
Site Address: 5 John King Shipyard, King Street, Emsworth, PO10 7AY
Proposal: Alterations to the south / harbour facing frontage, via enlarged fenestration. A replacement balcony in a central location. Additions to the north side of the house comprising an infill of the current courtyard area, creating an additional habitable room via the upgrading of the existing garage, with extensions. A covered car port, flat roof terrace, and additional storage accommodation in lieu of the previous garage.

Application No:	APP/21/00992	Expiry Date:	20/10/2021
Applicant:	Mr A Jackson		
Agent:	Mr N Wright	Case Officer:	Tina Pickup
	Noel Wright Architects		
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to a two storey, 3 bedroom detached dwelling located on the foreshore and accessed via the private drive of John King Shipyard. This was a development in the 1990's following permission to demolish the former shipyard factory and erect four, three storey town houses (now 1-4 John King Shipyard to the immediate west of the site) and the conversion of the existing office to form a dwelling. The application dwelling relates to the converted office building, which under 92/53215/3, had its eaves and ridge line increased with extension to the north, with altered fenestration including patio doors and juliette balcony on the ground floor south elevation.
- 1.2 The current dwelling comprises what appears to be old red brick elevations above a flint plinth to the beach/ground level, and has a hipped slate roof and is sited on a tight plot with limited separation to adjacent dwellings. The south elevation aligns with the foreshore ie it protrudes forward up to the beach with an existing ground floor balcony supported with timbers effectively overhanging the beach. The location plan includes the area of beach and landing jetty opposite the house outlined in blue, and the agent advises that this ownership is historic from the time the site was a boatyard with associated use of the foreshore and slipways etc.
- 1.3 The north side of the dwelling has an 'L' shaped footprint with an integral garage and the curtilage is entirely hard surfaced creating a combined parking and hard landscaped area. The ground slopes slightly down to the south. The properties either side are very tight to the shared side boundaries and extend further north than the application dwelling creating a tight courtyard feel to this space. Number 4 has a three storey side elevation, with single obscure glazed window, and number 8 Stanley Road has an integral garage with recent dormer addition creating a bedroom in the roof space (APP/18/00968) that wraps round the application dwelling and beyond.
- 1.4 As a result of the modest plot size and tight relationship with neighbouring properties, the existing dwelling does not have any usable amenity space - it just has a small balcony on the south elevation and the hard landscaped areas to the north.
- 1.5 The site lies within Emsworth Conservation Area but is not a Listed Building, nor on

the Local List. The site also lies within Chichester Harbour AONB and the foreshore of the harbour lies within the Chichester Harbour SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar. In addition the site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

2 Planning History

92/53215/003 - Demolition of existing factory. New development of four 4-bedroom terrace houses and garage block; conversion and extension of existing building to form 4-bedroom detached house with integral garage and parking. PERM 25/02/93

99/63216/000 - Retention of additional step to foreshore, REF,08/07/1999

99/63216/001 - Retention of additional step to foreshore (revised application), PERM,16/09/1999

04/63216/002 - Removal of existing steps from foreshore and replacement with new concrete steps constructed in gap between houses. Construction of new balcony to south elevation (on brackets from retaining wall) projecting beyond line of sea wall over foreshore., REF,14/04/2005

APP/13/00583 - Removal of existing brick steps, replacement with retractable timber steps and enlargement to existing balcony., PERM,19/09/2013

APP/14/00211 - Application for non-material change to Planning Permission APP/13/00583 relating to alterations to detail design of the balcony and steps., PERM,25/03/2014

APP/15/00128 - Discharge of Condition No. 3 of planning permission APP/13/00583., PERM,09/03/2015

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Alterations to the south / harbour facing frontage, via enlarged fenestration. A replacement balcony in a central location. Additions to the north side of the house comprising an infill of the current courtyard area, creating an additional habitable room via the upgrading of the existing garage, with extensions. A covered car port, flat roof terrace, and additional storage accommodation in lieu of the previous garage.
- 3.2 During the course of determining this application amended plans have been received reducing and re-configuring the extent of the roof terrace to the north and providing improved screening; and omission of the first floor brise soleil on the south elevation. It has also been confirmed that the windows and doors would be RAL 7032, Pebble grey.

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)
CS4	()
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL3	(Town, District and Local Centres)

Submission Version Havant Local Plan

E22	(Amenity and pollution)
E5	(Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)
E1*	(High quality design)
E13	(Historic environment and heritage asset)
IN3	(Transport and parking in new development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

ENP_H1	(Design & Heritage)
ENP_D1	(General Design Policy)
ENP_D2	(Height, Mass & Materials)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Emsworth

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

No objection, subject to agreeing external facing and roofing materials, with brickwork salvaged to re-use in the Harbour elevation and strict adherence to the method statement for working on the foreshore, with pads to be placed between scaffolding and the beach.

A site visit has been made as part of a pre-application enquiry and meeting held with Conservancy Officers. Regard has been had to the policy framework.

Some details have been added to the submitted drawings, but essentially they are the same as the enquiry made to The Conservancy.

This is a modern former Office building with Georgian-styled proportions within the Emsworth Conservation Area.

The Conservancy still takes no issue with the fenestration arrangement set out on drawing 04, which will present and enhance a symmetry of composition facing the Harbour. The use of a brise soleil at eaves level/over the enlarged central ground floor opening and sliding storm shutters at ground floor level will mitigate the impact of the increased glazing. The replacement windows will also be of a better proportion to the whole elevation. The axonometric drawing is welcomed and illustrates the effect of the brise soleil very well, albeit no specific detail is given about cills to window openings: more robust cill fittings, perhaps even considering stone/reconstituted stone to match the style on dwellings either side of the site was encouraged at the enquiry stage.

The proposed elevational drawings detail new windows made in aluminium, with marine grade polyester powder coated finish. The Conservancy would favour a darker colour for the frameworks, rather than white which was specified in the initial enquiry

response.

The Conservancy is encouraged to read in the Heritage, design and access statement that use of the same material finishes for the enlarged ground floor balcony is intended. It is hoped that you will be able to salvage brickwork when forming the larger central opening to use to infill the reinstated window to the left hand bottom side of the Harbour elevation and I see this was added as a note to the drawing.

No objections are raised to the modest stores proposed within the yard, even though these were not mentioned at our meeting.

We also did not discuss the oversailing roof terrace detailed on your drawings 03 and 05, a small side element of which would be visible (albeit well set back) from the Harbour. I can still understand the owner's desire for this feature to create some modest amenity area.

I will leave the Council to comment upon the amenity impact by the potential to overlook neighbours' amenity space to the west, but in terms of impact to the wider AONB landscape, this feature would not seem to have any great impact and would not be visible from King Street.

Whilst the proposal introduces the potential for further light spillage to the night sky, The Conservancy recognises the very urbanised nature of this part of the AONB and no overall deleterious impact is envisaged overall to either the natural beauty of the AONB nor historic significance of the Emsworth Conservation Area as a whole.

Conservation Officer

Initial response:

The application site is located in John King Shipyard which is located off King Street in Emsworth. The John King Shipyard is a residential development which was formerly a working shipyard located on the Chichester harbour frontage. The application site is built in the location of the former shipyard office and comprises a two-storey with a pitched, tiled roof. It is flanked either side by larger, more elaborate, three-storey dwellings. The site is within the Emsworth Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour AONB.

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.

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.

Local Planning Policies

Policy CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough) 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 CS16 (High Quality Design) (1a) of the Core Strategy states that “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.

Emerging Policy E13 from the Draft Local Plan 2036 provides similar advice to existing Policy CS11, but also adds that where harm cannot be avoided, mitigation may be proportionate to the impact and the significance of the heritage assets and fully incorporated into the development proposals.

The Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan has now been adopted and has relevant policies which are applicable to this application:

Policy H1 – Design and Heritage

Policy H2 – Heritage Appraisals

Proposal: _

Alterations to the south / harbour facing frontage, via enlarged fenestration. A replacement balcony in a central location. Additions to the north side of the house comprising an infill of the current courtyard area, creating an additional habitable room via the upgrading of the existing garage, with extensions. A covered car port, flat roof terrace, and additional storage accommodation in lieu of the previous garage.

Assessment: _

The application includes a Heritage Statement which sets out the significance of the site and conservation and impact of the proposed developments.

The application site is a modern building, part of a modern, yet traditionally designed development. The proposed changes to the rear elevation including to the fenestration, are considered to be sympathetic to the character of the building and will retain a symmetrical appearance. The small area of timber cladding is well suited to a building in this location and evident on other nearby properties. The GF windows will feature sliding timber storm shutters which break up the glazing and give a more traditional appearance.

With regards to the proposed changes to the north elevation, which include a new glazed balcony, covered car port and flat roof terrace, these will give a contemporary appearance however, these are not considered to result in harm to the character of the

conservation area.

Overall it is considered that the proposal meets the test of 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.

