

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	14 Bridgefoot Path, Emsworth, PO10 7EA		
Proposal:	Addition of a double and single storey extension to rear , balcony and pergola to the front elevation with a reduction in glazing and additional alterations to fenestration and materials.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/25/00368	Expiry Date:	02/07/2025
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Pritchard		
Agent:	Helyer Davies Architects	Case Officer:	Selina Donophy
	Helyer Davies Architects Ltd		
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 **Site Description**

The application site is located on Bridgefoot Path, which overlooks the Mill Pond in Emsworth. The site is located within the Emsworth Conservation Area. The application site comprises a two-storey, vernacular building, constructed from flint and brick. It forms part of a terrace facing onto the pond however, it is of its own bespoke character compared to the attached neighbours either side. To the north is a two-storey dwelling and to the south, is one half of a pair of semi-detached properties, with a small flat roof dormer window on the front roof elevation. All the properties have small front gardens.

2 **Planning History**

APP/16/01086 - Replacement of ground floor and first floor front windows with larger windows and the addition of shutters to the first floor front windows. ,
PERM,07/12/2016
APP/25/00226 - Addition of a double and single storey extension to rear and the addition of a balcony above the existing ground floor with pergola above to the front elevation, additional alterations to fenestration and materials.

3 **Proposal**

Addition of a double and single storey extension to rear , balcony and pergola to the front elevation with a reduction in glazing and additional alterations to fenestration and materials

4 **Policy Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016
Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Joint SPD 2017 Chichester Harbour Management Plan 2024-2025

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))
CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

- AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)
DM20 Historic Assets

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

- ENP_D1 (General Design Policy)
ENP_D2 (Height, Mass & Materials)
ENP_D3 (Layout, Form & Density)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Emsworth

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Recommendation – Objection, owing to –

- That the rear extensions would erode the significance of one of a few flint panel dwellings in this part of the Emsworth Conservation Area;
- That the proposed ground floor bedroom would have very poor outlook; and,
- That the degree of rearward projection in close proximity to the northern common boundary with 13 Bridgefoot Path and southern boundary to 15 Bridgefoot Path - (notwithstanding the effect of the existing rear outbuilding to be demolished) - would appear to compromise the outlook and natural light of ground floor habitable room windows and a first floor habitable room window in 13 Bridgefoot Path.

A site visit was made 14.4.2025 & 21.5.2025 and regard had to the policy framework* below. These proposals appear to largely duplicate those sought under application APP/25/00226, the main differences being –

- Lengthening the ground floor rear extension to 10m projection and not having the splayed window to the ground floor bedroom and two small window openings in its south elevation; bi-fold door proportions in rear elevation becoming smaller;
- Lengthening the first floor rear extension to 3m projection but only half-the existing property's width and south elevation would copy the flint and brick quoin detailing of the existing house, positioned next to the common boundary with 13 Bridgefoot Path and retaining two existing first floor windows within their flint panelling; and,
 - Not altering the front ground floor 'conservatory' nor proposing the use of its flat roof as a balcony (i.e. no glazed balustrade and no pergola covering); The site was viewed from the street, from Bath Road, School Lane and a private lane off West Street. One of an attractive red brick and flint/clay tiled roof terrace of dwellings, with small back gardens/yards facing the Mill Pond and whose rear elevation is visible when walking down School Lane, within the Emsworth Conservation Area (CA - Character Area B). Entrance to dwelling is at side, down the gap between 14 and 15. Flintwork more interesting at rear. Looking at historic mapping, No. 14 seems to pre-date the neighbours either side. No. 15 to the south is taller and has a

large rear dormer window (and more modest front dormer window).

No.14's first floor is recessed back from the front walls of the neighbours. It is unclear whether the flat roofed 'conservatory' at the front is used as a balcony, but it would seem easily accessed from the adjacent first floor windows: there is no balustrade to the leading edge of this flat roof. Looking closely at the central first floor flint panel, this clearly was originally another window opening, which must have been infilled at some point. A curious rendered oblong appears near the top of this flint panel (with another on the rear elevation too).

