
Site Address: 2 Towers Garden, Havant, PO9 1RZ
Proposal: Installation of a hard stand/drive on part of the front garden to support the charging of electric vehicles.
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Application No: APP/24/00130 Expiry Date: 15/04/2024
Applicant: Mr Evans
Agent: Case Officer: Josephine Lacey
Ward: St Faiths

Reason for Committee Consideration: At the request of Councillor Harris

HPS Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

2 Towers Garden, Havant, is positioned in a quiet residential area of the Langstone Conservation Area, close to the Harbour. The property is a mid terrace two-storey dwelling with ship-lap panelling at the first floor level and a tiled pitched roof. There is a flat roofed porch within the front elevation and a large window to the ground floor. There are three first floor windows within this elevation. The frontage comprises a grass lawn with a path leading to the front door. The neighbouring properties and other dwellings within the cul-de-sac are of very similar design and scale, with most properties' frontages comprising grass lawns. There is a dropped kerb providing vehicular access to the frontage of the property.

2 Planning History

04/67557/000 - Rear dormer window to east elevation., PERM,11/01/2005
APP/22/00900 - Reduce crown 2No Holm Oak by 2 metres to previous pruning points, leaving height of 9 metres and crown spread of 8 metres. Subject to TPO 1820., PERM,02/12/2022

3 Proposal

Installation of a hard stand/drive on part of the front garden to support the charging of electric vehicles. The proposed driveway would measure 5m x 5m in area, and be finished in block pavers to provide a porous surface.

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 Supplementary Planning Document
Chichester Harbour Management Plan 2024-2025
Langstone Conservation Area Review – Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2011

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)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM20	(Historic Assets)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Langstone

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy OBJECTION

1) Detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area / AONB, from the increase in hardstanding and introduction of vehicle activity within a currently open plan green area - contrary to policies CS16 and CS11 of the HBLP 2011, the NPPF (December 2023) and Section 9 of the Chichester Harbour AONB Supplementary Planning Document.

Reasoned Justification

This is a set piece development with lock up garages within the Langstone Conservation Area. Open plan in nature, this collection of dwellings has a pleasing overall appearance that contributes to the character of this part of the Conservation Area, within the Chichester Harbour AONB.

Whilst the desire to provide charging for an electric vehicle within the frontage of the property is understood, it would be possible to provide this within the garage, without impacting the attractive appearance of the open plan lawns at the front of the properties. The development would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene and Conservation Area as it would puncture this strong, predominantly green boundary character with hardstanding and vehicle activity. It is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Section 9 of the Chichester Harbour AONB SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023). The proposal would also create an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult to refuse further similar applications, which cumulatively would have a significantly damaging impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the natural beauty of Chichester Harbour AONB within which these properties are situated.

Conservation Officer

Initial comments

Site

The site is located in Towers Garden which is a residential cul-de-sac located off Langstone High Street and within the Langstone Conservation Area. It comprises a

uniform development of short terrace rows with separate garages blocks. As characteristic of the street scene, the application site has a front garden which is laid to lawn with no front boundary screening.

Proposal

Installation of a hard stand/drive on part of the front garden to support the charging of electric vehicles.

Legislative and Policy Context:

When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken in consideration.

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

NPPF

The revised NPPF (December 2023) sets out in Chapter 16, the core principles relating to development affecting Heritage Assets that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions in paragraphs 194 – 2014.

Local Plan

Local planning policy comprises the adopted Havant Borough Local Plan Core Strategy 2011, along with the Allocations Plan 2014. With regards to local planning policy, the following are relevant:

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for development that:

'Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.'

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states *'Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:*

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site'.

Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that conserves and enhances the historic assets of Havant. It also states that application which affect, or have the potential to affect, heritage assets are expected to provide a Heritage Statement that:

1. Describe the significance of the asset and its setting, using appropriate expertise and where necessary original survey, at a level of detail proportionate to its significance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal.
2. Sets out the impact of the development on the heritage assets and mitigation that is

proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage asset, including where possible positive opportunities to conserve and enjoy heritage assets.

Assessment

The proposal is very similar to a previous application at No. 9 Towers Garden in 2021 which was refused for the following reasons:

The development would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene and conservation area as it would puncture this strong, predominantly green boundary character with hardstanding and vehicle activity. It is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.

