
Site Address:	23 Claremont Gardens, Waterloooville, PO7 5LL		
Proposal:	Retention of a 2.4 metre fence.		
Application No:	APP/19/00277	Expiry Date:	10/05/2019
Applicant:	Miss S Roberts		
Agent:	Mr Critchley	Case Officer:	Emma Chisnall
	Critchley Architecture and Design Ltd		
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The property is a Grade 2 Listed dwelling set within a modern residential development. The property is a 18th century 3 storey detached dwelling (formally a dairy farmhouse) which is set back from the main highway in excess of 20 metres and benefits from a large front garden.
- 1.2 The curtilage boundary consists of mainly hedging in particular along the north and east of the application site. However, part of the hedging has been removed along the east side and replaced with a 2.4m timber fence which is the subject of this application and assessment.

2 Planning History

97/60513/001 - Listed Building application for replacement of UPVC windows to rear elevation with wooden sash windows at first floor and wooden casement windows at ground floor, PERM,21/10/1997

95/60513/000 - Retention of 8 replacement UPVC windows to rear elevation, REF,24/08/1995

05/60513/002 - Erection of double garage., PERM,13/06/2005

06/60513/003 - Detached double garage., PERM,28/03/2006

07/60513/005 - Retention of timber log store and security gate., PERM,14/08/2007

07/60513/006 - Listed Building Consent for re-rendering The Dairy Farm. , NPW,07/04/2008

09/60513/007 - Raise flat roof to rear, create accommodation in roof space incorporating dormers to front and rear and velux to side (west) elevations. , PERM,23/11/2009

APP/10/00130 - Discharge of Condition No's 2, 3 and 4 of Planning Permission 09/60513/007., PERM,19/07/2010

09/60513/008 - Listed Building Consent to raise flat roof to rear, create accommodation in roof space incorporating dormers to front and rear, velux to side (west) elevations and the repainting of the front elevation. , PERM,23/11/2009

APP/15/01024 - Erection of timber framed carport in front garden (approved 12.11.15). Request to Discharge Condition No. 2 (received 14.6.16)., PERM,12/11/2015

APP/15/01027 - Listed Building application to replace existing rear elevation ground floor bow window with double doors & winglights & plain tiled canopy over (approved 12.11.15). Request to Discharge Condition No. 2 (received 14.6.16)., PERM,12/11/2015

APP/18/00043 - Listed Building Consent for replacement of existing windows with timber windows to match original., PERM,21/02/2018
APP/19/00278 - Listed building consent for retention of a 2.4 metre fence., PERM,

3 Proposal

3.1 Retention of a 2.4 metre fence.

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)

CS16 (High Quality Design)

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)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer

In regards of the above applications I can confirm that I have no objection to the retention of the fence. In the context of the listed building the fence would not look out of keeping and as such I consider it appropriate.

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: 1

Statutory advertisement: 29/03/2019

Number of representations received: 10 letters of support

Comment	Officer Comment
I would like to let you know that we	Noted

think the 2.4 m fence at 23 Claremont Gardens should remain, as it is very tidy, the Old Dairy Farm House has been restored and is looking great, including the fencing.	
Fully support. Well constructed and in keeping with the area.	Noted
I support the retention of the 2.4 metre fence that is mentioned in Planning Proposal APP/19/00277. The fence is well constructed and looks a lot tidier than the scrubs and greenery that it replaced. Thank you.	Noted
I fully support the retention of the 2.4m fence. As a regular visitor to the Cul-De-Sac, appearance once entered Claremont Gardens looks much more pleasant since the owner has inserted the fence. The fence is in keeping with the property and the owner has made sure the fence fits with the style of the property. Before the fence was erected, there were messy bushes, shrubs & greenery which didn't look nearly as nice and easy on the eye as the current fence does now! Thank you.	Noted
I would like to fully support the erection of the 2.4m fence at the property. The owner has done a great job, and it's much tidier and in keeping with the house. Before the fence, there was untidy greenery along the west side. Thanks	Noted
Retention of 2.4m fence, gives the property a smart clean tidy boundary, adds privacy and security for the home owners. Over the last 10+ years I have watched the property lovingly maintained and improved.	Noted
The fencing looks professionally done and in keeping with the neighborhood.	Noted
I have just recently moved onto the estate, the fencing looks like they have always been there, and is part of our estate	Noted
Nice fencing, both visually and structurally.	Noted
The owners of 23 Claremont Gardens have greatly improved the entrance to the cul-de-sac by erecting an attractive and well constructed fence which	Noted

replaced the very unattractive and untidy shrubbery along the boundary. The construction of the fencing is in keeping with the property and surrounding environment. Looking at the council's reason, saying it is not in keeping, if you look at the other side of the property you will see approximately 100 feet of identical fencing which has been there for years with no comments made, this seems to be a bit of a witch hunt to me and a complete waste of council's money which, we as taxpayers, have to pay for. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the fencing, if anything, it is an improvement to the area. I fully support this application for the retention of the 2.4 metre fence.	
--	--

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:

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 character and appearance of the Listed Building
- (iii) Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- (iv) Effect on neighbouring properties

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

7.3 In this case the proposal includes works to boundary surrounding a Listed Building and the proposal must therefore be assessed against the relevant parts of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and this assessment is made below.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building

7.4 The site comprises of a Grade II listed building and therefore particular consideration needs to be given to the historical importance of the building when making a proposal for changes.

7.5 Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed building or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

- 7.6 The application has been considered in detail by the Councils Conservation Officer and the works are considered to not be significantly harmful to the listed building and no objection has been raised. In the context of the listed building it is considered that the fence would conserve the character and setting of the listed building. The works are considered to be acceptable.

(iii) Impact on the character and appearance of the area

- 7.7 The development subject of this application has sought formal planning permission on a retrospective basis following an investigation by the Councils Enforcement Team. As such, it is important to note that the fence has been fully completed and a clear assessment was able to take place.
- 7.8 Following a site visit it was noted that the retrospective fence has been built to a high quality and although high, is appropriately set off from the private road adjacent and has a small area of greenery to the front of it which reduces the visual impact caused creating a neat visual line of development to the east of No 23. In addition to this the fence is softly screened by hedging to the north front boundary and towards the back which alongside the boundary being to the side of No 23 and not forming a front boundary is considered to reduce the visual impact caused significantly resulting in an acceptable visual impact from the highway of Claremont Gardens and No 23 itself.
- 7.9 High level boundaries are present within Claremont Gardens towards the east end of the estate and therefore the works at No 23 are considered to not look out of place nor detract significant character from the area. Furthermore, the adjacent neighbouring property forms part of the boundary to the west with its two storey flank wall and therefore the fence at No 23, albeit high, is considered to not appear obtrusive or out of character within the streetscene. The development is therefore considered to be acceptable.

(iv) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 The works are positioned along the east side of the curtilage boundary and run along a private road. Due to the position of the works it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or oppressive 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).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 In conclusion, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in principle and would preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building and would not be unneighbourly. Planning permission can therefore be recommended subject to conditions.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00277 subject to the following conditions:-

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

Photographs: Received 15.03.2019

Location and Block Plan: Drawing No 1583-101

Existing Site Plan Showing Fence Position: Drawing No 1583-105 A

East and North Elevation Plan: Drawing No 1583-305

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.