

Consultee Comments for Planning Application APP/16/00929

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/16/00929

Address: 5 Mill Lane, Langstone, Havant, PO9 1RX

Proposal: Demolition of existing single storey structure, proposed single storey rear extension, alterations to existing pool house, new detached car port, including alterations to boundary wall.

Case Officer: Bee Crawford

Consultee Details

Name: Mr John Heritage Team

Address: Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant PO9 2AX

Email: Havant.Heritage@havant.gov.uk

On Behalf Of: Conservation Officer

Comments

Conservation Officer - Objection

5 Mill Lane is a nicely detailed traditional property which is located within the Mill Lane Conservation Area. The property is located off Mill Lane but access to the garage is served by a private drive from Mill Lane which also serves an adjacent properties to the south.

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 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications along with the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

The NPPF sets out, in paragraph 17, the 12 core planning principles that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions. One of these core principles relates directly to conserving heritage assets, as follows

planning should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations;

Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that 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. It also goes on to state that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing

justification.

Paragraph 133 provides guidance in relation to development proposals that cause 'substantial harm'. While, paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy states that where a development 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.

Paragraph 64 (Section 7 Requiring Good Design) is also particularly relevant to this case in that development should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

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

Protects and where appropriate enhances the boroughs 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:

a) 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

It is considered that the footprint of the extension would be large when viewed in the context of the original dwelling. I consider that the scale and design of the proposed addition to the rear would overwhelm the modest form and traditional proportions of the existing property. I appreciate there has been the additional of a flat roof outbuilding but the juxtaposition of a further flat roof extension to link the property would be at odds with its character. It would therefore not appear harmonious with the architectural character and composition of the existing dwelling.

This is not to say that an extension is not possible at this location but I believe it may need to be scaled back with some traditional detailing brought into the design.

As such, the proposed rear extension by virtue of its design would fail to respect the character of the host structure and in so doing would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Mill Lane Conservation Area

Refuse:

The proposed extension, by reason of its design and massing would detract from the character and appearance of the existing property and would harm and would therefore not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such the proposed extension is considered to be contrary to policies CS11 and CS16 (1a) of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011), policy DM20 of the Havant Allocations Plan 2014 and national guidance contained in the NPPF