The agent's supporting statement shows there have been earlier planning applications at the site, relating to the front. Ground floor extension in 1966 under reference 16833/1. The Council webpages also indicate a decision 16833 refusing permission on 14 April 1965, but not stating a description of development. Proposals Front elevation: No change. The existing front boundary wall would be retained, as indicated on the proposed sectional drawing. Rear elevation: ground floor extension of 10 m length, the full width of the property, leaving some 25 m left of the back garden. A small freestanding outbuilding would need to be demolished to make way for the new extension. It is unclear whether this is part of the dwelling as originally constructed and may have been added later. It would seem sensible to add these works of demolition in the CA to the description of development. Half width, first floor extension, treated with a double pitched, hipped roof, projecting some 3m out from the main back wall. The east and south-facing wall of this first floor element would also be given the flint panel and brick quoin detailing. It is not clear what treatment the north elevation would have. Internally: staircase position moved. Storage space formed off front 'office' space.

Assessment

The views of the Emsworth Forum on-line to the earlier application APP/25/00226 are noted. Whilst it would be permitted development to move between Class C3 and Class C4, the applicant could usefully clarify whether or not a Class C4 use is in fact proposed, being as each bedroom is to have its own sanitary accommodation. The annotation of the front ground floor space as an 'office' is also intriguing. Is this to allow homeworking or is a business space actually proposed, enjoying its own hallway sanitary accommodation? Views from School Lane are rather constrained, owing to intervening vegetation and built form, but the rear of site is clearly visible standing next to No. 9 School Lane and looking north-west. The rear is not visible from the Mill Pond, nor the Harbour itself. As such there would be very little visual impact to the Chichester Harbour National Landscape (NL). However, that still leaves impact to the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst the property is not statutorily Listed, nor is it an 'Other building of local interest' according to the CACA, it still can be considered to be an undesignated heritage asset within the CA. The ground floor extension has been designed to include a downstairs bedroom, with a habitable room not enjoying good outlook, looking straight at the side brick wall of No.15's conservatory and questionable levels of natural light.

It is for the Council to determine whether this represents high quality design under its Local Plan Policies CS11, CS16 and DM20 and Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Policies H1, D1 a), D2 a) and D3. Whilst only having a half-width first floor extension would retain more of the significance of the flintwork to the rear elevation, its lengthening by a further metre is likely to adversely affect the outlook and natural light to a first floor habitable room in No. 13 Bridgefoot Path's main original rear wall.

Apart from pulling the extension completely off the rear wall and having some sort of glazed link to preserve the 'significance' of the rear flintwork, it is difficult to see how the property could be extended to meet the Council Conservation Officer's concerns made to application APP/25/00226. The agent has not really commented on the 'significance' of this undesignated heritage asset, how this would be impacted and whether any public benefits

might flow from the proposals. As a general comment, the large hallway would appear to be very wasteful of available space, where it could have been easier to move the proposed bedroom to the front, to give it good natural light and outlook.

Case officer comment : Further comments received following consultation on amended plans

Recommendation – No objection, subject to – • Approval of facing and roofing materials; • Pergola timber to either be left to naturally weather or to be stained in accordance with details to be submitted/approved, but not painted white or any light colour; • Implementation of sedum over flat roof, within 1 month of the extension being substantially complete • All demolished materials being removed from the site.

Officer reasoned justification Further to the views expressed 2 June 2025, I have again regard had to the policy framework* below and note the following changes to the submitted plans, reflected in an adjusted description of development (formerly “Addition of a double and single storey extension to rear and additional alterations to fenestration and materials”), the main differences being –

- Pergola and glazed balustrade added over front projection;
- Multi-paned glazing to front ground floor altered to two full length pane openings, separated by new panel of flint, edged by brick quoining (albeit floor plan suggests one continuous pane of glazing (perhaps best to ensure plan and elevation tally);
- Window frameworks confirmed as white, powder-coated metal;
- Adjusting size of south-facing ground floor window to dining space;
- At rear at first floor, further window to shower-room deleted to retain more original flintwork, height of hipped roof ridge lowered to first floor rear projection; and,
- Extending ground floor extension further out into the back garden, with parapet edging continued around to south side and moving position of rooflight/adjusted internal room layout, including deletion of previously proposed ground floor bedroom/formation of enclosed pantry.