The proposal would create an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult to refuse further similar applications. It is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Langstone Conservation Area and Management Plan 2011 states the following:

'The more recent development on the southern side, comprising Tower Gardens and The Saltings complement the historic pattern of development. This is through the replication of the linear street pattern and terraced blocks of buildings. However, one difference is that the front gardens are open plan with an absence of walls and fences. Off street parking is arranged in discreet courtyards allowing front gardens to be laid to grass. Collectively this provides an attractive environment enhanced by trees which are reaching maturity, adding to the visual amenities and contrasting with the hard landscape treatment elsewhere'.

Since the 2021 application for No. 9, nothing has changed in terms of the status of the Langstone Conservation Area. Therefore, the heritage position is that the proposal to change the front garden into an area of hardstanding to provide on site parking would not be supported, as it would erode the verdant and uniform character of the front gardens in Towers Garden. This would be harmful to the character of the conservation area.

With regards to the provision of an EV charging point, there is no objection to this in itself, it is the loss of the front garden and the creation of the hardstanding which is being objected to.

Overall it is considered that the proposal would fail to meet the test of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as it would neither preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

OBJECTION

Further Comment

FURTHER RESPONSE TO ORIGINAL RESPONSE DATED 10/4/2024

Further to the response dated 10/4/24, I would like to provide further explanation in relation to the heritage position of the LPA:

Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy (NPPF) advises that:
'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the

significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.

As the proposal to create a hardstanding would not result in the total loss of the heritage asset (in this case that being the Langstone Conservation Area), the level of harm is deemed to be 'less than substantial harm'. The NPPF advises that such harm should be weighed up against the public benefits of the proposal.

In this case, the proposal would reduce demand for on street parking and as such, there would be some modest public benefit. However, as the hardstanding itself would only directly benefit the applicants, the benefits are predominantly more private than public and therefore, the modest public benefit is not considered to outweigh the 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of the Langstone Conservation Area. Overall it is considered that the proposal would fail to meet the test of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as it would neither preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area and would not meet the requirements of the NPPF, nor those of Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).

Officer comment: *Please see section 7 where the above is discussed in detail.*

Councillor Gillian Harris

I support this application as other drives in Tower Gardens already have a hard standing so it will not be out of place. Additionally, it will take a car off the road where parking is at a premium and leave space for customers of the Royal Oak which is a valuable business in the area. The installation of charging points leading to increased use of electric cars is to be encouraged.

Request for item to be considered at Committee:

Development plan policy

· Langstone Conservation Area Review was written in 2011 and stated that "....properties in these two roads (Tower Gardens and Saltings) do have front gardens which at present are not enclosed by boundary treatments, none of these front plots have been converted into off street parking areas." However, the article 4 restrictions were not enacted until 2022 and in the intervening years, two other driveways were installed, another front garden laid to gravel and for another house a drive to the back garden. Demand for parking places by both residents and visitors has grown considerably since 2011

Government guidance

· The Department for Transport (DfT) has a zero emissions vehicle (ZEV) mandate, which will require more than a fifth (22%) of cars and 10% of vans sold by manufacturers to be electric, which comes in to force this year. We need to encourage households to install EV chargers. The garage size at this property measures 2.6m wide and 5.3m in length – these dimensions are not big enough to be considered as a parking space under the Havant Borough Parking Supplementary Planning Document. Highway safety and traffic

The property already has a dropped kerb for which permission was obtained and installed in 2019, so a car can be already be parked in the front garden.

Installing a driveway will help increase the safety in Towers Garden as the demand for on-street parking will be decreased.

Design, appearance and layout

The design of the planned driveway is in keeping with the 2 driveways which already exist in Towers Garden. These have set a precedent for the road and are not detrimental to the look of the road.

Officer comment: *Please see summary of third party comments in section 6, and planning considerations in section 7.*

Former Ward Councillor Imogen Payter

No comment received.

Councillor Phil Munday - St Faiths

I support this application. Several houses in Tower Gardens already have their front gardens paved for parking. Importantly this will enable the occupier to charge an electric car. We should do all we can to encourage electric car use and other properties already have their drives paved in the same road.

Officer comment: *Please see summary of third party comments in section 6, and planning considerations in section 7.*

County Archaeologist

Thank you for your consultation. The site lies within an area with some archaeological potential, with the projected path of the a Roman Road passing 75m to the west of the property. However, the proposal is of a limited scale and unlikely to create significant new ground works. Whilst it is not possible to completely rule out the presence of archaeological remains, I do not believe that the burden of archaeological mitigation is justified in this circumstance. On this basis, I do not wish to raise any archaeological issues.

