

APP/12/00385

LANGNESS, WOODGASTON LANE, HAYLING ISLAND. PO11 ORL

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING 5 BED DETACHED DWELLING AND GARAGE. CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACED 4 BED DETACHED, TIMBER FRAME DWELLING CLAD WITH CEDAR SHINGLES; REPLACEMENT TWO-STOREY GARAGE, BOAT LOFT AND NEW SLIP WAY AND SEA DEFENCES (REVISED APPLICATION).

PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

NPPF para. 115; CS11, CS12, CS16, DM8, DM9: Havant Core Strategy 2011. Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan 2004-2009: BD1, BD2: Appendix 3: Policies B2, B3, E6-E9. Chichester Harbour AONB Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions.

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY'S COMMENTS

These were the Conservancy's comments on the previous application (APP/11/01034):-

"Langness is a detached flat roofed dwelling within a rural location fronting the Harbour. The existing dwelling is viewed against a backdrop of trees which screen the dwelling from the wider countryside to the north. The existing dwelling has large picture windows and has cedar clad boarded elevations. There are a mixture of properties and design styles in Woodgaston Lane. There are other properties with pitched roofs.

The Conservancy commented on two previous applications for the addition of a pitched roof and a new garage at the property. We raised concerns relating to the first application in 2004 (04/56425/000) due to the substantial increase in height proposed (3.6 metres) which we felt in combination with a very large detached garage extending to the full plot width would increase the prominence of the building when viewed from the wider landscape. We also commented on the picture windows and proposed steel balustrade, preferring natural materials such as timber. The application was withdrawn. The second application (04/56425/001) included changes such as a 0.7 metre reduction in height to the main dwelling but no reduction to the size of the garage. The Conservancy maintained an objection as the overall bulk had not been fully addressed and we remained concerned with some design elements. This application was approved by the Council subject to conditions.

The permission was renewed in 2009 (09/56425/002 refers). The Conservancy commented that the circumstances of the site had not significantly changed since 2004; the application property is still a large, prominent and highly exposed building visible for some distance from the water and main Harbour channel to the south and southeast. We therefore maintained our objection for the reasons given previously regarding the substantial increase in bulk proposed; however, if the Council was minded to grant renewal of permission then we asked that the proposed eternit boarding and render colours be agreed in consultation with the Conservancy, and that the planting of native shrubs or trees within the garden fronting the Harbour be considered, both of which would help soften the impact of this large roof extension in the wider landscape.

This new application seeks permission for a wholesale replacement dwelling of an unusual design with 'Dutch barn' style gable faces within a 'mansard' roof finished in cedar singles/cladding, with timber sash windows with lattice glazing bars. The applicant sought pre-application advice from Conservancy officers and we acknowledged the improvements in comparison with the approved scheme in terms of a reduction in height and omission of large picture windows. However, we raised concerns regarding the extent of glazing on the Harbour (south) elevation, the proposed use of cedar shingles/cladding on the entire building; and the size and resemblance of the proposed garage/studio to a separate dwelling. We also commented on proposals for a replacement sea wall with vertical timber sleepers and a new slipway, encouraging the use of the 'rip rap' rock armour style of sea defence which absorbs wave energy more effectively (therefore minimising the impacts of wave action on the designated intertidal area) and vegetates over time helping to integrate the rocks into the natural landscape. The applicant responded to each of the points at a meeting and in writing, but did not make any actual changes to the plans.

The only changes incorporated into the submitted application following further advice are a reduction in height (by nearly 0.5m, to 6.34m high) of the garage/studio building. While this goes some way to addressing our previous concerns, we still feel that this would be a very large building and its overall scale/appearance (mirroring the design of the proposed main dwelling) would still resemble a dwelling in itself. We would therefore still wish to see a more significant reduction in height/bulk and a simplification of the design to ensure that the building appears subservient in scale and ancillary in use to the main house – this being particularly important given its location westwards of the main house, extending almost to the public footpath.

A comparative silhouette of the approved scheme has been submitted which shows that the proposed dwelling would be significantly less high than the approved building, but with a slightly increased width on either side of the existing building. However, no silhouette or footprint plans providing a comparison with the existing building have been submitted and therefore it is difficult to fully visualise the proposed building or to assess the increase in size proposed. A 'Harbour elevation' showing the proposed building in the context of neighbouring properties and a coloured plan of the proposed building showing some shading/depth would also assist in this assessment.