I have carefully read the Conservation Officer’s comments placed on line 11 June 2025. The site was viewed from the street, from Bath Road, School Lane and a private lane off West Street. One of an attractive red brick and flint/clay tiled roof terrace of dwellings, with small back gardens/yards facing the Mill Pond and whose rear elevation is visible when walking down School Lane, within the Emsworth Conservation Area (CA - Character Area B). Entrance to dwelling is at side, down the gap between 14 and 15. Flintwork more interesting at rear.

Looking at historic mapping, No. 14 seems to pre-date the neighbours either side. No. 15 to the south is taller and has a large rear dormer window (and more modest front dormer window). No.14’s first floor is recessed back from the front walls of the neighbours. It is unclear whether the flat roofed ‘conservatory’ at the front is used as a balcony, but it would seem easily accessed from the adjacent first floor windows: there is no balustrade to the leading edge of this flat roof. Looking closely at the central first floor flint panel, this clearly was originally another window opening, which must have been infilled at some point. A curious rendered oblong appears near the top of this flint panel (with another on the rear elevation too). The agent’s supporting statement shows there have been earlier planning applications at the site, relating to the front. Ground floor extension in 1966 under reference 16833/1. The Council webpages also indicate a decision 16833 refusing permission on 14 April 1965, but not stating a description of development. Proposals A small freestanding outbuilding would need to be demolished to make way for the new (longer) ground floor rear extension. It is unclear whether this is part of the dwelling as originally constructed and may have been added later. It would still seem sensible to add these works of demolition in the CA to the description of development. Half width, first floor extension, treated with a double pitched, hipped roof, projecting some 3m out from the main back wall. The east and south-facing wall of this first floor element would also be given the flint panel and brick quoin

detailing. It is not clear what treatment the north elevation would have

Assessment

The views of the Emsworth Forum on-line to the earlier application APP/25/00226 are noted. Whilst it would be permitted development to move between Class C3 and Class C4, the applicant could usefully clarify whether or not a Class C4 use is in fact proposed, being as each bedroom is to have its own sanitary accommodation. The annotation of the front ground floor space as an 'office' is also intriguing. Is this to allow homeworking or is a business space actually proposed, enjoying its own hallway sanitary accommodation? Views from School Lane are rather constrained, owing to intervening vegetation and built form, but the rear of site is clearly visible standing next to No. 9 School Lane and looking north-west. The rear is not visible from the Mill Pond, nor the Harbour itself. As such there would be very little visual impact to the Chichester Harbour National Landscape (NL). The amended proposals have retained much more of the original flint/brick quoin detailing. As such, The Conservancy's original holding objection is withdrawn.

Conservation Officer

Assessment

This application is a revised version of APP/25/00226 which is yet to be determined .

Comments to this application were provided on 15/5/2025, raising an overall objection to the application.

This proposal is broadly similar to that proposed under APP/25/00226, but with the following variations:

- Increase in depth of the proposed GF extension to 10m but omitting the angled window on the side elevation and variations to fenestration position and size.
- Variation to the first-floor extension – would only extend across half the width of the rear elevation, but would extend out further along to a 3m projection next to No. 13.
- Omission of balcony to front elevation and no variation to front windows.

As with the previous response, it is considered that whilst significance in depth, the proposed GF extension would not be overly harmful to the CA, nor the NDHA as a result of its limited visibility.

With regards to the first-floor extension, the variation in this design would retain a section of the original rear elevation, including 1no. window opening (albeit fitted with a modern uPVC window). However, the existing section of wall adjacent to this window, would be lost to incorporate a new window opening. As a result, the amount of flintwork walling retained would be minimal and therefore, harm would arise with regards to the loss of the historic flintwork, similar to the scheme proposed under APP/25/00226.