Developer Services, Southern Water

Surface Water Drainage

In situations where surface water is being considered for discharge to our network, we require the below hierarchy for surface water to be followed which is reflected in part H3 of the Building Regulations. Whilst reuse does not strictly form part of this hierarchy, Southern Water would encourage the consideration of reuse for new developments.

- Reuse
- Infiltration
- Watercourse
- Storm Sewer
- Combined Sewer

Guidance on Building Regulations is here:

gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-document-h

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

Website: southernwater.co.uk or by email at:

SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk

Engineering Services

Drainage: see Highway authority response

Environment Agency

No comments received.

Hampshire Highways

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above.

This site already has a dropped kerb vehicular access. The mock up of the drive indicates a block paved surface material, subject to the detailed levels ensuring the drive area does not drain onto the highway I can confirm the Highway Authority have no objection subject to the following condition :-

During the construction period and prior to the first use of the drive the means of drainage shall ensure no surface water spills out onto the adjacent highway. If you think it is appropriate a detailed level plan could be sought and/or the scheme could show interception drainage.

Officer comment: *Noted. The Design and Access Statement submitted with the application advises that "...The driveway will also be porous to limit any additional load on the drainage system..."*

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: 16

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 03/05/2024

Number of representations received: 27

(12 in favour; 15 against)

Councillors are reminded that all representations are available to view in full on the Council's website.

Summary of representations

Support

Properties in Towers Garden already have hardstanding.

Officer comment: *There are two houses within Towers Garden that have completed hardstand driveways to their properties. These developments were not granted planning permission, instead being undertaken using permitted development rights which have since been withdrawn following the confirmation of the Langstone Conservation Area Article 4 direction. If permission is granted for a hardstanding at this property, it would set a precedent in the area for this type of development, which would further erode the character of the Conservation Area. Additionally, the houses with the hardstandings are not in such a prominent location as the application site, meaning there is less visual*

harm.

There is insufficient parking for residents within Towers Garden.

Officer comment: *It is noted that there is an issue with parking to this location, however, the benefit resulting from the proposal is considered to be more of a private benefit than a public benefit, so does not outweigh the harm to the conservation area. This is discussed within section 7.*

Planning permission was granted for the entire area within Towers Garden to be concrete.

Officer comment: *The Article 4 Direction confirmed in 2022 prevents any development forward of front elevations from being completed under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, notwithstanding changes completed before this date. There are no extant planning permissions for the application site.*

The proposal will take cars off the road, meaning that the character of the area would be enhanced.

Officer comment: *Noted, however the development would be contrary to the Langstone Conservation Area Appraisal, which states that the grass front gardens of Towers Garden provide an attractive environment, indicating that the character of the area would not be enhanced as a result of the proposal.*

There should be resident parking on Towers Garden and customers of local businesses should not park there.

Officer comment: *The issue of residents' only parking schemes fall outside the jurisdiction of the Local Planning Authority and is not a material consideration for this application.*

Electric car use should be encouraged.

Officer comment: *Whilst considered environmentally important, the benefit of the electric car being able to be charged at the property is not considered of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area.*

Objection

The proposal runs contrary to the character of the Conservation Area.

Officer comment: *This is noted. The Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application, as set out in Section 5 above and further discussed in section 7 below.*

The property already has a garage that provides parking.

Officer comment: *This is noted, though the applicants advise that the garage is not large enough to accommodate a modern car. This is discussed in section 7.*

If the proposal were to be approved, it would set a precedent for more hardstanding within Towers Garden.

Officer comment: *This is noted and discussed in section 7.*

There would be a loss of wildlife if the proposal were to be approved.

Officer comment: *The proposals relate to a domestic lawn which, given its size and condition, is not considered to provide a significant habitat for wildlife in this case.*

The green front garden provides a sense of wellbeing.

Officer comment: *This is noted.*

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan and all other material considerations it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact on visual amenity and the National Landscape
- (iii) Impact on the character and significance of the Conservation Area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking provision and highway safety

(i) Principle of development

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

(ii) Impact on visual amenity and the National Landscape

7.3 The application site is within the Chichester Harbour National Landscape (formerly known as the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)).

7.4 Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 requires that new development; Responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and: Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site. Policy CS12 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 seeks to conserve and enhance the qualities of the Chichester Harbour AONB (as defined in the Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan).