We acknowledge the improvements compared with the approved scheme relating to the reduction in overall height and the move towards a more traditional design, although the proposed harbour elevation has greater detailing more akin to a 'suburban' style than the example photograph showing a similarly designed property, which displays a simpler design, and less glazed elements. The use of cedar shingles can be an appropriate material in a rural setting such as this, and the applicant has stated that the use of 'white' cedar shingles on the elevations and 'red' cedar shingles for the roof would provide some variation to help break up the massing of the building (a submitted photo of a similarly designed house appears to demonstrate this effect, which helps to alleviate our concerns about a monotonous appearance). However, we remain concerned about the extent of glazing on the proposed south elevation, in particular that on the left-hand gable at ground floor level, which extends to the full-width of this part of the building and would not be shaded by the balcony element as the glazing in the centre of the elevation would. The application forms suggest that the window frames would be off-white, which increases our concern about this extent of glazing, as light colours would draw the eye further to the glazed elements. Furthermore, the proposed layout plan now appears to show the new dwelling being sited further south (towards the Harbour) than the existing building, which would further increase the visual impact of the large areas of glazing proposed.

The applicant has stated that existing trees would be safeguarded and new planting would be provided to the south and sides of the new building - however, no details have been shown on the layout plan. Similarly, only very limited details are shown of the proposed new sea wall and slipway which are not sufficient to enable a thorough assessment (we would wish to see existing/proposed comparative layout and elevation plans and a detailed method statement to demonstrate no adverse impacts on the adjacent European designated sites). We would also encourage the consideration of the 'rip-rap' style of sea defence or an explanation of why the timber sleeper option is considered more appropriate as part of any application.

Overall, we remain concerned about some aspects of the proposal which fail to address our previous concerns or accord with key elements of the AONB Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions (which was produced after the previous scheme was approved in 2004) and which we consider would be unsympathetic and visually prominent in this very exposed, rural location as viewed from the footpath and water. We also feel that significant elements of the proposal lack sufficient information to enable a thorough assessment to be made. While the current application is a step in the right direction, for the above reasons we have no alternative but to object at this stage, and would invite further dialogue with the applicant to address the issues and concerns raised."

The application has not yet been decided by the Borough Council.

The applicant contacted Conservancy officers in December 2011 with a revised design for the proposed outbuilding, showing a reduction in bulk at the southern end of the building. We commented that this showed an improvement but that we remained concerned that the building would still be a very large building resembling a separate dwelling, and suggested that a reduction in height of the building and replacement of the dormers with rooflights would reduce the dominance of the building and better reflect its ancillary use. We also reiterated our comments on other elements of the proposals and asked for an update

on these, but did not hear anything further.

The current application is a revised submission which includes a table of comments seeking to address each issue raised by the Conservancy. The changes from the previous application include that the building footprint has been moved back (northwards away from the Harbour) in line with the existing building; the footprint and bulk of the outbuilding have been reduced (but not changed from the plans submitted informally in December 2011); and it has been confirmed in the table of comments that 'the exact colour for all external joinery has now been specified, it is a muted colour to blend with the weathered shingle cladding. Samples will be provided in the normal manner to the local authority for approval'. Further information submitted includes a black and white photo montage of the proposed dwelling as viewed from the foreshore footpath; and a 'section' of the proposed sea wall, which would now be raised in height by 300mm to accord with advice from the Environment Agency. Elements which have not been addressed as suggested include that the extent of glazing on the harbour elevation has not been reduced; a planting scheme has not been provided (it is stated that this will be provided following the grant of planning permission); and the suggested changes to the proposed garage/boat loft have not been made. Further, the comparative silhouette drawings still show the approved scheme, rather than the existing building which would allow comparison with the existing situation. Most significantly however, there are still no existing and proposed layout plans and elevations of the proposed sea defence wall and slipway or detailed method statement outlining the proposed construction. This element of the proposals would require a 'Works Licence' from the Conservancy and these details would be necessary to form part of that application.

The changes made to the siting of the proposed dwelling would be an improvement as the new building would be no further towards the Harbour than the existing building. The photo montage is also useful in assisting with an assessment of the impact on the landscape from the replacement dwelling. Subject to seeing details or samples of the proposed materials and finishes, including window frames and fascias etc; and details of the proposed planting scheme, to ensure that these elements are appropriate to the sensitive rural harbourside setting of the proposals, on balance, the proposed replacement dwelling and outbuilding would not have a detrimental impact on the AONB and represent a significant improvement from the approved scheme as previously commented. However, we remain unable to properly assess the proposed changes to the sea defence and slipway due to the lack of detail regarding the methodology of construction, and the lack of plans showing the proposed changes in footprint and elevation, and as such, we still have no option but to object to the application until this information is forthcoming.

DATE CONSIDERED

16/05/12

CONSIDERED BY

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Committee sub-group under delegated powers.

RECOMMENDATION

The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application pending further information regarding the proposed new slipway and sea defences.