proposal retains the original flint wall and proposes the loss of just a small section to the side of more recent red brick infill, to enable the forward projection of the northern gable. This marginal loss would not be visible from the wider Conservation Area or visually significant in street scene terms, and would continue to preserve the overall appearance of the flint boundary wall.

The amended plans have lowered the ridge height, primarily for residential amenity reasons (see below), but the reduced height also results in a less dominant development in street scene terms. The ridge line of the northern wing will now sit between the lower ridge of the original building and the higher rear extension and would not appear overly intrusive. Given that other properties to the south have undergone contemporary remodelling with similar use of oak frames and large glazed areas then this modest change to roofline and materials, largely screened behind the frontage wall, would be appropriate to the immediate setting of the site.

It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions and remodelling would represent a positive contribution to the visual appearance of the street scene and Conservation Area. Accordingly the proposal is considered to preserve the character of the Conservation Area and be compliant with policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

As originally submitted it was considered that the bulk and mass of the increased height

of the side elevation would have resulted in a significant loss of outlook and sense of enclosure to the residents of 44 Bath Road. The combination of the forward extension and increase in height, together with the use of dark slates, would have had an intrusive impact with the loss of significant skyline from primary living windows.

Following negotiations the scheme was reduced and amended, omitting the mezzanine floor and hence allowing the ridge to be reduced by a full metre. The eaves line on the north elevation was also dropped with a reversion to the use of softer traditional plain tiles; as a result the gable end is now offset, but overall the silhouette of the key north elevation has been successfully reduced. The reduced scale of the proposal is now considered to have a less harmful effect on the outlook from number 44. The occupiers of this property have been re-notified and no comment received, although a letter of support as been forwarded from the agent.

Overall the amended proposal is considered appropriate to the design of the host building and would not appear overbearing or result in a significant loss of outlook and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Flood risk issues

The eastern edge of the site ie part of the front garden and driveway, are within Flood Zones 2 and 3, though the existing house itself is outside any flood zone. The proposed forward extension of the northern wing would just impinge on the flood zone, largely where an open verandah is proposed. Part of the submission is to increase the internal floor area of this wing by 650mm. This wing currently comprises 2 bedrooms and in the proposal would become a living room and external verandah. Overall the risk to life would be improved from the change of room function and with the increased floor area. As a 'minor development' according to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), then the proposal is considered unlikely to cause any increase in flood risk to occupiers.

(v) Highways and parking

There is no change to the access arrangements proposed. The existing dwelling has 5 bedrooms and after the proposed remodelling works the property would only have 3 bedrooms. Accordingly the existing side drive is considered sufficient to continue providing adequate on site parking for the development.

8 Conclusion

The scale, siting and design of the amended extensions and remodelling are considered to have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and would preserve the character of Conservation Area, and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00567

(A) subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

Location and Block Plan Drawing number 0583-01.001.01

Proposed Site and Ground Floor Plans Drawing number 0583-01.004.04

Proposed First Floor and Roof Plan Drawing number 0583-01.005.03

Proposed Elevations Drawing number 0583-01.007.04

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 The glazing within the hereby approved gable end serving the lounge, shall be fitted with coated surface glass that is non-reflective. Thereafter the non reflective glazing shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To minimise reflective glare from the wider AONB views, having regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough (Core Strategy) 2011, the Chichester Harbour AONB Joint SPD, May 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework.