
Site Address: 5 Seaview Terrace, South Street, Emsworth, PO10 7EN
Proposal: Two storey front extension, single storey rear extension, new porch to east and west elevations. Alterations to existing fenestration and 2No dormer windows.
Application No: APP/21/01437 Expiry Date: 16/02/2022
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Winch
Agent: Mr Wild Case Officer: Graham Speller
Helyer Davies Architects Ltd
Ward: Emsworth

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located on the Emsworth Harbour frontage and comprises a detached two storey dwelling. It is located within the Emsworth Conservation Area and the Chichester Harbour AONB. The dwelling has a distinctive catslide roof fronting onto the harbour replicating the former winkle shed design.
- 1.2 The site is adjacent to a Grade II listed building at 23 Tower Street.
- 1.3 The site is within flood zones 2 & 3.

2 Planning History

APP/14/00144 - Crown reduce 1No. Poplar by 4m to previous pollard points; within Conservation Area of Emsworth., RNO,20/03/2014

APP/16/00415 - Listed Building Consent for additional rooflight to north elevation., PERM,10/06/2016

APP/16/00823 - Crown reduce 1No. Cherry tree (T5) by 2m overall. Crown reduce 1No. Tree of Heaven (T6) by 1.5m overall to prune to shape. Both trees subject to TPO 1788., PERM,07/09/2016

APP/16/00826 - Crown reduce 3No. Ornamental Plum trees (T1, T2 and T3) by 1.5m overall and re-pollard 1No. Poplar (T4), within Conservation Area of Emsworth., RNO,07/09/2016

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Two storey front extension, single storey rear extension, new porch to east and west elevations. Alterations to existing fenestration and 2No dormer windows.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

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 ()

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20 (Historic Assets)
DM25 (Managing Flood Risk in Emsworth)
AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL3 (Town, District and Local Centres)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

ENP_H2 (Buildings of Local Historic Interest)
ENP_H1 (Design & Heritage)
ENP_D1 (General Design Policy)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Emsworth

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

The current proposal lies inside the AONB. The proposal is located within a built-up urban location within the AONB protected national landscape. The proposed works comprise works / alterations that require detailed approval of the LPA. The planning history for the site indicates no earlier considerations that would have any obvious bearing on the current proposal in relation to the AONB. The works lie wholly within the site. The proposal has been the subject of an LPA /CHC pre-application enquiry GEN/20/01207 (26-04-2021) and has been modified following advice offered.

The proposal is for the construction of a south facing two-storey half-hipped roof extension stepped down from the main retained building roof, to bring the building to the seawall site property boundary, with a projecting (and overhanging) bay window that over-sails the seawall tidal accessible walkway. The west elevation alongside the pedestrian access (via Seaview Cottages) and slipway access off the shoreline, would have a small single-storey bay window addition under a mono-pitch roof that runs to the north of the building. The east elevation would have two dormer windows inserted into the catslide roof and a modified ground floor double gabled canopy over the altered window treatment (note this canopy appears to be on the site east boundary line). The north elevation would be partially enclosed with a ground floor storage structure within the boundary wall cutting. The main roof would be changed to a hipped treatment to reduce the building visual bulk.

The submission includes a Design, Access & Heritage Statement (DAHS). There is no reference to para 172 of the NPPF as the site is within the AONB. The submission does not include an AONB Visual Impact Statement. The submission does make recognition of the site's location within the AONB protected national landscape. There is no detailed AONB policy approach as would be expected in such a location although a floor space and silhouette profile consideration has been made. This is a helpful assessment by the agents given the status of the AONB within the statutory planning assessment regime.

ASSESSMENT CONSULTATION CONCLUSION

AONB PP03 / PP09 / Joint SPD considerations have been part of this AONB planning assessment. The increase in ground floor footprint is approx. 24.2sqm which equates to a 25.6% increase in coverage. The north/south building profile silhouette changes amount to an approx. 35.8% increase in area and the east/west silhouette profile provides an approx. 16% increase. The proposals fall within the guidance allowances of 50% for ground footprint increase and 25% building silhouette profile increases, and where there is a disparity, the scale, positioning, and design of the works is not considered to detract from the building, the site, or the immediate surrounds. Internal and external illumination sources are unlikely to be an issue subject to compliance with glazing screening / window blind / light fitment cowling criteria.

Given the backdrop and setting of the built-up area, the works to the street scene / shoreline would be noticeable but this work would not be unduly imposing to the public realm. The main works to the dwelling are proportionate and subservient to the host building. The scale of the proposed works would have a visual impact within the site and within the local area. In this setting the proposal is considered to have a significant visual impact on the AONB protected national landscape but is not viewed as being demonstrably harmful to the natural beauty of the AONB environment and surrounding supporting hinterland / buffer area.