Conclusion – No objection .

Following 3rd party comments and further consideration, updated response provided:

I would like to clarify that I was incorrect in my original statement that the building is a modern build, when it is in fact a residential conversion of an older commercial building which previously existed on the site, forming part of the former shipyard.

I would also like to apologise but in my original assessment, I did not take into account the 'Elevational Detail Plan' which shows the balcony and ground and first floor brise soliels in their 3D formation. Having been on site and looking in detail at the houses on the foreshore and the existing balcony / awning arrangements, I can see that the majority of properties have an awning but these are retractable and located at ground floor level.

Now that I have been able to study the elevational detail plan in more detail, I have concerns that the combination of the proposed enlarged balcony with the ground and first floor soliels, would form what would appear to be akin to an extension on the rear elevation. I feel this would be out of keeping with this harbour side view of the conservation area and would not preserve or enhance its special status. My recommendation would be to remove the first floor brise soleil so that the extended areas are focussed solely to the ground floor and therefore more in character with harbourside setting. Please note that I am not objecting to the proposed materials – aluminium framed windows / doors and the use of hardwood and natural cladding (left natura) which I feel are within the pallete of materials evident in the local vernacular.

My apologies again that this update has come late on the in application process however, I feel this amendment would be necessary to meet the requirements of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Following receipt of amended plans:

The removal of the first floor brise soleil addresses the concern I raised in the email dated 13/12/21 and I therefore remove the objection to the application.

Councillor Lulu Bowerman

Proposal discussed and agreed amended plans an improvement that can be supported

Countryside Access Team

None received

County Ecologist

I would not raise any overriding concerns in relation to ecological matters. The additions to the southern frontage will be immediately adjacent to parts of the Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site and Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). As such, there is some potential for construction activities to result in noise and visual disturbance to over wintering bird species within the SPA/Ramsar. Given the scale and nature of works to this

frontage I would consider this risk to be minimal and that no specific mitigation measures are required.

The proposed works within the northern courtyard area will entail single-storey additions to the site. Again, I would not raise any concerns in relation to ecological matters.

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: 19

Number of site notices: At least one site notice exists.

Statutory advertisement: 24/09/2021

Number of representations received: **5**: 4 letters were received initially - one raising no objection; and 3 objections. Following receipt of amended plans and re-notification, 1 further letter was received from a previous author:

Comment	Officer Comment
I can confirm to you that as the owners (redacted) we have no objections to the planned developments at #5 John King Shipyard.	Noted
This is a highly visible old building which makes a valuable contribution to the mix of housing along the foreshore. The protruding balcony added some years ago was very unpopular as it detracted from the integrity of the south facade. This proposal for enlargement and modernisation of the south side would, in my view, be even more inappropriate. I would like therefore to register an objection.	Noted - see section 7 below
I have no objection to the rear (north) part of this application, although converting the Garage into a fifth bedroom will have an impact on parking in King Street as vehicles from the shipyard development already park there. Its permit parking & I often cannot find a spot, so not a very good idea for the residents of King Street who don't have a garage or off street parking, this would be at least 80% of the premises.	Existing house 3 bedrooms, proposal results in 4th bedroom -see section 7 below

My main concern is the south elevation (sea facing frontage), & so it would appear is the architects as they constantly mention, and would like you to believe, that it is a new build, constructed in February 1993 along with numbers 1 to 4 John King Shipyard.

Number 5 was in fact, as the plan's stipulated a simple renovation & rear extension, to retain the character of this building. That is exactly what happened (redacted)

Therefore the main existing part of number 5 was I think, built in approximately 1870, the same period as numbers 21 to 33 King, & that section (the most important south elevation) is the same now. The architect says the building has the same silhouette as the original south elevation, that's because it is the original. The original old Stanley Road terrace of houses were built by John Lewis, who also owned the buildings next to what is now number 5.

There are only 5 original houses built between the bottom of South Street & bottom of King Street, all well over 100 to 150 years old, this is one of them! It's not protected but it should be.

There is apparently concern of flooding to this property, perhaps they should not put in large doors only 2 feet above a normal tide level, a high tide with a Gale or Storm force wind would do serious damage, with protecting shutters or not. How planning aloud the present doors to installed is a disaster, perhaps they were led to believe it was a modern build ?? To allow much larger doors plus much larger balcony PLUS much larger windows would be catastrophic to the appearance of this building with so much heritage attached to it. What about Brise Soleil shutters ?? this is very much overwhelming as is the proposed building works to the front elevation of this cottage.

