

From: Steve Lawrence [<mailto:steve.lawrence@conservancy.co.uk>]

Sent: 13 June 2018 16:49

To: Pickup, Tina <Tina.Pickup@havant.gov.uk>

Cc: Havant Planning and Development Mailbox New <planning.development@havant.gov.uk>

Subject: APP/18/00448 – Grey Havens, 9 Western Parade, Emsworth, PO10 7HS

Dear Tina,

Grey Havens, 9 Western Parade, Emsworth, PO10 7HS

APP/18/00448 – Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a replacement 1No. 3 bed detached dwelling, including balcony to front elevation, balcony and external staircase to rear elevation, flue to western elevation, existing garage refurbishment with render cladding.

Fully delegated Officer decision from Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Recommendation – Objection; Unsympathetic materials and excessive glazing harmful to the setting of the AONB.

Apologies for the delay in replying, owing to staff shortages.

Just an initial observation about the council's description of development. "render cladding" does not make much sense and implies that either one treatment would be overlaid on the other. I assume the council meant to say "render/cladding".

Having regard to the Policy framework* below and a site visit made 13.6.18, The Conservancy has concerns about the colour of the proposed cladding.

The agent's argument that other similar lighter finished dwellings are close by is not itself a justification for adding more into the landscape and the directly immediate setting of the AONB. The Planning system should be about betterment.

The applicant was advised at pre-application stage by The Conservancy that light coloured cladding would not be supported, notwithstanding the existing white UPVc cladding of the existing house.

Similarly advice about the use and amount of glazing in the facade has not been heeded. Notwithstanding the arguments made by the agent on page 7 of the Design and Access Statement, the comment on page 14 that the design approach of the Joint CHAONBB SPD has been followed is not accepted. The relative massing and silhouette would at least reduced by some 13% on my calculation.

The 56% increase in footprint can be tolerated on a plot of this size, spatial separation to neighbours would be roughly the same across the plot and the architecture and roof profile of the new would be better than that of the old.

However, choice of light CO3 pale grey cedar boarding and amounts of glazing relative to the totality of the south (Harbour) elevation do not sit comfortably next to the AONB.

*Policy framework

NPPF - 11, 14, 17, 56-57, 60-61, 63-64, 115, 186-191, 196-197, 203 & 206; **NPPG** – ID's – 8, 21a, 26; **HBLP** – CS12, CS16, DM9; **DENP** – H1, D1-D2, D5, D7-D8; **CHMP** - LS1-LS2, BD1-BD2; **PP** – 01, 03, 09; **SPG/SPD**.

NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
NPPG – National Planning Practice Guidance (2014)
HBLP – Havant Borough Local Plan (2011/2014)
DENP - Draft Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan
CHMP – Chichester Harbour Management Plan (2014-2019)
PP – CHC Planning Principles, Version 1.1 (2017)

SPG/SPD –
Borough Design Guide
Emsworth Design Statement
Joint Chichester Harbour AONB SPD (2017)

Yours sincerely

Steve		Chichester Harbour
Lawrence		Conservancy
MRTPI		
Planning		Harbour Office, Itchenor
Officer		
01243		Chichester, PO20 7AW
510001		
		www.conservancy.co.uk

Please visit our new look website [here](#).

Please note that I work 3 days per week,
typically Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

Confidential information may be contained in this email message and is intended only for use of the addressee. If you receive this email message by mistake, please notify info@conservancy.co.uk and delete this email, which must not be copied, distributed or disclosed to any other person.