

---

Site Address: Seafield House, 7 Kinnell Close, Emsworth, PO10 7HF  
Proposal: Listed building consent for new and replacement fencing fronting Havant Road; garage/store extensions and alterations; provision of woodburner and external flue in orangery; satellite dish installation.

5+ OBJ councillor letters need to be sent SD

Application No: APP/21/01444

Expiry Date: 16/02/2022

Applicant: Mrs A Spence

Agent: Miss E Knight

Case Officer: Selina Donophy

Helyer Design Architects

Ward: Emsworth

Recommendation: **REFUSE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**

---

## **1 Site Description**

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.

## **2 Planning History**

None relevant

### **3 Proposal**

Listed building consent for new and replacement fencing fronting Havant Road; garage/store extensions and alterations; provision of woodburner and external flue in orangery; satellite dish installation.

### **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)  
CS16 (High Quality Design)

#### Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

#### Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

E1\* (High quality design)

#### Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

ENP\_H1 (Design & Heritage)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.  
Conservation Area: St Faiths

### **5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

#### **Historic England**

Thank you for your letter dated 5 January 2022 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, in our view you do not need to notify or consult us on this application under the relevant statutory provisions, details of which are attached.

If you consider that this application does fall within one of the relevant categories, or you have other reasons for seeking our advice, please contact us to discuss your request

## **Conservation Officer**

In 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 Seafield House. It has been constructed of a softwood material (maybe larch or pine). The pallette 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 Seafield 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 streestcene. 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 hertiage 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 hertiage asset of Seafield 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 a 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 black 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, not 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 Seafield 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 Seafield House and Little Seafield 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 Seafield 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 Seafield House. Both the flue and the satellite dish are considered to result in less than harmful significance of Little Seafield.

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**

*Case Officer comment : Further comments made by Conservation Officer following submission of amended plans*

**Heritage Team Response**

**Date – 17/2/2022**

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

**UPDATED RESPONSE BASED ON AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED ON 10/2/2022**

**THE ORIGINAL RESPONSE WHICH REFERS TO THE RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND POLICY IS STILL APPLICABLE**

**Amended scheme –**

- Relocation of flue to side elevation of Seafield House. The flue would extend out of the conservatory roof and be attached to the south elevation of the house. It is proposed to be painted green to match the existing historic trellis work. The satellite dish is proposed to stay in situ but be painted green
- Change of design of fence panel attached to the historic flint wall on Havant Road. This is also proposed to be painted green.
- Change of design for boundary treatment to the rear of the extended, detached garage. This would change from timber fencing to a low level flint brick wall with a 'living wall' above.

**Assessment –**

**Relocation of Flue**

Whilst relocating the flue to the new proposed position would make it less visible from Kinnell Close and from directly in front of No. 6, its height and prominent position on the south elevation (i.e. not obscured by being vented up through an existing chimney stack), would make it a strident feature on this elevation that would detract from the architectural significance of the heritage asset. I appreciate that the proposed to paint it green would match with the trellising however, I feel this would result in the flue appearing even more incongruous and contrived. This also refers to the painting of the satellite dish.

**Fence panel on listed wall fronting onto Havant Road**

My concern is that the revised fence design, whilst also being painted green, would still detract from the architectural significance of the wall and result in harm to this element of the heritage asset. Perhaps some simple planting to the rear of the wall may provide some level of screening if that is the main objective for the applicants.

### Fence onto Havant Road

The proposal for the low-level flint wall is welcomed however, there is concern over the proposal for the living wall. This is a modern feature which would appear out of character with the traditional style of the flint wall beneath it. Furthermore, as it would front onto Havant Road, it would be difficult to maintain from within the site. If the planting failed, the overall look could be harmful to the adjacent listed wall and fail to screen the garage extension which has occurred to the rear.

### Summary

Overall it is considered that proposed amendments to the unlawful works already carried out would still lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset.

## **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: 10

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 07/01/2022

Number of representations received: 13

| <b>Comment</b>                                                | <b>Officer Comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Representees in support : 0<br>Representees in objection : 12 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Case Officer comments :</b>                                | <b>All representees received have been reviewed by the case officer</b><br><br><b>Main areas of concern include :</b><br><br><b>- Impact on the heritage asset and wider character of the area</b><br><br><b>- Health and safety and pollution concerns</b><br><br><b>Following submission of amended plans concerns have similarly been raised which include :</b> |

|  |                                                                                                                                                     |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  | <p><b>- <i>Impact on the heritage asset and wider character of the area</i></b></p> <p><b>- <i>Health and safety and pollution concerns</i></b></p> |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## **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
- (ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area and the Grade II Listed Building

### **(i) Principle of development**

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

7.3 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.