Overall, the majority of the scheme could in principle, be supported from a heritage perspective subject to further details regarding material finishes. However, whilst this scheme is marginally less harmful to the NDHA and CA than that proposed under APP/25/00226, it does still result in less than substantial harm to the CA and the NDHA. As this is limited to the rear elevation and given that the harm would be mitigated to a lesser degree by the use of flint and brick on the proposed first floor extension, the level of less than substantial harm is considered to be at the lower end of the scale, within this bracket of harm.

In addition to this harm, it is considered that the proposal, for the reason explained above, would not meet the requirement of S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("1990 Act"), nor the relevant policies in the NPPF and Local Plan.

Conclusion OBJECTION

Case officer comment : APP/25/00226 has been refused following receipt of this consultee comment . The application has also since been amended with the addition of alterations to the front elevation as well as to the rear elevation and the Heritage Officer has also been reconsulted. Please see below for further comment .

The plans have been amended so that the first-floor element now only extends across half the width of the original rear elevation. This would retain some of the historic flint / brick work, which given this building is deemed to be a NDHA within the CA, is important to reflect its architectural significance. This scheme also reintroduces the balcony which was included on APP/25/00226 and revised window to the front facing extension. There was no previous heritage objection to these elements.

Now part of the rear façade has been retained, the less than substantial harm at the lower end of the scale has now been addressed and as such, the proposal can now be supported.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposal as amended, would now meet the requirement of S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("1990 Act"), along with the relevant policies in the NPPF and Local Plan.

No objection subject to a materials condition requiring samples / details of all new external materials, including windows.

Councillor Charles Robert

No comment received

Councillor Grainne Rason

No comment received

Councillor Reuben Mychaleckyj

No Comment received

Ecologist

Thank you for consulting me on this application. The application is not accompanied by any ecological information. I have therefore carried out my own non-exhaustive desk-based assessment using the application documents, online sources and GIS mapping. I am comfortable that the proposal is not likely to result in ecological impacts. Works to the roof are limited, and the roof materials are of tight-fitting, concrete, interlocking type and therefore less likely to offer potential opportunities for protected species such as bats. Similarly, the small outbuilding to the rear is unlikely to be of ecological value.

Emsworth Residents Forum

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: 19

Number of site notices: 2

Statutory advertisement: 16/05/2025

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
While proposal APP/25/00368 has considerably less impact on the light and outlook [Redacted], when compared with App 00226, the proposal further extends the already substantial ground floor addition. [Redacted]	Comment has been noted.

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 area
- (iii) Impact on the Emsworth Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour National Landscape
- (iv) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (v) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (vi) Flood risk
- (vii) 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. When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken in consideration.

7.3 Relevant legislation : Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

7.4 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.

National Planning Policy Framework (revised December 2024)

Chapter 16 of the NPPF relates to the Historic Environment including paragraphs 202-221. The following are most relevant:

Para 212 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 (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'.

Para 214 states that:

'Where a development will result in substantial harm to, or total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, permission should be refused, unless this harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits, or a number of criteria are met. Where less than substantial harm is identified paragraph 208 requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development

Para 215 states that:

'Where a development proposal 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.

The building subject to this application is not listed, but is deemed to be a non-designated heritage asset (as set out in the introduction) and therefore the following paragraph is also relevant:

Para 216:

'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.

7.5 Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011 and Allocations Plan 2014)

Policy CS11 – Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of the Havant Borough

Policy CS11 (4) states that planning permission will be granted for development which:

'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

Policy CP16 (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’.

Integrates with existing local landscape features, promotes wildlife and biodiversity and/or applies characteristics of the local area into the design of a scheme wherever possible to create variety and interest;

Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;

Is well connected to and integrates with the immediate local area and the wider area by linking to existing pedestrian and cycle routes and encouraging people to use public transport where possible; and

The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.

Policy DM20 (Allocations Plan) - Historic Assets

Policy DM20 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.

