

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	Langstone Lodge, 1 Langstone High Street, Havant, PO9 1RY		
Proposal:	Proposed extension to existing outbuilding/annex to form additional living accommodation.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/24/00345	Expiry Date:	21/10/2024
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Denton		
Agent:	Ms S Roberts	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Critchley Architecture and Design		
Ward:	St Faiths		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 Langstone Lodge is a substantial detached two storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof space, located in extensive grounds, enclosed by a high brick wall, on the east side of Langstone Road, accessed off Langstone High Street.
- 1.2 The site lies outside the defined urban area by policies AL2 and CS17 and is therefore within the non-urban area for planning policy purposes. The site is within both the Langstone Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour National Landscape (formerly AONB). To the north of the dwelling, within the garden area are two trees protected by TPO's - a beech and an oak. Part of the site falls within current flood zones 2 and 3, whilst the whole site lies within the future flood zone. To the east, The Paddocks at Langstone, is designated a Local Green Space by policy AL8.
- 1.3 The existing dwelling is not Listed, but is mentioned in the Langstone Conservation Area Review Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2011 as a building that makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. As such it is a 'Non-Designated Heritage Asset' (NDHA) by virtue of the definition of a heritage asset contained within the NPPF. It is a notable example of a large Victorian villa, complete with its setting of a large, landscaped garden that makes a valuable contribution to the Langstone Conservation Area.
- 1.4 Notably the existing house has planning permission for extensions and alterations approved under APP/21/01322 in September 2022. Works have commenced on these through the demolition of the previous single storey elements that were to be replaced/altered. As part of these works the property has been gutted internally with all floors and ceilings now stripped back to just timber supports, and all staircases removed etc. Essentially the dwelling is currently a shell and uninhabitable, with the original external facades remaining intact. Recently planning permission was refused (30/9/24) to demolish this main dwelling on the site and replace it with a nominally like for like replacement.

- 1.5 Within the site there is also a detached garage that has ancillary living accommodation above, sited in the south-eastern corner, adjacent number 2a The Mews, Langstone High Street. This detached structure is the subject of this current application. It currently comprises a four bay garage behind two double garage doors on the ground floor, with an external staircase at its eastern end, leading to a studio style flat on the first floor. It is constructed of red brick beneath a plain tiled pitched roof, which includes a dormer window on the north western elevation that has a double gabled roof. There are two roof lights on the rear roof slope and a wooden pergola structure above a concrete base has been erected at the rear, in the triangle between the rear elevation and the boundary wall with 2a The Mews.

2 Planning History (excluding applications for tree works)

00/51864/009 - Continued use of garage and loft over as offices, TPP,27/10/2000
97/62764/000 - Single storey extension to south elevation, PERM,19/09/1997
96/51864/006 - New dormer on north east elevation (Retrospective)., PERM,24/09/1996
95/51864/005 - Continued Use of ground floor of garage as offices, insertion of patio doors in rear elevation and renewal of PP No. 94/51864/4 to continue using first floor of building as offices., ,06/06/1996
94/51864/004 - Renewal of planning permission ref: 93/51864/2 to continue use of office above garage as marketing company., TPP,26/04/1994
92/51864/001 - Conversion to two dwellings, WD,19/05/1992
93/51864/002 - Use of office above garage for marketing company and retention of dormer to north elevation of garage., ZHIS,21/05/1993
03/51864/011 - Renewal of temporary planning permission 00/51864/009 to allow the continued use of garage and loft over as offices., TPP,10/12/2003
06/51864/014 - Erection of a timber framed garage for 3 cars, including the felling of a tree within Langstone Conservation Area., WD,10/01/2007
06/51864/013 - Conversion, extension and change of use of existing garage block to 1No. 3 bedroom detached house with integral single garage and altered access to Langstone High Street., WD,10/01/2007
07/51864/015 - Minor alterations and conversion of annex to a separate 2/3 bedroom dwelling., WD,28/02/2008
APP/20/00072 - Replacement windows in south west elevation., PERM,01/04/2020
APP/20/00794 - Single storey six car garage and turning area., WD,20/04/2021
APP/21/01322 - Demolition of existing single storey additions; extensions and alterations including part single, part two storey extensions to NE elevation with terrace; and single storey to NW elevation; repositioning of the main entrance stone portico., PERM,06/09/2022
APP/24/00121 - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling, designed to match the extended form of dwelling as approved in 2022., REF,30/09/2024

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Proposed extension to existing outbuilding/annex to form additional living accommodation.
- 3.2 During the course of determining this application amended plans have been received re-orientating the bulk of the extension to the north of the existing garage/annex. The proposal includes a 2.4m forward extension of the existing garage, with a re-roof above increasing the height of the ridge by 1.3m to 7.8m high.