The Chichester Harbour Conservancy raises **no objection** to the current submission. Appropriate planning conditions to control the materials of construction and the finished appearance, and measures to limit light pollution within the Dark Skies protocol should be considered by the LPA.

Conservation Officer

Legislative and Policy Context

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

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

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.

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan .

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

Assessment: .

The proposal would comprise a remodelling of the internal layout and certain alterations to the exterior. These include a two-storey front extension to the existing catslide roof section which fronts onto the harbour. The catslide roof would be replaced with a gable end extension, the ridge height of which sits below the highest part of the main roof. On the east elevation, the sloping roof would feature two, pitched roof dormer windows and a ground floor, pitched roof porch canopy. The west elevation would include a new ground floor canopy section and new fenestration at ground and first floor. Some further additions in the form of a store area to the north elevation and new gates to the slipway are also proposed. The proposed materials include reclaimed oak cladding of the entire building and new clay roof tiles. The new fenestration will see the replacement of the existing UPVc windows with powder coated aluminium frames.

I note that a number of objections have been raised against the proposal, some relating to the change of design, which would alter the representation of the former winkleshed which resided on the site prior to the 1970's conversion to a residential building.

Whilst the existing building does represent the architectural style of the former structure, it is a modern interpretation (in terms of materials and fenestration style).

Due to these modern alterations, the building is not classed as a non-designated heritage asset, although it is noted as a building of local interest from the comments raised. The harbour frontage comprises a mixed style of dwelling types, both traditional and contemporary. The proposal would alter the design of the building to a more traditional focus whilst incorporating materials that are more in character with the local vernacular such as the oak cladding.

The proposed works are subservient and proportionate to the main dwelling and are not considered to result in harm to the character of the conservation area. I note that CHC have not raised any objections with regards to the impact of the proposal on the AONB.

The adjacent building to the east is 23 Tower Street – a Grade II listed building. The original setting of this building has altered significantly over time, including when the application site building was converted. The proposed alterations to the east elevation would extend towards the designated heritage asset however, the footprint would remain the same. As the extended areas would be subservient and proportionate to the scale of the main dwelling, whilst utilising appropriate materials, the works would not result in harm to the architectural significance of the listed building, or its setting (that being the front garden area) which also forms part of its significance.

On balance, it is considered that the proposed works would not result in harm to either the conservation area or the adjacent listed building to the site.

Conclusion – No objection subject to the following condition: _

1. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until detailed drawings of the new windows / door on the front elevation of the building subject to the application, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details to comprise:-
 - a) Plans to clearly identify the window and door in question and its location within the building. These should be cross referenced to an elevation drawing or floor plan for the avoidance of doubt.
 - b) 1:20 elevation and plan; 1:5 section and full size glazing bar detail. The details to include the position of the window within the opening (depth of reveal) and method of fixing the glazing (putty or beading)
 - c) The materials used, method of opening and finishes.
2. Material samples (oak cladding, brick and clay roof tile and details of materials to be used for the new gates to the slipway)

The works shall be carried out in full accordance with such approvals and be retained thereafter.

Councillor Julie Thain-Smith

No comments received.

Councillor Lulu Bowerman

I have carefully examined all the plans and reports for the application and after careful consideration I am content for this to proceed and be decided by yourself under

delegated powers.

I understand the objections to this application but the current property is not a great example of the 'original' Emsworth Harbour and there are many other different examples of modern, new build on the Harbour. I agree with the Senior Conservation officer's report. There is no objection from Chichester Harbour Conservancy either. Unfortunately a loss of view is not a material planning consideration.

Councillor R Kennett

No comments received.

Countryside Access Team

No comments received.

Environment Agency

No comments 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: 11

Number of site notices: At least one site notice exists

Statutory advertisement: 11/02/2022

Number of representations received: 16

14 letters of objection, including an objection from the Emsworth Residents Association, raising the following issues:

- Site is within a conservation area
- When the house was constructed about 40 years ago, the slightly curious design clearly respected the original winkle shed that had previously existed on the site and as a result the view of this part of Emsworth from the millpond wall was impacted relatively little
- Proposed design imposes a radical and unwelcome change to the harbour frontage
- New design does not respect the original winkle shed
- New design is higher and projects forward over the harbour wall not respecting building line
- Harbour views of houses either side will be severely constrained by the new forward projection
- Proposed changes means house will become very large for the plot

