

24 Beacon Square, Emsworth, PO10 7HU

APP/18/00876 – Replacement dwelling

I firstly apologise for the delay in replying, due to staff shortage.

Fully delegated Officer decision from Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Recommendation – Objection to increase in massing and roof ridge height, Arboricultural impact from extending westwards not evidenced, which might lead to later tree loss to the landscape and excessive amounts of glazing facing the Harbour.

I made a site visit 4.6.18 to review GEN/18/00353, viewing the site from front and back. I see that very little if nothing has changed on the drawings, apart from annotations about materials.

Having regard to the Policy framework* below, it is noted that this is one of 5 dwellings, west of the sailing club dinghy compound, on a fairly regular building line facing the Harbour, with generous spatial separation between them. The southern boundary of its 77m long and varying 25-38m wide plot, forms the boundary with the Chichester Harbour AONB, where there is also a public footpath running along the foreshore.

A public footpath also leads up from the foreshore between 24 and 26 Beacon Square, affording some limited views of the site and dwelling.

The main views of the site then are from the east west public footpath to the foreshore, approaching the site along this footpath heading west and from Beacon Square itself, with the narrow north south footpath providing a limited vista of the Harbour beyond. Views looking north-east from the foreshore footpath are closed off by trees.

The plot largely sits within EA flood zones 2 and 3, which probably accounts for why the dwelling is sited where it is on the plot. I note the owner is seeking to future-proof the replacement dwelling by placing it on a raised plinth, reading as a raised terrace in front of the new house. I estimate the new roof ridge height would be in the region of 1.5-2m higher than the existing.

The existing silhouette has now been superimposed on the proposed elevation. This reveals a 45.5% increase in the building silhouette facing the Harbour, mostly resulting from raising the roof ridge height, but also making the dwelling wider across the plot. Taken with dimensions given in the Design and Access Statement the footprint increase represents a 48% increase in footprint, within the Conservancy's preferred tolerances.

The increase in footprint would appear modest, especially given the size of the plot. I see the agent has legitimised the increase in roof ridge height as to match the neighbour to the west. Whilst the silhouette rule of thumb is strictly only applicable in the AONB, I nonetheless remain concerned about this substantial increase in massing and raising of the roof ridge, when seen from the Harbour.

Under the pre-application response I indicated I would like to see the footprint pulled off the western boundary a little more, to reduce the pressure on tree root systems there. This has not occurred and with no arboricultural impact report submitted, The conservancy remains concerned on that point. I had suggested mirroring the same separation 26 has to the north-south public footpath for the new dwelling.

There are some intervening trees between the existing/proposed dwelling and the foreshore southern boundary. These are sufficiently distant not to be troubled by the new works, but it would be sad to see them felled for no great reason other than to open up an unrestricted view of the Harbour. I previously asked that the council's tree officer please give these trees a quick review to see if they merit a TPO, to secure their retention. The Conservancy is pleased to see the agent state they will be retained.

Notwithstanding the submitted analysis of existing versus proposed extent of glazing facing the Harbour, I still consider it to be excessive. Notwithstanding the eaves overhang to provide some shading effect from the first floor balcony. My request to see post and wire balustrading rather than glass panels, raked backwards so they do not constitute a climbing hazard to children, seems to have been ignored. Whilst the agent argues solid panels will offer great protection from the wind, this argument seems poor as no-one is really going to sit on the balcony when a gale is blowing. The post and wire solution would still stop people falling off the generous balcony, whilst reducing visual impact and maintaining views of the Harbour.

The materials palette offered, is acceptable. The quality of the materials suggested seems fine and should raise the quality of appearance of dwellings facing the Harbour, enhancing the setting of the AONB.

Hipping the main roof would help reduce its bulk/silhouette on what will be a fairly unrelieved, relatively long ridge line.

It is encouraging to see the owner using sedum roofs and continuing with solar panels to improve the CO₂ footprint of the new dwelling. If the surrounds to the solar panels could also be colour finished black, that will draw less attention to them.

*Policy framework

NPPF paragraphs - 14, 17, 56-58, 60, 64, 99, 109-113, 115; **NPPG** – ID's 6-8, 21a, 26; **Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011** - CS11, CS12, CS15-CS17, DM8, DM9; **Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014** - AL1; **Draft Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan (2017)** – L1 (c), W5 (b), M4 (a), D1-D3, D6-D8 (a) & (b); **Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan 2014-2019**: BD1; **SDP/SPG** – Joint CHAONB SPD; Emsworth DS

Yours sincerely

Steve Lawrence MRTPI		Chichester Harbour Conservancy
Principal Planning Officer		Harbour Office, Itchenor