7.5 The special qualities of the National Landscape (as defined in the Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan) include; *'The particularly strong historic character and associations'* and *'The picturesque harbourside settlements.'*

7.6 Section 9 of the Joint Chichester Harbour AONB Supplementary Planning Document states; *'Loss of garden space and boundary vegetation may lead to adverse impacts on local character and biodiversity'*.

7.7 The frontage of Towers Garden is characterised by verdant front amenity spaces with no boundary treatments, creating a shared sense of garden space. The proposal requires removal of the grass frontage of the property and replacement with 25 sqm of hardstanding, which would erode the green landscape of Towers Garden. The application site is in a prominent position within the streetscene. Amended plans were submitted during the application showing a hedgerow planted along the northern boundary, which would soften some of the views from this approach. However, at just 0.38m wide, the hedge is unlikely to be wide enough for staggered planting to create robust screening.

7.8 Chichester Harbour Conservancy have objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene and character and appearance of the Conservation Area and AONB. It is noted that the objection relates to the hardstanding and vehicle activity. It should be noted that the site already benefits from a dropped kerb and the Local Planning Authority are not able to control vehicles parking on the application site in the current condition of the site. Therefore, it is only the proposed hardstanding which is to be considered in the assessment of this application. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the Chichester Harbour Conservancy commented that *'Open plan in nature, this collection of dwellings has a pleasing overall*

appearance that contributes to the character of this part of the Conservation Area, within the Chichester Harbour AONB.' The impact of the proposed hardstanding on the Conservation Area is considered in the following section of this report. Given that the character of the Conservation Area contributes to the special character of the National Landscape (AONB), it can be concluded that there would inherently be harm to the National Landscape (AONB).

- 7.9 To this regard it is considered that this development would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene, would fail to conserve and enhance the National Landscape and is contrary to the requirements of policies CS12 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan and Section 9 of the Chichester Harbour AONB SPD.

(iii) Impact on the character and significance of the Conservation Area

- 7.10 The application site is within the Conservation Area of Langstone.
- 7.11 Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The *South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment* case and the Barnwell Manor case (*East Northamptonshire DC v SSCLG*) establish that "preserving" means "doing no harm".
- 7.12 Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 states that development would be granted permission where it protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas.
- 7.13 Paragraph 201 of the NPPF 2023 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. The Langstone Conservation Area is significant because it encapsulates a historical hamlet that evolved around the harbour and was the acknowledged port of Havant in Medieval times. It has a unique coastal setting with an ancient wadeway to Hayling Island which is visible when the tide is out. Paragraph 205 of the NPPF 2023 goes on to state that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
- 7.14 The adopted Langstone Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan identifies the importance of landscaped front gardens to the prevailing character of the area and is a material planning consideration. It identifies the key features which contribute towards the conservation area's character and provides the Council with valuable information which can guide and inform planning related decisions in that area. Relating to Towers Garden specifically, the document states the following:

'The more recent development on the southern side, comprising Tower Gardens and The Saltings complement the historic pattern of development. This is through the replication of the linear street pattern and terraced blocks of buildings. However, one difference is that the front gardens are open plan with an absence of walls and fences. Off street parking is arranged in discreet courtyards allowing front gardens to be laid to grass. Collectively this provides an attractive environment enhanced by trees which are reaching maturity, adding to the visual amenities and contrasting with the hard landscape treatment elsewhere'.

In light of this, to approve parking in this location would be contrary to the Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan due to the erosion of the landscaped front garden. A permission of this proposal would provide an undesirable precedent for

the adjoining properties. In this context, if this application were to be permitted it would further puncture this strong, predominantly green boundary character with hardstanding. It is therefore considered that the proposal neither protects nor enhances the heritage designation, nor responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site.