A 7m long and 6.7m wide extension would be added to the north, which would have a pitched roof at 6.5m high. Additionally there would be a flat roofed single storey extension to the south, having a maximum length of 8m and height of 2.9m, effectively replacing the existing pergola.

- 3.3 Internally a replacement double garage would be provided in the new northern section, and the remainder of the ground floor would provide a kitchen/diner, family room, snug, office, shower room, armoury etc. Three bedrooms and two bathrooms would be provided on the first floor.
- 3.4 It is proposed that the accommodation would be occupied on an ancillary basis to the main Langstone Lodge. Part of the justification for this is to provide somewhere for the applicant and his family to live whilst works to the repair of the main dwelling take place. It is further contended that the annexe accommodation proposed would not be used as a self-contained dwelling as it will still share access and parking via a secure and gated entrance, share the garden and amenity areas, and all utilities would be supplied via the main house. Additionally the agent notes that the proposed outbuilding is still subordinate to, and in scale with the main residence and once works are complete on the main house would remain ancillary accommodation providing a boot room, games room, armoury in connection with a hobby etc.

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)
CS12	(Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB))
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
AL8	(Local Green Spaces)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Langstone

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control

No comments

Chichester Harbour Conservancy on initial plans:

OBJECTION, on the following grounds:-

The proposed extensions would create a large, detached building beyond the size and character of an ancillary domestic building which would appear as a separate dwelling, remote from the main house. This would make the building more prominent as viewed from Langstone Meadows, which would be harmful to the natural beauty of the Chichester Harbour AONB / National Landscape, as well as the character and appearance of the Langstone Conservation Area. The proposal would effectively involve the creation of a separate dwelling within the countryside, which would be contrary to established countryside policies including Planning Principle PP06 and Local Plan Policies CS11, CS12 and CS17.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy on amended plans:

OBJECTION, on the following grounds:-

The proposed extensions would create a large, detached building beyond the size and character of an ancillary domestic building which would appear as a separate dwelling, remote from the main house. This would make the building more prominent as viewed from Langstone Meadows, which would be harmful to the natural beauty of the Chichester Harbour AONB / National Landscape, as well as the character and appearance of the Langstone Conservation Area. The proposal would effectively involve the creation of a separate dwelling within the countryside and would make it very difficult for the Local Planning Authority to prevent future occupiers of Langstone Lodge using the proposed building as a separate dwelling (particularly given the '4-year rule' for lawful development) which would be contrary to established countryside policies including Planning Principle PP06 and Local Plan Policies CS11, CS12 and CS17.

Conservation Officer

Compared to the historic character of the main building on the site, Langstone Lodge, the outbuilding is of modern construction. The outbuilding is tucked into a southeast corner of the site, close to the shared boundary with 2a The Mews. As such, it has limited visibility from Langstone High Street.

The proposal is for an extension to the existing outbuilding. This would extend to the rear at single storey and at 1 ½ storey to the side, extending forward of the existing front building line. The ridge height of the existing building would be raised by approx. 1m and replaced with clay roof tiles. The dormers would be minimised in size and separated out to two separate structures. The extended side section would feature a lower roof height and be constructed of matching materials. The rear extension would also be of matching materials. The existing garage doors would be replaced with arched, full-length windows and a new, traditional style stable entrance door.

The design of the proposed extensions is considered to be complementary to the character of the existing outbuilding and the main Langstone Lodge, which is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). It is therefore considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the significance of the NDHA.

The proposed works would not be highly visible within the context of the Langstone Conservation however, as the design is considered to be of high-quality, the proposal would not result in harm to the Langstone Conservation Area and would meet the test set out in Section 72 of the Town (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the relevant sections / policies of the NPPF and adopted Local Plan.