I Very Much Object To This Planning

Noted - see section 7 below

Not Listed, nor Locally Listed and has not been put forward for consideration in reviews

Noted - see section 7 below

First floor Brise Soleil since omitted

Application	
If the owner wishes to upgrade the heating & electrics, thats fine. PLEASE do not do any more damage to this front elevation than has already been achieved with the current balcony & doors	
I watched the demolition of John King shipyard main building a massive structure of corrugated asbestos and steel sheets around a steel frame. The store building was. NEVER demolished it was left intact the rear of the building was extended and is as now, the roof was raised to obtain a higher story height. Reclaimed bricks were laid above the first floor windows to accommodate this in an upright fashion. I am a car owner and I have great difficulty parking anywhere in Kings Street, the residence of John King shipyard also park in King Street. I would love to rent the garage that the owner of Number five wants to turn into a fifth bedroom, then I would have somewhere to park.	Noted - see section 7 below Existing integral garage impractical - see section 7 below
On amended plans:	
Removal of Brise Soleil from the first floor level hardly minimises the enormous effect that this application would impose on the Emsworth foreshore. R Mc Murray senior conservation planner states that any development should preserve or enhance the area. Number five John King shipyard is at least 150 years old contrary to what the architect has very much tried to alleviate saying that it is a new build. How this carbuncle of the south elevation is going to preserve it is a mystery. It has already been partly destroyed when the installation of the present balcony was allowed to be done, I also failed to see how it could possibly enhance the foreshore area at all, stating that the new doors would be symmetrically in the middle is ridiculous	see section 7 below

what possible difference would that make it is after all a very old building that was not built to look symmetrical, It was built to be a practical addition to the boat yard for storage and office use.	

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, including Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour AONB
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Parking
- (v) Flood Risk

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. Since the site lies within a Conservation Area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant to the determination of this application requiring special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

7.3 It is noted that the third party comments dispute some of the facts/assumptions in the submitted Heritage and Planning Design & Access Statement with regard to the age of the application site and whether it was converted or re-built in the 1990's. The 1993 permission was for a conversion and notwithstanding the dispute the site currently presents to the foreshore as an old building with character, and it is on this basis that it makes a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area as the heritage asset, AONB and foreshore generally.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area, including Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour AONB

7.3 The proposed alterations to the south elevation include a re-configuration of the openings: the windows would be enlarged with aluminium frames, the existing patio door opening and balcony re-sited centrally and enlarged, with timber storm shutters, and a ground floor brise soleil providing shading, constructed of a mix of stainless steel and hardwood.

7.4 As originally proposed the plans included a first floor brise soleil as well, but after detailed consideration it was considered that this, together with the ground floor brise soleil, resulted in a boxy permanent addition to the south facade. Since the south facade is already flush with the beach, then the originally proposed two brise-soleils were considered tantamount to an extension to this elevation which was overly fussy and harmful to the character of the Conservation Area. Within the vicinity most dwellings have some sort of awning above ground floor windows, often retractable, but there are no fixed permanent such additions at first floor. Although the brise soleil has

the benefit of providing shading to the glazing below, and thus reducing reflection and glare to the wider views from the AONB, the bulky harm to the individual building and the immediate setting of the foreshore was considered to outweigh any benefits.

- 7.5 Since there is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and the need to conserve and enhance the landscape interests of the AONB are given under paragraph 176 of the NPPF, then in this instance the weight given to the protection of the heritage asset i.e. the Conservation Area was considered to outweigh the shading desirability of the AONB and Chichester Harbour Conservancy's views. As a result, amended plans were received omitting the first floor brise soleil.
- 7.6 The revised south elevation would result in a symmetrical design with centralised balcony and larger openings, with ribbon headers and integrated window shutters. The use of timber cladding between the central ground and first floor windows and sliding timber storm shutters could give the impression of a commercial building, which is considered appropriate given the building's historic shipyard use. It is acknowledged that the south elevation would be significantly altered from its existing appearance, but that change is not considered inappropriate for a non-listed building within the Conservation Area surrounded by a mix of architectural styles. Similarly the proposed use of pale-grey aluminium frames would not be dissimilar to other buildings in the vicinity fronting the foreshore, and muted colours reduces the long distance visual impacts making the proposal visually appropriate to this particular foreshore view of the Conservation Area and AONB.
- 7.7 The planning history of the site reveals past controversy over the access steps to the foreshore which were described as retractable. However no condition was ever imposed requiring them to be retracted when not in use and this application makes no change to the existing step arrangement. In addition past controversy related to the balcony projection partly impacting the use of the footpath on the beach below. But the height and design of supporting struts of the replacement balcony would be essentially the same as existing, albeit centrally located and slightly enlarged. Considering high tides prevent use of the path and when low tide the public have access to the entire beach, then the replacement balcony would not further impact this previous concern.
- 7.8 The alterations to the north elevation, which largely impact neighbouring amenity, see below, would not impact the appearance of the Conservation Area or AONB. Overall the proposed alterations to the south elevation, whilst considerable in their reconfiguration of the appearance of the dwelling, would nevertheless result in a symmetrical appearance that is considered in keeping with the historic significance of the building and would continue to preserve and enhance the Conservation Area. Considerable detail has been provided in the plans including use of reclaimed where bricks where possible, indicating attention to detail worthy of the prominence of the site. Whilst the enlarged glazing at first floor level would not be shaded from glare, overall the impact on the wider landscape setting of the AONB is considered acceptable. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policies CS11, CS12, and CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy) and policy DM20 of the HBLP (Allocations).