7.6 The Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan

Policy H1' Design and Heritage' of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan states that any new development or alteration to an existing structure that affects, or has the potential to affect a heritage asset (whether designated or undesignated) will be required in its design, scale and materials to conserve or enhance the significance of the heritage asset, the wider historic character of Emsworth, and to have regard to the design guidance within this neighbourhood plan. 7.9 Policy H2 'Heritage Appraisals' of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan states that:

- a) Any application for new development or alteration to an existing structure that affects, or has the potential to affect, a heritage asset must include an appraisal of the site and its surroundings, with drawings showing its relationship to heritage assets, whether designated or undesignated, including roofscapes and views
- b). Any application for new development or alteration to an existing structure must include an appraisal of the impact of construction work and traffic on heritage assets, whether designated or undesignated.
- c) The application must clearly explain how the development proposals have taken account of the findings of such an appraisal. 7.7 Policy D1 ' General Design Policy' ,

7.7 Policy D2 'Height , mass and materials' and Policy D3, 'Layout , form and density' of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan all relate to the appropriateness of design within Emsworth.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.8 This proposal comprises alterations to both the front and rear elevations of the property. Proposals to the front elevation include a balcony over the existing ground floor level with a pergola above. The ground floor windows would be removed and replaced with two sets of doors and materials updated and the materials would be updated to brick and flintwork. The pergola would step out by approximately 2 metres with a height of 1.9 metres and the balcony would have clear screening to the south side. The balcony would be accessed via the front bedroom. The existing outbuilding in the rear garden would be removed- it is noted this has now been removed.

7.9 To the rear elevation both two and single storey extensions are proposed . This proposal has been altered following its initial submission with the single storey rear extension reduced in depth and the rear first floor bathroom window has also been removed. The proposed two storey extension would have dimensions of approximately 4 metres depth by 3.5 metres width with a hipped back roof with a ridge height set below that of the main roof and an eaves level matching that of the main roof . A new window is proposed to the south elevation serving a new bathroom . The extension would create a rear bedroom with a rear elevation window at first floor level. Flint and brickwork are proposed as materials to the first floor rear extension.

7.10 As noted above, the proposals for a single storey rear extension have been amended following the initial submission and the single storey extension now proposed would now project beyond the original rear elevation wall by approximately 7.5 metres and beyond the proposed two storey extension by approximately 3.5 metres. It would follow the existing width of the main property and would have a parapet roof with a height of approximately 3.4 metres and would feature bi-fold doors to the rear elevation. There would be two ground floor windows to the south elevation and these would serve the kitchen. At ground floor the extended area would create an open plan kitchen and living area. The existing entrance door to the south side elevation would be moved to the left . The existing lounge towards the front of the property would become an office.

7.11 In regards to the proposals to the front elevation, the existing windows would be replaced with smaller windows in white powder coated metal at ground floor level. At first floor level , a door would replace one of the windows and the flat roof would become a balcony with a pergola above as stated in paragraph 7.3.

7.12 In regards to the proposals to the front of the property, the replacement glazing to the front would appear more modern than existing however this is not deemed to result in any harm to the streetscene. The balcony and pergola above the flat roof would remain set back behind the main building line, as No. 14 is located behind the adjacent properties at first floor level. There are other examples of balconies in the immediate area and the context of the area is not typical, with vistas out over the Mill Pond which is directly to the west of the site.

7.13 The proposed two storey rear extension would not be notably deep and is considered to be generally subservient to the host dwelling. In regards to the design, in principle the design is considered to be acceptable. In regards to proposed materials, these include brickwork to the front elevation as well as to the rear at ground floor level and flint and brickwork to the first floor walls. The proposed materials are considered to be acceptable in appearance.

7.14 Whilst it is noted that the rear extension has been reduced from the initially proposed 10 metres depth to now 7.5 metres. Whilst this is an improvement, concerns are raised in relation to the mass and bulk of the extensions in relation to the host dwelling and surrounding character of the area. The ground floor rear extension proposed (including that beneath the first floor proposed rear extension) would more than double the existing depth of the existing dwelling. This is considered to be contrary to the Havant Borough Design Guide (paragraph 5.41) which states that 'Rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building'. In this instance it is considered to be an excessive size and contributes to the appearance of mass and bulk with a large area of flat roof. This is exacerbated by the parapet roof which would have a generous height. Whilst the large extension at No. 13 is noted, it is not considered that this should set a precedent for future development as this was granted consent over 60 years ago, prior and before current design guidance. Whilst many other properties in the immediate area have benefited from extensions, these are of a much smaller scale than of that proposed and would be considered much more modest additions. It is therefore considered that this proposal would be contrary to the surrounding pattern of development.