Conclusion

NO OBJECTION subject to the following condition:

1. Details and / or samples of all new external materials to be provided and agreed prior to use and used in situ thereafter.

Reason – in the interests of the preserving and enhancing the special character of the Emsworth Conservation Area and having due regard to policies CS11(4) and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.

Crime Prevention

None received

Ecologist

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information. Whilst I would not expect the building to be of significant ecological importance, the proposed works will entail substantial modifications to roof materials and presumably any roof void/s below. These features may have potential to provide suitable habitat for legally protected species such as bats.

In the first instance I would welcome some recent, good quality photographs of the building. These should clearly show all elevations (where possible) and show roof materials (roof and ridge tiles, any cladding), soffit and fascia areas, and any internal void (ideally showing underlying roof structure). Photographs should allow me to provide a more informed view on the likelihood of protected species occurring.

Should photos be inconclusive, or demonstrate that potential for protected species is obvious, then I would recommend that the applicant provides an ecological assessment, to be provided by a qualified ecologist. The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (www.cieem.net) holds a database of suitably qualified ecologists. An ecological assessment will determine whether there is any evidence of protected and notable habitats and species, and whether the proposed works are likely to result in impacts to those habitats and species. Unless the qualified ecologist can conclude that there is no reasonable likelihood of protected habitats and species being present (due to negligible potential) or that if present they are not to be impacted by the works, it is likely that further ecological survey work will be required prior to determination of any application. The results of any further surveys should be used to provide an assessment of the likely ecological impacts of the proposed works and to inform any mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures.

With regard to Biodiversity Net Gain, the proposal would be exempt as a householder application.

NPPF, Circular 06/2005 and Natural England Standing Advice, require that planning decisions are based on full, up-to-date ecological information and it is essential that all necessary survey, assessment and mitigation information is available to the Local Planning Authority prior to determination, particularly in the case of protected sites, habitats and species, which are a material planning consideration.

This will enable the Local Planning Authority to determine the application on the basis of full knowledge about the potential ecological impacts of the proposal and to ensure that any impacts can and will be mitigated.

Environment Agency - initial comment

In the absence of an acceptable flood risk assessment (FRA) we **object** to this application and recommend that planning permission is refused.

Reasons

The FRA that the applicant has referred to in the document (*Flood Measures - Mitigation Measures to Protect from Flooding in Householder Extensions*), relates to another application which does not comply with the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 20 to 21 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change planning practice guidance and its site-specific flood risk assessment checklist.

The FRA does not therefore adequately assess the flood risks posed by the development. In particular, the FRA fails to:

- demonstrate that the development is 'safe'
- consider whether flood risk will be increased in the surrounding area
- address the opportunities presented by this development for reducing flood risk
- consider how people will be kept safe from the identified flood hazards
- consider how a range of flooding events (including extreme events) will affect people and property
- consider the requirement for flood emergency planning including flood warning and evacuation of people for a range of flooding events up to and including the extreme event
- take the impacts of climate change into account

Flood risk mitigation measures to address flood risk for the lifetime of the development have not been included within the design. Consequently, the development proposes inadequate:

- Raised finished floor levels
- Resistance and resilience measures

Safe access and egress routes

Advice to Applicant and the Local Planning Authority

Householder extension

We note that the FRA that has been submitted is the form that applies to Householder and other minor extensions in Flood Zones 2 and 3. This guidance is only for extensions where the additional footprint does not exceed 250m² and should not be applied to the self-contained annex. However, we note that in Section 3.3 of the Design and Access Statement it states that 'the proposals add an additional 268m² of floor space'. Therefore, we require a more comprehensive FRA to be submitted.

Environment Agency - following explanation that application for householder ancillary accommodation only:

if the extension totals less than 250sqm and is considered ancillary then we wouldn't need to be consulted as per the external consultation checklist (attached) and therefore as a local authority you would need to be satisfied that [Flood Risk Standing Advice](#) has been applied.