- Proposed design will significantly change the harbour frontage
- Current dwelling had to conform to planning constraints placed on it at the time to mirror the shape of original winkleshed
- Architect should be required to reflect the original planning restrictions to retain shape of building
- Addition of gate across front of slipway would mar the appearance of the harbour frontage
- Will restrict outlook from adjacent properties
- Unique, iconic and interesting shape of the winkleshed will be lost forever replaced by something much less attractive and far less in keeping with surrounding area
- Proposed extension will extend the building to the sea wall not in keeping with any other buildings at this end of the foreshore
- New skyline of the proposed front elevation would ruin the vista of the foreshore
- The existing property was converted in the 1970's and consciously reflected and respected the original building design of the 'winkle shed'
- Would dominate section of the outlook and view to the harbour
- Will affect outlook and natural light to properties to the west of winkleshed
- Will detract greatly from the unique setting, and enjoyment of the Emsworth coastline and Chichester Harbour which the neighbours currently enjoy
- Will severely impact some residents to the rear (north) of the property in Orange Row
- Height of proposed store with a pitched roof of over 3m will significantly impact on the natural light and outlook of some of the Orange Row properties
- Significant change to historic sight lines from the Coastal Path
- Store will be an overbearing structure restricting light
- Loss of outlook
- Loss of sunlight
- Dormer windows are large and obtrusive
- Seek clarification with regard to the glazing of the dormers as any north facing would result in overlooking
- Not of high quality
- Would have adverse impact on the Chichester Harbour AONB
- Would not respect designated heritage assets
- Would have serious impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties
- Would obscure the eastward facing aspect along the foreshore from Seaview

Terrace for ever

- Further proposal to extend the house southwards, to align with the seawall, along with a box window makes obstruction to amenity even worse
- The addition of such a large extension in a sensitive and highly prominent location would not respect the position of neighbouring dwellings to the east and west and would result in an awkward and overtly dominant building that would have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area
- Not only would the amenity of residents of Seaview Terrace be severely impacted, but those properties to the east will also have their amenity impacted, as their vista of the west end of the foreshore will also be partially obscured
- Will adversely impact the appearance of the west end of the foreshore
- Out of keeping with the current size of Seaview Terrace and No.23 to the immediate east
- Any increase in density will affect overall appearance of an iconic view from the harbour towards Emsworth
- Would impact too much and have an overbearing and detrimental effect on the outstanding natural beauty of Emsworth
- Building the southern wall of the property on top of the sea wall will not only be further encroachment, it may also be unstable
- Will present a very high wall which will overpower the beach and block any view eastwards from the public slipway
- Design would look significantly out of place and compromise the overall appearance of the existing row of shoreline cottages
- Proposed design will create a much larger house on a relatively small plot and clearly a case of overdevelopment in a neighbourhood of tightly packed cottages and houses
- Will overshadow and change outlook of many of the nearby neighbouring properties
- If building work is granted would be more appropriate for the building contractors involved to access site via the neighbouring property immediately to the east

One letter neither objecting or supporting application raising concern about noise and disruption and would like reassurance about timings of works and work hours

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) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the conservation area, AONB and heritage assets

- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Flood risk
- (v) Parking

(i) Principle of development

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

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the conservation area, AONB and heritage assets

7.3 A number of objections relate to the loss of the existing design and appearance which replicated the former winkleshed building. As noted by the conservation officer, whilst the building does represent the architectural style of the former structure, it is a modern interpretation and that due to the modern alterations, the building is not classed as a non designated heritage asset and therefore, the loss of the catslide feature is not considered to result in any harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

7.4 Objections are also raised regarding the proposed forward siting to the harbour wall and that this would be out of character and harmful to the visual amenities of the locality. However, whilst the majority of properties are set back from the harbour wall, there are similar sited examples and the harbour frontage comprises an eclectic mix of styles and designs and in this context, the siting of the proposed extension to the southern elevation and the change in design and appearance, is considered acceptable.

7.5 The proposals include two small dormer windows in the eastern roofslope which would replace the existing rooflights and would be a visual improvement and combined with the use of materials that are more in character with the local vernacular, such as oak cladding, would result in a visual improvement to the appearance of the building.

7.6 The proposals also involve creating a store at the rear of the site. It is noted that adjacent properties have similar buildings and as it would be set back from the frontage, it is considered that there would be no adverse impact on the character of the conservation area as a result of this element.

7.7 The conservation officer considers the proposed works are subservient and proportionate to the main dwelling and are not considered to result in harm to the character of the conservation area.