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

7.5 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.

7.6 Policy CS16 (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:

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

7.8 Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that development proposals must conserve and enhance the historic assets of Havant.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area and the Grade II Listed Building .

- 7.4 This retrospective planning application includes a flue , alterations to the site boundary treatments , a satellite dish and additions to the garage . The main building is a Grade II listed building and as such there is particular importance to protect and maintain the heritage of the building. The proposals have been amended following their initial submission. The initial proposal included a flue located to the west side of the orangery , adjacent to the side boundary shared with no 6 . It also featured fencing to the Havant Road boundary to the north of the site .These proposals were assessed by the Council's Heritage Officer who did not support the retrospective changes by reason of the impact on the heritage asset . The applicant has subsequently submitted amended plans which show the flue now to be sited to the east of the orangery, with the woodburner moved internally to be adjacent to the rear elevation wall of the orangery . The flue would now have a height of approximately 0.9 metres raised above the eaves line and would be painted in 'Seafield green' to match the existing trellis . Instead of the fencing along Havant Road, a living wall is now proposed which would be north facing with a flint wall with brick detailing added below . This would have an average height of approximately 1 metre and the living wall would have a total height of 3.3 metres above ground level. A row of laurels would be planted behind the existing wall. The fencing to the curved section of wall would be painted 'Seafield green' and detailed to match the existing trellis.

7.5 **1. Extension to garage and new fence onto Havant Road**

No objection has been upheld to the proposed extensions and alterations to the garage. 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 Seafield House. It has been constructed of a softwood material. 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 Seafield 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 Seafield House.

**Further comments made by the Conservation Officer following amended plans :**

The proposal for the low-level flint wall is welcomed however, there is concern over the proposal for the living wall. This is a modern feature which would appear out of character with the traditional style of the flint wall beneath it. Furthermore, as it would front onto Havant Road, it would be difficult to maintain from within the site. If the planting failed, the overall look could be harmful to the adjacent listed wall and fail to screen the garage extension which has occurred to the rear.

**7.6 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.

**Further comments made by the Conservation Officer following amended plans :**

The revised fence design, whilst also being painted green, would still detract from the architectural significance of the wall and result in harm to this element of the heritage asset. Perhaps some simple planting to the rear of the wall may provide some level of screening if that is the main objective for the applicants.

**7.7 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 brick 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, not 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 Seaford 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 Seafield House and Little Seafield and is considered to result in less than substantial harm.

**Further comments made by the Conservation Officer following amended plans :**

Whilst relocating the flue to the new proposed position would make it less visible from Kinnell Close and from directly in front of No. 6, its height and prominent position on the south elevation (i.e. not obscured by being vented up through an existing chimney stack), would make it a strident feature on this elevation that would detract from the architectural significance of the heritage asset. I appreciate that the proposed to paint it green would match with the trellising however, I feel this would result in the flue appearing even more incongruous and contrived. This also refers to the painting of the satellite dish.

**7.8 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 Seafield 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.

- 7.9 Whilst it is noted the applicant has amended the proposals in response to the comments received following the initial submission it is still judged that the amended proposals are considered to result in less than substantial harm (as defined by the NPPF) to the historic significance of Seafield House. Both the flue and the satellite dish are considered to result in less than harmful significance of Little Seafield. 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 the view of the Conservation Officer that there are no public benefits arising from the works which outweigh the harm caused.

**8 Conclusion**

- 8.1 The proposed alterations to boundary treatments would result in harm to both the historic character of both the Grade II listed building and the wider character of the area. The fencing and living wall are considered unsympathetic additions within the context of the existing boundary treatments and in a highly prominent location along Havant Road. The flue and satellite dish would appear as incongruous additions harmful to the historic fabric of the building which would undermine the setting and character of the listed building. The proposal would cause clear harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and wider area and is contrary to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 as well as policy H1 of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan .

---

## 9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT** for application APP/21/01444 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed alterations to boundary treatments would result in harm to both the historic character of both the Grade II listed building and the wider character of the area. The fencing and living wall are considered unsympathetic additions within the context of the existing boundary treatments and in a highly prominent location along Havant Road. The flue and satellite dish would appear as incongruous additions harmful to the historic fabric of the building which would undermine the setting and character of the listed building. The proposal would cause clear harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and wider area and is contrary to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 as well as policy H1 of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan .