
Site Address: Little Oaks Hollybank Lane and, 8A Oaktree Drive,
Emsworth
Proposal: Proposed demolition of unstable brick boundary wall and replacement
with new brick boundary wall as detailed located to north of Plot 32 of Planning
Approval ref 09/72129/002. Replacement stables.
Application No: APP/14/00545 Expiry Date: 18/11/2014
Applicant: Mr S Forrester Team: Team 2
Agent: Case Officer: Daphney Haywood
Ward: Emsworth

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site comprises part of a current housing construction site located on the northern edge of Emsworth, and the curtilage of Oaks Cottage . The housing site adjoins woodland to the north and the 2 cul-de sac heads and bungalows of development in Oak Tree Drive to the south. A bridleway open to all traffic lies to the east along the boundary with Oaks Cottage.

2 Planning History

09/72129/002 Demolition of 2No. dwellings and erection of 48No. dwellings with associated garages and parking with access from Oak Tree Drive. - Permit 28/02/11

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Proposed demolition of brick boundary wall and replacement with new 2.2m high brick boundary wall located to north of Plot 32 of Planning Approval ref 09/72129/002, and adjoining the boundary with Oaks Cottage. The wall would be constructed in Thakeham Red Multi which is the same brick as the nearest plot which is no 32. Attached to the boundary wall and within the curtilage of Oaks Cottage is a stable block and the plans have been amended to provide for replacement stables within the curtilage of Oaks Cottage, comprising a timber building 10.8m by 3.6m to 4.8m and 2.9m to ridge. The stables would be finished with timber cladding.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

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

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

No objection

Conservation Officer

The wall is roughly L-shaped and forms the shared boundary with Oaks Cottage. It comprises two distinct elements. The western most portion is of flint and brick construction. Its mean height is around 2.4 metres. This was clearly formerly a building - readily evident on site but confirmed by reference to historic mapping. The remaining larger portion of the wall is approx 2.1m in height and constructed in rat-trap bond. I have not had sight of the structural report. The section of wall in rat trap bond appears in alignment and in fair to good condition. There is some ivy growth which needs attention. Rat-Trap bond walls have some historic significance - examples can be found in Havant Town Centre - see St Faith's Conservation Area Appraisal. It is primarily used for economy - uses fewer bricks to achieve the same height. It is also reputed to be used in agricultural situations (walled garden) the cavity providing warmth and assisting with plant growth. Fruit trees were often trained against the wall. The historic map suggests the wall formed part of a kitchen garden enclosure with greenhouses etc., so this could be an additional reason for its use here. From my visit I would say there may be an argument for demolishing the flint wall. It has lost its context and being only a remnant of a former structure the structural dynamics have changed. It does not appear unsafe but the contractor is obviously being precautionary in view of future garden use. It probably could be made safe by lowering its height and capping off but less incentive for doing so. The Rat-Trap bond wall does have historic interest for the reasons stated. It does not appear to be structurally unsound. To demolish and rebuild would appear over the top and I would encourage a rethink. The wall is not protected (or something that could be statutorily protected). Conservative repair in my opinion would retain and provide an attractive feature for the newly formed gardens and prove more cost-effective.

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: 55

Number of site notices: one

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary:

Initial Plans

The issue appears to be a concern that the levels of the 5 terraced houses means the wall foundations are going to be exposed when digging footings which is exactly what we already suspected rather than a specific issue with the wall itself. I totally agree that the wall may now be in poor condition following the activity that has taken place in the last 18 months but its clear that even if the wall was in good condition the foundations would still be undermined in order to construct the terrace as should have been highlighted on the initial survey of the site.

The wall is specifically required to stay in the planning approval as it forms an integral part of the screening required in the original inspectors report. Subsequently, communication over a year ago between the Council planning team and Banner confirmed that if the wall is unstable it should be retained and repaired.

The Council message appears very clear but we are realistic and understand underpinning and repair of the wall as it exists today in order to undertake the next phase of build is expensive so we have already stated we would be willing to allow Banner to replace the wall on a like for like basis. There does not appear to be any detail regarding the replacement wall in the documents section of the planning website but the site manager has already confirmed it will be 9" wide as currently exists and all we request is the height is maintained to match what's there now.

I also note in the report that they claim to have been unable to gain access to our side of the wall. Nobody actually approached us and had anyone asked then we would have been more than happy with a site visit and discussion of options with them. They may also then have realised that the wall is integral to the stable block and would have provided a plan on how to incorporate this.

From the report published I believe its clear that the condition of the wall is being used partly as an excuse to overcome an issue with building the terrace as the parking of vehicles and site offices next to this 'unstable' wall for over a year has not been a concern to them and although we are quite willing to see it replaced I trust the council will support our request that any replacement matches the height of the existing wall in line with the original planning approval.

Comment:

The plans have been amended to provide for replacement stables and the new wall would be of a similar height to the one to be demolished. The objector has been notified and has not raised objection to the amended plans subject to provision of the new stables prior to demolition of the old as annotated on the submitted site plan.

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) Visual impact
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Arboricultural considerations
- (v) Conservation considerations.

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Visual impact

7.2 The replacement wall is of a similar height to that to be demolished and is located adjoining residential gardens and subject to the use of appropriate materials will not

result in visual detriment. In respect to the stables, these will replace existing stables attached to the wall to be demolished. They will be relocated off the boundary with the new housing and be screened by the existing and proposed boundary treatment, and are of appropriate design and form for this semi-rural setting and not considered to result in detriment.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.3 The boundary wall location is unchanged and is considered appropriate for this rear garden location and would maintain privacy. Regarding the stables these would be sited further from the proposed dwellings on the Banner site and this relationship is considered to be acceptable.

(iv) Arboricultural considerations

- 7.4 The application is supported by a statement from Barrel Tree Consultancy which identifies the need to remove the wall section within the RPA of the adjacent oak under arboricultural supervision and once this is done it will be necessary to design the foundations to take account of any roots either by piling or bridging the roots. Subject to compliance with this report the impact on the adjacent oak tree is considered acceptable.

(v) Conservation considerations.

- 7.5 The Conservation Officer has inspected the wall and is of the view that whilst the rat trap element of the wall has some historical significance and should be retained it is not suitable for listing. The proposal is for a replacement brick wall and subject to appropriate materials this would maintain the visual amenities of the area, and there are no sound planning reasons for requiring retention of the existing wall.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The application is considered acceptable and recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to
GRANT PERMISSION for application APP/14/00545

subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date on which this planning permission was granted.
Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 External materials shall comprise:-
Wall - Thakeham Red Multi to match those on plot 32.
Stable walls - Wood cladding
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 2012.

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

Site location plan ref P08b

Site layout ref P01J

Site plan showing revised siting of stables and area of wall to be demolished prior to completion of new stables received 17 November 2014.

Brick screen wall details BHSD/7020 Rev A

Stable block floor plan and elevations ST.01 Rev A

Boundary wall inspection report dated April 2014 - SMA Ref 4337 issue 01

Barrel Tree Consultancy Tree Protection measures ref 8418-Let3-DC

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.