Hampshire Highways

I refer to the consultation on the above planning application and would advise that as a proposal relating to the provision of additional living accommodation with no proposed changes to the existing vehicle access to the public highway that HCC's Highway Standing Advice should be referred to in the first instance.

This can be viewed via the following link under the heading Consultation with the Highway Authority -

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/consultation>

HCC Arboricultural Consultancy

TPO ref: 09944 and the Langstone Conservation Area protect trees at this site. The Conservation Area appraisal shows a significant tree belt along the north and northwest boundaries. Also, a significant individual tree near the southern boundary.

The arboricultural details supplied with this application are dated 2022 and relate to a different application. As such, the overall arboricultural impact of the proposed extension is not yet clarified. However, the trees near the proposal (numbered 42-45 on the Tree Protection Plan) were noted as poor quality back when they were surveyed in 2022. The loss of any or all of these trees will not be harmful to public amenity or the character of the Conservation Area. The application form states that no trees requiring felling or pruning to facilitate the proposal, so it may be that these trees have already been removed.

It's likely that this proposal will be acceptable in arboricultural terms. However, we need a certain level of detail up front so we are absolutely clear as to how it may impact on trees. Please can we have a proposal-specific tree survey, tree removal/retention plan, arb impact assessment and tree protection plan before it is determined. If the impact as per the previous paragraph, all of this information could reasonably be supplied on a single annotated plan

Officer Comment -

The trees nearest to the development building (a sycamore and 2 ash trees) have already been removed under APP/24/00250 and are no longer constraints to this development.

Natural England

None received

Southern Gas Network

Linesearch result - object as there are high pressure pipelines in the vicinity of the area.

But no follow up stage 1 responses received

Officer Comment

The building the subject of this application is over 20m away from any high pressure pipeline and as a minor householder development it is not expected that the extensions would adversely impact the nearest pipeline. The matter would also be covered by Building Regulations at construction stage. An Informative can nevertheless be added to raise awareness of this issue.

Waste Services Manager

None received

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: 9

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 07/06/2024

Number of representations received: 2 - both of **Support**

Comment	Officer Comment
will have minimal impact; we have no objections.	Noted
Fully support their choice to build a house whilst they try to re build the lodge. It has no impact on the local area	Noted

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:

- (i) Principle of development and use
- (ii) Impact on Heritage assets
- (iii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area including National Landscape (formerly AONB)
- (iv) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (v) Flood risk
- (vi) Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (vii) Parking
- (viii) CIL

(i) Principle of development and use

7.2 The application site is located outside the defined urban area and as such the more restrictive rural policies of the NPPF apply. However the application is for householder extensions to an existing outbuilding within the curtilage of an existing residential dwelling and no new dwelling is proposed. Policy AL2 does allow for small scale householder development as an exception in the rural areas, and hence the development would comply with policy AL2.

7.3 It is however noted that the proposed plans would result in a significant extension to the existing outbuilding creating additional habitable accommodation that would be capable of independent occupation. However it is not the intention of the applicant to create a new dwelling but rather, in the short term, provide somewhere for his family to live whilst the main residence is repaired. After the main residence is again habitable, then the extended outbuilding would revert to ancillary accommodation including providing somewhere for relatives to stay.

- 7.4 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed accommodation is larger than standard annexes, nevertheless, relative to the scale of the main house, the annexe would be subservient and tantamount to a coach house or staff accommodation often associated with such significant dwellings. It would be served by the main house in terms of utilities and bills, and share a private gated entrance as well as the grounds. Therefore there would be a functional link with the main house. During the course of determining this application the red lined application site has been amended, clarifying that the annex would be within the curtilage of the existing dwelling and not result in a subdivision of the site or formation of a new planning unit.
- 7.5 Due to the unusual circumstances of the case, legal advice has been sought, which advises that all cases are a matter of fact and degree, but that whilst the main house is being renovated the occupation of the annexe could be considered tantamount to a temporary use ie similar to a temporary caravan for the same use. It is further advised that the temporary occupation by the family would not establish or count time towards the use of the site as an additional dwelling because it wouldn't be in use as a separate dwelling if the main house is uninhabitable.
- 7.6 A condition would be imposed requiring the occupation of the outbuilding to be on an ancillary basis only, and any future breach of that condition could be enforced. On this basis, with a lack of evidence that there is any intention on the part of the owners to use the extended outbuilding except for themselves and their wider family, to supplement the main residence, then it is considered that the proposed extensions to the outbuilding can be considered as genuine ancillary accommodation. As such there is no objection in principle to the proposed annexe, and the use of householder planning forms is considered appropriate.