7.8 As noted above, the adjacent building to the east is a Grade II listed building. The conservation officer identifies that the original setting of this building has altered significantly over time and considers that the works would not result in harm to the architectural significance of the listed building, or its setting (that being the front garden area) which also forms part of its significance.

7.9 In addition, the Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC) also comment that the scale, positioning and design of the works is not considered to detract from the building, the site, or the immediate surroundings. In addition, the CHC consider that the main works to the dwelling are proportionate and subservient to the host building and whilst having a significant impact on the AONB is not viewed as being demonstrably harmful to the natural beauty of the AONB environment and surrounding supporting

hinterland/buffer area.

- 7.10 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.11 Objection has been raised regarding the height of the proposed rear store at over 3m that this would significantly impact on the natural light and outlook of some of the Orange Row properties. In addition, objection has been raised that the store will be an overbearing structure restricting light. Whilst the height of the store, when taken from the application site would be approximately 3.37m high, there is a change in levels between the site itself and the properties immediately to the rear in Orange Row which are set on higher ground. The design of the store building is such that the roof would pitch away from the properties to the rear and it is not considered that it would result in an overbearing impact to adjacent properties. A significant part of the store would also, when viewed from the Orange Row properties, have the backdrop of the main two storey dwelling. In addition, the existing northern gable end would be redesigned to have a hipped roof thereby reducing its visual impact. Whilst objection has also been raised to the size of the proposed dormer windows they are considered to be well designed and in proportion to the existing dwelling.
- 7.12 Regarding the proposed dormer windows, a representation has been made regarding the glazing of the dormers and that any north facing would result in overlooking. The floor plan indicates that it would only be the southern cheeks of the dormers that would incorporate glazing and the northern cheeks would be cladding. The agent has confirmed that this is the case and as such, this could be controlled by imposing an appropriate condition. The drawings have been amended to clarify this aspect.
- 7.13 Further objections are raised in that the proposed development would restrict outlook and views to the harbour and obscure the eastward facing aspect along the foreshore from Seaview Terrace. In addition, that those properties to the east would also have their amenity impacted, as their vista of the west end of the foreshore will also be partially obscured. Further objection is raised in that outlook would also be affected from properties in Orange Row. However, the potential impacts of a proposed development on private views is not a planning consideration and that even if a new development significantly changes a view from a private property, this could not be a reason for refusal of planning permission.
- 7.14 Objections have also been raised that the proposed development would result in loss of light, overshadowing and sunlight to neighbouring properties. It is considered that the proposed development would not result in significant loss of light, overshadowing and sunlight sufficient to warrant a refusal on these grounds. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development would not appear overbearing albeit, it is recognised that the proposed development would result in some increase in scale and massing to the existing building.
- 7.15 Consequently, it is considered that the 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 and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Flood risk

- 7.16 The site is within flood zones 2 & 3. A flood risk statement has been submitted which is considered proportionate to the scale of the proposed development. This states, inter alia, that no change is proposed to the existing levels of the dwelling and that the ground floor level of the proposed extensions is to match the existing ground floor level and are therefore not at any greater risk of flooding.

(v) Parking

- 7.17 The property currently has 5 bedrooms that would reduce to 4 as a result of the development. There is currently an integral garage, however, access is difficult, and it would only be accessible at low tide and accessed via a slipway. This garage would be lost as a result of the development, however, due to the difficulty in accessing the garage at all times and the parking provision in the locality, it is considered that this is not a determining issue in this instance.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and the character of the conservation area, AONB and heritage assets and 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/21/01437 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:

20101 – 01 REV A - AMENDED - LOCATION PLAN AND EXISTING PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

20101 – 02 REV A - AMENDED - PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 Notwithstanding the approved plans, the development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until detailed drawings of the new windows / door on the front elevation of the building subject to the application, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details to comprise:-

- a) Plans to clearly identify the window and door in question and its location within the building. These should be cross referenced to an elevation drawing or floor plan for the avoidance of doubt.
- b) 1:20 elevation and plan; 1:5 section and full size glazing bar detail. The details to include the position of the window within the opening (depth of reveal) and method of fixing the glazing (putty or beading)
- c) The materials used, method of opening and finishes.
- d) Material samples (oak cladding, brick and clay roof tile and details of materials to be used for the new gates to the slipway)

The works shall be carried out in full accordance with such approvals and be retained thereafter.

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

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall have no windows or other openings inserted into the north elevation at first floor level, unless planning permission has first been granted by the Borough Council.

Reason: To preserve the reasonable privacy of neighbouring residents in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.