

Heritage Team Response

Date – 17/1/2022

APP/21/01256 & APP/21/01444 – Seafield House, 7 Kinnell Close, Emsworth

Application proposal - new and replacement fencing fronting Havant Road; garage/store extensions and alterations; provision of woodburner and external flue in orangery; satellite dish installation.

LBC (21/01444) – LBC - new and replacement fencing fronting Havant Road; garage/store extensions and alterations; provision of woodburner and external flue in orangery; satellite dish installation.

Background

Seafield House is a Grade II listed building in residential use. It is located in Kinnell Close (No. 7) which is a cul-de-sac of modern style housing built around Seafield House. The house is located immediately adjacent to Havant Road and has a listed brick wall which forms part of the boundary with Havant Road however, it is accessed from Kinnell Close. During the 1970's Seafield House was subdivided into two dwellings. The principal elevation with the curved bay windows and veranda belongs to Seafield House and Little Seafield (No. 6 Kinnell Close) is located to the west of the Seafield House. This property has its own entrance from Kinnell Close and front garden / driveway located on the south elevation.

Seafield House has a detached, flat roof garage / car port located to the east of the house. The small section of land between the garage and the boundary with Havant Road has recently been infilled to form a storage area. The north boundary of this fronts onto Havant Road and has been constructed of horizontal wooden fencing at a height of approx. 3.5-4m. Previously this boundary formed a low brick wall with planting above.

Part of the wall fronting Havant Road features a curved brick wall. This wall forms part of the listing of Seafield House. To the rear of the section wall which curves down is a north facing bay window, serving one of the primary ground floor windows. A horizontal wooden fence panel has been erected on the curved section of the wall.

On the south elevation of Seafield House, there is an 8.5m (approx.) length conservatory / orangery structure. The west elevation of this is formed by a brick wall which forms the boundary with Little Seafield (apart from a small, paved section which is delineated by a low brick wall). The roof and east elevation of the conservatory are glazed. A flue has been erected on the west elevation which extends up by 3.2m and adjacent to this, a black satellite dish has been erected.

Legislative and Policy Context

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

Section 66 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 listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The revised NPPF (July 2021) 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 the following paragraphs:

189. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

194. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

195. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

196. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

197. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

199. 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

200. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Historic England Advice

In addition to the advice laid out in the NPPF, Historic England has published planning advice in the form of Good Practice Advice Notes (GPA's) and Historic England Advice Notes (HEANs). Most relevant to this application will be GPA2 – Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment.

GPA2 states at paragraph 4 - 'The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic, and artistic interest'. It also advises that an assessment of significance is required as part of the application process including the understanding of the nature of the significance, the extent of that significance and level of significance. Paragraph 11 states 'to accord with the NPPF, the application will need to undertake an assessment of significance to inform the application process an extent necessary to understand the potential impact (positive or negative) of the proposal and the level of thoroughness proportionate to the relative importance of the asset whose fabric or setting affected'.

Local Policy

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 development proposals must conserve and enhance the historic assets of Havant.

Assessment:

The works to the listed building have already been carried so are technically unlawful. The separate works will be assessed in turn below.

1. Extension to garage and new fence onto Havant Road

The rear elevation of the garage extension is adjacent to the section of wall which is listed and specifically referred to in the listing of Seafeld House. It has been constructed of a softwood material (maybe larch or pine). The palette of materials along the section of the wall stretching from the corner of Lands End Drive to the rear of the now extended garage, comprises a historic brick wall, stone entrance gate and then a lower height flint brick wall up to the point the garage is situated.

Looking back at historic street map images, in July 2019, the section of boundary to the rear of the garage comprised a low-level vertical timber fence panel with soft landscaping above, which sat adjacent to a large tree within the Seafeld House grounds. Since then, the low-level fence has been

replaced with a breeze block wall, clad in horizontal timber cladding which extends up to the height of the wall which forms the side / rear of No. 1 Kinnell Close.

Unfortunately, the materials (softwood cladding) used bear no resemblance to either the historic flint wall to the immediate west, or the more modern brick wall to the east. As such, this section of new fencing appears highly incongruous within the Havant Road streetscene. Whilst this alone is not a listed building consideration, as the section of fencing is attached to the listed wall and forms part of the boundary to a designated heritage asset, it is considered that it results in less than substantial harm to the historic and architectural significance of this wall within its frontage setting on Havant Road. I feel that much more careful consideration needs to be given to the type of material used and the design, in how this relates to the listed wall and the heritage asset of Seafeld House.

2. Fencing on listed wall fronting onto Havant Road

A contemporary style softwood (perhaps larch) fence panel has been erected within the curved section of the listed wall. The reason given for the erection of the fence panel is that protection was / is required for the bay window which sits behind the wall. The curved section of wall is directly in front of the bay window, to allow views outwards onto Havant Road and to provide a view of the bay window which is an important feature of the house.

The contemporary fence panel is completely out of keeping with the character of the main house and the listed wall. It also obscures the view of the bay window and decorative veranda detail which are an important feature of the heritage asset. It is considered to result in less than substantial harm to the listed house and wall.

3. Erection of metal flue on conservatory

The Heritage Statement (HS) advises that the conservatory does not form part of the main listing. Whilst it is not specifically referred to in the listing description, it is however covered by the listing designation and as such, the works require listed building consent.

The flue which has been erected comprises a very shiny metal finish /material. It extends to a height of 3.5m from where it is attached to the wall. It is located adjacent to a small concrete chimney stack which from historic photos, appeared to once have a small black chimney pot.

Whilst there may have been a small block chimney pot in situ adjacent to the site of the new flue, the new flue bears no relation to that of a traditional chimney stack, nor does it make use of the existing chimney. It involves a large, shiny metal structure which protrudes from the conservatory. It has a very modern appearance which is completely out of keeping with the historic character of Seafeld House (no. 7 Kinnell Close), which is characterised by its decorative trellis veranda and bay windows.

The adjacent, attached property which used to form part of the main house (now No. 6 Kinnell Close), is also Grade II listed. The flue sits approx. 6m south of the front elevation of No. 6. This property features front facing, single glazed sash windows and a terraced level front garden. The flue which sits at the front of the boundary, forms a highly incongruous feature which is completely out of character with the listed building to its rear.

I note that there is a proposal to paint the flue black. Whilst this would 'tone down' the shiny appearance, it would still form an alien feature which detracts from the architectural significance of both Seafeld House and Little Seafeld and is considered to result in less than substantial harm.

4. Erection of satellite dish on conservatory

The satellite dish has been erected adjacent to the flue. Whilst not as visually obtrusive as the flue, it has been positioned in a highly visible location on the building with no attempt to conceal the metal fixings. As with the flue, it sits forward of the frontage of Little Seafeld and detracts from its architectural significance when viewed from Kinnell Close. It is also considered to result in less than significant harm but at a lower level than the flue.

Conclusion

All the retrospective works which have been carried out are considered to result in less than substantial harm (as defined by the NPPF) to the historic significance of Seafeld House. Both the flue and the satellite dish are considered to result in less than harmful significance of Little Seafeld.

The NPPF advises that (para 202):

‘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’.

It is my view that there are no public benefits arising from the works which outweigh the harm caused. As such, the applications are recommended for refusal. It is also advised that the unauthorised works (flue satellite dish and fence panel) are removed within a specified timescale. There may be some scope to improve the north elevation of the garage extension however, I feel this will need to be submitted in a separate application.

RECOMMENDATION - REFUSE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

R. McMurray

17/1/2022