

**SHORT PLANNING & DESIGN  
STATEMENT IN RESPECT OF  
PROPOSED EXTENSION**

**AT**

**33 MAISEMORE GARDENS, EMSWORTH  
PO10 7JX**

**MLP REF: MG/20/188**

**JUNE 2020**

**Mark Leedale Planning**

**Chartered Town Planning Consultant  
52 Crondall Lane,  
Farnham,  
Surrey GU9 7DD  
01252 718855 tel/fax  
markleedale@hotmail.com**

## **Contents**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Planning history
- 3.0 Relevant planning policy
- 4.0 Applying planning policy
- 5.0 Summary and conclusions - the planning balance

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1. This statement sets out relevant planning policies and the application of those policies. In so doing, the following conclusions are reached:
  - The application site lies within the Urban Area Boundary as defined in the adopted development plan. It is outside of the Coast Management Area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), although adjacent to the latter.
  - The garden of the lies within the identified flood zone although the proposed extension is outside of this designation. This is an area of coastal flood risk and the application is accompanied by a Statement which details the relevant effects and how this is impacted on the household. It is established that there would be no materially adverse effect on flood matters as a result of the development proposal.
  - In design terms the dwelling and surrounds are of utilitarian appearance and the proposal simply reflect this approach as has been undertaken on adjacent properties. There is no conflict with relevant planning policy.
  - Whilst close to the common boundary there is no adverse effect in terms of overbearing impact or loss of privacy to the adjoining occupiers. As such there is no basis to resist the proposal on the basis of the effect on residential amenity.
- 2.1. In light of the foregoing, the proposal represents sustainable development and should be granted planning permission.

## **2.0 Relevant planning history**

- 2.1. There have been no previous extensions to the application property.
- 2.2. It is noted that there has been a two storey extension to the adjoining property, 32 Maisemore Gardens although there is no record of this on the Council's database.

### **3.0 Planning policy**

- 3.1. The application site lies within the built up area as designated by policy AL2 in the Sites Allocation DPD. In such areas there is an acceptance of residential development and extensions to dwellings.
- 3.2. The application site is outwith although adjacent to the AONB where CS12 applies. As such regard may properly be given to the scenic beauty of the landscape and the effect of the development proposal upon it. The site is not within or close to the Coastal Management Areas. As such there are no relevant policies in this regard.
- 3.3. The garden of the property is within the coastal flood zone as shown on the Environment Agency maps and policy CS15 refers. The test is whether the proposed extension would materially affect flood related matters on this or adjacent land.
- 3.4. The generic design policy (CS16) and related SPD's are relevant to the determination of the application.
- 3.5. Framework policies pertaining to the AONB landscape, design and flood risk are relevant and the development plan is broadly compliant with these.
- 3.6. The following section applies these policies to consideration of this development proposal.

### **4.0. Applying planning policy**

- 4.1. In considering the relevant planning policies, we refer to the following:

1. Is the design and effect on the AONB acceptable?
2. Is the effect on residential amenity acceptable?
3. Is there any adverse effect on flood risk?
4. Are there any other material planning considerations?

#### **Design and the effect on the AONB**

- 4.2. The design of the surrounding houses is uniform and this is reflected in some extensions which have taken place. It may be considered that the architecture is of its time and by contemporary standards is utilitarian in approach. This said it is pleasing in the spaciousness of the environment and where there are gaps between building blocks, there are views to the landscape beyond and behind the houses. It is this which perhaps defines the character of the locality.

- 4.3. It is clear that from public views along Maisemore Gardens that there is an extension to no.32 adjoining and this may have consciously been set back from the frontage although this may also be a factor of land ownership. Nevertheless, the applicant has taken this same approach with the design of the two storey extension to replace the existing single storey addition. In this way and with the retained set back there is space between 33 and 32 which avoids any perception of a cramped or over developed form. There will remain views of the space about the building and the landscape beyond.
- 4.4. The effect on the AONB landscape which is beyond the application site and adjoining built development will be negligible when seen in the context of relatively high density terraced housing. This aspect of the policy and planning objectives framework is not offended and the scenic beauty of the AONB coastline/harbour is retained.
- 4.5. The design approach is uncomplicated. It is informed by the standardised and uniform architectural in the locality. There is no basis save for an approach which departs from the existing and that is the basis for the design of the proposal.

**Residential amenity**

- 4.6. The proposal has a further north facing first floor window in proximity to the adjoining dwelling (32) although this would be to a bathroom and provides only extremely oblique views to the rear private garden of this dwelling.
- 4.7. The upper floor window to the rear (south) does not offer any further overlooking into adjoining gardens than do the existing bedroom windows in this direction.
- 4.8. Whilst the mass and bulk are closer to no. 32 the effect is one which would not be overbearing on the dwelling itself or the amenity space which is situated away from the extension principally to the west of the property.
- 4.9. On this basis there would be no material effect on amenity and no conflict with relevant planning policies.

**Flood risk**

- 4.10. The accompanying Statement details that the building and extension are outside of the identified flood zone. However, there is a requirement to have regard to climate change and this position could change as a result of this.

- 4.11. All of these considerations are detailed in the Statement and there is no basis to withhold planning permission. In short, the dwelling would not be the subject of flood risk and the tidal surge would be both readily notified and allow for the removal of property from the small garden at the rear of the dwelling. There are other measures detailed in the Statement.
- 4.12. Even accounting for climate change there would remain a dry/safe access at the front of the house and there is no risk to life in the case of short term tidal flood events. Whilst affording additional residential accommodation there is no increase in the population which would be subjected to unacceptable flood risk.
- 4.13. On this basis there is no conflict with relevant planning policy in the development plan or Framework.

**Other material planning considerations**

- 4.14. The proposed extension to the property does not impede on the available areas for off street vehicular parking. Having regard to the SPD “Parking” as updated in September 2019, there is no material difference between the existing 4 bedroom dwelling and that which is proposed.

**6.0 Summary - the planning balance**

- 6.1. By way of summary, the following matters are set out:

- Having regard to the designation within the Urban Area Boundary there is in principle acceptance of further residential development. Importantly the constraints pertaining to the Coast Management Area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) are not implicated by way of specific designation.
- In design terms the proposal simply follows the surrounds which are of overtly utilitarian appearance and are broadly uniform in architectural terms. This said there is a retained gap to the adjoining dwelling and views through this to the mature landscape beyond. It follows that there is no conflict with relevant planning policy.

- The proposed extension is close to the common boundary with no. 32 adjoining. However, it is demonstrated that there is no adverse effect in terms of overbearing impact or loss of privacy to the adjoining occupiers. As such there is no basis to resist the proposal on the judgement of the effect on residential amenity.
- The rear garden and patio of the dwelling lies within the identified flood zone although the proposed extension is outside of this designation. Having regard to this and allowing for climate change it is shown that the short period of coastal flood risk is easily identifiable to residents and there remains a safe route to allow dry access and egress at the frontage. It is established that there would be no materially adverse effect on flood matters as a result of the development proposal.

6.2. In light of the foregoing, the proposal represents sustainable development and should be granted planning permission.