- 7.15 A further consideration is that the development cannot be completed under permitted development rights due to the Article 4 Direction in place in Langstone Conservation Area. It is noted that this direction was confirmed in 2022 in order to preserve Langstone's features that contribute to its charm. Permitted development rights were removed so that development within this area can be assessed before commencing, allowing for the Council to determine whether there would be any impact on the Conservation Area as a result. The Direction covers all properties within the Conservation Area, but only those elevations which front onto a public area. It is noted that there are two houses within Towers Garden that have completed hardstand driveways to their properties. These developments were not granted planning permission, instead being undertaken using permitted development rights which have since been withdrawn following the confirmation of the Langstone Conservation Area Article 4 direction. Furthermore, the current application site is in a more prominent location within the streetscene and wider Conservation Area, as the other two houses with hardstanding are at the end of the road and less visible, resulting in less visual harm than what is proposed at the application site.
- 7.16 The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application and has raised an objection, which has been maintained after the submission of the revised Site Plan. The objection is on the grounds of the conflict between the proposal and the Conservation Area Appraisal and failure to meet the test of the Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The objection from the Conservation Officer is a key consideration in the determination of the application.
- 7.17 The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that the proposal would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the Conservation Area, as it is not the entirety of the Conservation Area that would be harmed or lost. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states that *"...where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use."* Considering this, the public benefits that would result from the proposal have been identified and weighed against the harm to the Conservation Area.
- 7.18 The proposal would facilitate parking and Electric Vehicle charging on-site at this property. It is acknowledged that parking is an issue within Towers Garden and this area of Langstone, and that there is designated space for parking at this property within the allocated garage which is to the rear of the property and can be accessed from a side access past No.1 Towers Garden. Furthermore, it is also acknowledged that this space is small in relation to the size of the modern car and is not practical. There are benefits identified therefore in that up to two vehicles would be taken off the road, and in the location proposed they would benefit from convenient electric charging. However, these are considered to be more of a private benefit and at best a limited and modest public benefit. It is therefore concluded that in this regard, the public benefits do not outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area.
- 7.19 It is concluded that this development would fail to preserve and enhance the Conservation Area and would be contrary to the requirements of policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014. The public benefits would not outweigh the harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and therefore the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 205 of the NPPF. The proposal would also fail to meet the test of Section 72 of

the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as it would neither preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.20 Given the scale, location and nature of the works proposed, it is considered that there would be no direct adverse impacts on neighbouring occupiers. The proposal therefore accords with the requirements of Policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 in that regard.

(iv) Parking provision and highway safety

- 7.21 There is an existing dropped kerb at the property, and the hardstanding would provide space to facilitate parking for two vehicles in line with the Havant Borough Council Parking SPD. The Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal, subject to a condition to ensure drainage provision – in that respect the applicants have confirmed the intention to install a porous block paved surface. As such in highway terms the proposal would accord with Policy DM11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed installation of a hardstand drive to the frontage of 2 Towers Garden, within Langstone Conservation Area, has been considered against its design, the impact on the character of the Conservation Area and National Landscape (AONB), its impact on the neighbouring properties and parking provision. It is noted that parking is an issue for residents in Towers Garden, and it can be understood that on-site parking with an electric vehicle charging facility is desirable to residents, though given the prominent position of the application site within the streetscene and its location within the Langstone Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour National Landscape (formerly known as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty), in weighing the planning considerations relating to this case, it is clear that a balanced judgement must be reached regarding the key issues.
- 8.2 The Council's Conservation Officer and Chichester Harbour Conservancy have been consulted on the application to receive their respective views on any impact on the Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour National Landscape. Both parties have objected to the development.
- 8.3 Officers consider that the introduction of 25sqm of hardstanding would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene as it would puncture the strong, predominantly green frontage in Towers Garden. It is acknowledged that there are two dwellinghouses without grass frontages within Towers Garden (located at the end of the cul-de-sac and therefore in a less prominent position) however these were installed prior to the confirmation of the Article 4 direction which seeks to restrict development between the front elevations and the highway by removal of permitted development rights.
- 8.4 The Langstone Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan identifies the importance of landscaped front gardens in the prevailing character of the area. The proposal would introduce hard standing and therefore erode the verdant appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would result in less than substantial harm to its significance. The public benefits of reducing on-street parking demand by two vehicles would be limited and would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.5 Furthermore, the proposal would fail to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the National Landscape (Chichester Harbour AONB).

- 8.6 On this basis officers conclude that the proposal is contrary to policies CS11, CS12, and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, the Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan and Section 9 of the Chichester Harbour AONB SPD, the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It is recommended that the application is refused.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00130 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposal by virtue of introduction of a large expanse of hardstanding would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene as it would puncture the strong, predominantly green frontage in Tower Gardens. The proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would result in less than substantial harm to its significance. The public benefits would be limited and would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the proposal would fail to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the National Landscape (Chichester Harbour AONB). The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS11, CS12 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, the Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan and the Chichester Harbour AONB SPD, the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Appendices:

- (A) Location Plan
- (B) Revised Site Plan
- (C) Mock Ups of Drive