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.9 In terms of amenity for future occupiers, the proposed alterations aim to improve the availability of outdoor space through both the enlarged balcony on the south elevation and a more private sitting out, first floor terrace created on the north side. This is achieved by utilising the roof of a proposed car port which effectively fills the recess

in the dwelling and projects out a further 2.4m to align with the frontage of number 4 to the west. It has been confirmed that this terrace will be self-supporting on steel stanchions and the development would be wholly contained within the application site so that the ownership Certificate A submitted remains relevant.

- 7.10 Given the size of the terrace is clearly intended for outdoor dining, the potential for noise and disturbance to neighbours is a consideration. The tight-knit relationship of the dwelling with its immediate neighbours is such that amended plans were requested reducing the scale of the proposed northern terrace by pulling it away from the bedroom dormers in number 8's garage to the east and providing a solid screen to this eastern elevation. Amended plans also address a conflict with the window in the side elevation of number 4, which directly overlooks the proposed terrace, by providing the stairs up to the terrace alongside the window and hence buffering the window from the usable sitting out area. Given this window is small and obscure glazed and no objection has been received from this neighbour, then the adverse impact on this neighbours amenity from the stairs is considered limited.
- 7.11 The proposal also involves some single storey flat roofed stores along the eastern boundary, to replace the garage converted to a bedroom. These would sit alongside number 8's garage at a lower level and have no harm to neighbouring amenity. Overall the revised roof terrace and its use, is considered unlikely to result in any overlooking, loss of privacy or unacceptable noise and disturbance to neighbouring amenity by virtue of its largely recessed siting and mitigation screens. As such it is considered that the revised proposal will not appear overbearing or lead to overlooking and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.12 The existing integral garage is difficult to access with its west facing doors and restricted maneuvering space and therefore used for storage only. Two parking spaces are currently provided on the frontage. The dwelling currently has 3 bedrooms and through the conversion and small extension of the existing integral garage, a 4th bedroom is created. As such the development requires 3 on site parking spaces to meet the Parking SPD. These can be provided on site - one under the car port/terrace and two in the front area by widening the access ie the existing front boundary wall would be reduced to enable easier access to these spaces. This meets the Parking SPD and policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, and there is therefore no objection on highway grounds.

(v) Flood Risk

- 7.13 As a householder application (minor development) within flood zone 2 and 3, a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted indicating that part of the rationale for the proposal is to improve flood resilience measures. To protect against high tides and waves battering the south elevation improved barriers are proposed for vulnerable areas ie the ground floor windows are to include integral roll down shutters and sliding storm shutters. Internally electrical outlets will be raised. Overall the development would improve flood resilience and not place occupiers at any increased risk of flooding.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the alterations to both the north and south elevations are considered appropriate to the host dwelling and would preserve the character of the building and Conservation Area, have limited impact on the wider landscape views and AONB, and would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours. The proposal is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.
-

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/21/00992

(A) 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:

Location Plan, Drawing Number 01
Block Plan, Drawing Number 02
Ground and First Floor Plans, Drawing Number 03 Rev D
South Elevation, Drawing Number 04 Rev A
Elevations and Sections, Drawing Number 05 Rev E
Isometric Proposed Alteration Detail & Storm Resilience Measures, Drawing Number 08 Rev A

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.
- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans, with use of RAL 7032 'Pebble grey' powder coating for all windows and doors; or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable, unless otherwise first agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policies CS11, CS12 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.