(ii) Impact on Heritage assets

- 7.7 The site lies within Langstone Conservation Area and as such Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant, which 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.
- 7.8 As noted by the Conservation Officer, in this instance the building is tucked away in the southeast corner of the site and has limited visibility from the street. Although the ridge height would be increased, nevertheless the finished development would be of a high quality and not be overly visible in the context of the Conservation Area. Therefore it is concluded that there would be no harm to the character of the Conservation Area which would be preserved.
- 7.9 In accordance with paragraph 209 of the NPPF, the impact on Langstone Lodge itself must also be considered, which is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA), by virtue of its mention in the Langstone Conservation Area Review Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2011 as a building that makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. It is considered that the design of the extensions to the outbuilding are appropriate and akin to a coach house, complimenting the main lodge, and as such would not be harmful to the significance of the Non-Designated Heritage Asset.
- 7.10 Therefore the proposal is considered to protect and conserve the historic assets as required by policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Allocations Plan, and policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy.

(iii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area including National Landscape (formerly AONB)

- 7.11 The site also lies within Chichester Harbour National Landscape (formerly AONB) and the main house, as an attractive period property set in large landscaped grounds, makes a valuable contribution to the landscape. The existing outbuilding, the subject of this application, is set against the hedge line to the open space to the east at Langstone Meadows, and the roof of the outbuilding is visible from this direction. Currently the most prominent part of the building, when viewed from Langstone Meadows, is the white painted first floor entrance door, which, on the north-east elevation is angled to face the open space. The remainder of the dark muted bricks and tiles generally blend with the landscape and mature trees behind, and the existing silhouette of the building is less prominent than the rear of the properties in Langstone High Street.
- 7.12 The proposal would increase the height of the outbuilding's roof by 1.3m, and add a lower pitched roof single storey northern projection increasing its mass and silhouette. Chichester Harbour Conservancy have objected to the proposal, considering the scale of additions take the building beyond the size and character of an ancillary domestic building and would appear as a separate dwelling, remote from the main house. They consider this enlargement would make the building more prominent when viewed from the public footpath and around Langstone Meadows to the east.
- 7.13 However it is noted that relative to the surrounding building's profiles abutting the Langstone Meadows open space, this would still be lower and relatively modest, not dominating the view. Discussions have taken place with the agent about materials to ensure the enlarged north-east gable end facing the field would not be render, which would be bright and prominent. Instead further amended plans have been submitted clarifying the materials to be used, with this north-east gable end being clay tile hung to match the roof. This would give an appropriate dark and muted visual appearance to Langstone Meadows, in keeping with other roof profiles that would blend with the wider surroundings. With the removal of the first floor white door, arguably the proposed development would be less intrusive than the existing one. It is also noted that french grey aluminium windows are proposed, but as a modernish outbuilding which would otherwise comprise of mainly matching materials, then there is no objection to the use of aluminium windows.
- 7.14 On this basis it is considered that there would be minimal harm to the long distance views and no adverse visual impact from the east on the character of the area or the National Landscape. Despite Chichester Harbours objection, it is considered that with the use of clay tiling on the north-east elevation, then the proposal would conserve the special qualities of the National Landscape (AONB) and its setting. The development is therefore considered to meet the requirements of Policies CS12 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, as well as policy PP03 of the Chichester Harbour Planning Principles.

(iv) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.15 As originally submitted the bulk and mass of the proposed pitched roof extension with accommodation at first floor, sited to the south-west of the outbuilding would have been close to the shared boundary with 2a's private garden, and would have been enclosing and overbearing, affecting their outlook. As a result amended plans have been submitted re-siting this pitched roof element extension to the north-east of the outbuilding, away from any neighbouring residents. As such this element of the proposal would have no direct impact on or harm to neighbouring amenity.
- 7.16 The proposal also includes a single storey extension in the south-eastern corner, which would be just 0.5m from the shared boundary with 2a. There is a 2m high brick wall on this boundary with 2a which has a blank side gable facing the site. But its height has been kept as low as possible at 2.9m, and being flat roofed it is considered that this would have minimal impact on the amenity of the occupiers of 2a.
- 7.17 Overall it is considered that the proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site or on Langstone high Street, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(v) Flood risk

- 7.18 Part of the site falls within current flood zones 2 and 3, whilst the whole site lies within the future flood zone. Therefore the site is not sequentially suitable for new residential development and there would be an objection to any independently occupied dwelling or subdivision of the site to form 2 dwellings on flood risk grounds. The Environment Agency originally objected to the proposal on the basis of an inadequate Flood Risk Assessment.
- 7.19 Discussions were had with the EA explaining the householder application type, proposing ancillary accommodation only, and fact that the additional floor space proposed amounts to 168 sqm, which is less than the Environment Agency's threshold of 250sqm. On that basis, as a minor development, the EA noted that they wouldn't need to be consulted and their standing advice would apply instead. The submitted FRA on a Householder EA Form, which notes that floor levels would be set no lower than existing, together with the amended submitted flood measures statement which sets out measures such as sealing service entry connections, fittings for flood boards, signing up to flood warnings etc, are considered acceptable to meet the standing advice. Any occupants could also escape to the safety of the main house in any flood event, and as such it is considered that the proposal complies with policy CS15 and CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(vi) Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.20 Detailed photographs have been provided to the Council's ecologist. The existing outbuilding is currently well maintained, in use and occupied, and it has been demonstrated that the roof is intact and unlikely to house protected species. Whilst the wider site has potential for notable habitats and species, the outbuilding itself and immediate setting of graveled driveway, is likely to be devoid of any notable species. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would not result in any adverse harm to protected habitats and species. An Informative can be added raising awareness of protected species and the need for separate licenses in the event that any protected species are found during construction.

- 7.21 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

(vii) Parking

- 7.22 Whilst it is noted that all of the existing internal garage spaces would be lost, nevertheless two garage spaces would be re-provided and the site has ample room for the parking of multiple vehicles on the existing extensive driveway. As such there would remain ample parking on site for both the main dwelling and annexe, and the proposal is therefore considered to comply with the Parking SPD and policy DM13 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(viii) CIL

- 7.23 As a detached annexe the development is CIL liable. Amended CIL forms have been provided correctly reflecting the amended plans, which amount to a net additional floor space of 168.3 sqm. A self-build exemption has been claimed. The CIL team will issue the appropriate Draft Liability Notice.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed additions to the outbuilding would create accommodation capable of independent occupation, nevertheless it is not considered inappropriate for such a coach-house style development within the grounds of a substantial property like Langstone Lodge. The proposal has been submitted as ancillary accommodation and there is no evidence that it would be used for anything other than family purposes. With an appropriate ancillary condition, any breach of occupation in the future could be enforced, and so the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle.
- 8.2 The amended plans and material details are considered appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the heritage assets, AONB, character of the area, and would have a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis the proposal is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/24/00345 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

Design Access and Heritage Report, Issue V2 - 27th August 2024
Flood Risk Assessment - EA Householder Form
Amended Flood Measures Statement on Council's website dated 28 August 2024

Site Plans - Drawing number 24018 101 Rev C
Proposed Ground Floor Plan - Drawing number 24018 401 Rev B
Proposed First Floor Plan - Drawing number 24018 402 Rev B
Proposed Elevations - North-West & South-West - Drawing number 24018 501 Rev C
Proposed Elevations - South-East & North-East - Drawing number 24018 502 Rev B
Proposed Elevations - West & North - Drawing number 24018 503 Rev B
Proposed Site Sections - Drawing number 24018 601 Rev A

Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes ancillary to the occupation and enjoyment of the existing dwelling, Langstone Lodge, and shall not be used as a separate independent unit of accommodation at any time.

Reason: The consideration of this application has been as a householder ancillary annexe and not for a new planning unit, and the site's location in an area of flood risk makes it unsuitable for new residential accommodation, having due regard to policies CS15, CS12, CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, to match in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policies CS12 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.