(iii) Impact on the Emsworth Conservation Area and Chichester Harbour National Landscape

7.15 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.

7.16 Policy CS11 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011 is relevant in the assessment of a development within a Conservation Area. Policy CS11 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'

7.17 The site is located within the Emsworth Conservation Area. The Emsworth Conservation Area is centred around the old Georgian historic harbour side town and port, at the head of the northwest channel of Chichester Harbour, on the county boundary of Hampshire and Sussex. The Emsworth Mill Pond SINC forms part of the

western boundary of the conservation area. More specifically, Bridgefoot Path is located on the eastern side of the Mill Pond and is largely characterised by late 19th and early/mid-20th century development. It is understood that No. 14 pre dates the properties either side of it. For this reason Havant's Heritage Officer has been consulted on this proposal. They have noted the unique mainly flint, with brick quoin detailing of the property and have stated that the building holds some historic significance and is therefore considered to be a non-designed heritage asset (NDHA). They initially objected to this proposal on the grounds of the loss of the original flintwork to the rear elevation. Following amendments to the proposal whereby an element of the rear flintwork has been retained, the Heritage Officer has since removed their objections to this proposal subject to the submission of material details.

- 7.18 The Chichester Harbour Conservancy have also been consulted in regards to this proposal and they have removed their holding objection following the submission of amended plans pending materials samples to be submitted and implementation of the sedum roof.

(iv) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.19 To the south of the application site is No. 15 Bridgefoot Path . This property is separated from No. 14 by approximately 1.5 metres however No. 15 is angled away from No. 14. The two storey extension would be sited away from the shared boundary and would not infringe upon the 45 degree line taken from the closest window mid point .
- 7.20 It is noted that there is a high, brick boundary wall running along the boundary line between these two properties. Whilst this may already have some impact in regards to light on No. 15 , the height of the proposed ground floor extension is considered to project above this and further impact light on the ground floor lounge window located close to the boundary at No. 15 as well as the side elevation kitchen window which faces back towards No. 14. The height of the extension in conjunction with its depth is judged to have a harmful impact upon the light received by these rooms as well as an oppressive outlook, nothing that the lounge window is the only light source to this room. The kitchen window also received some light from the conservatory. It is noted that the conservatory at No. 15 is not shown on the location plans.
- 7.21 To the north of the application site is No. 12 and 13 Bridgefoot Path. This property has been extended generously in the 1960s at two storey level and has been converted from flats back to a singular residential unit in recent years. It is understood that, at the time this application was made, this property is owned by the applicant, however, there are tenants who occupy the property. The living conditions of those tenants are required to be taken into consideration and therefore concern is raised in regards to the impact on light on windows located on the rear and side elevation of No. 12 and 13 as well as an oppressive outlook on the rear bedroom window especially. The most recent plans on file for this property show that on the rear elevation serve a rear bedroom at first floor and a open plan living area at ground floor level. There's also a door serving a kitchen on the ground floor side elevation facing back towards No. 14 and at first floor level there are bathroom windows. The rear elevation windows are of notable concern as well as the side elevation kitchen doorway , due to the siting of the two storey extension located on the shared boundary . This would result in an infringement of the 45 degree line on both the bedroom and living room windows on the rear elevation and would also impact the light received by the kitchen doorway which is the light source for this room. The extensions are therefore considered to result in an overbearing and overshadowing impact, harmful to the amenities of this

property.

- 7.22 To the rear (east) of the site there is no property directly to the rear although the rear gardens of No's 1c, 2 and 3 School Lane run alongside the southern boundary of the sites rear garden. Whilst there would be the introduction of new first floor windows set closer as a result of the proposal , there would remain over 20 metres separation distance between the properties and therefore it is not considered that this view would be significantly different than existing.
- 7.23 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would appear overbearing, would lead to overshadowing and would have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the properties immediately either side of the application site and therefore would not meet the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).
- .

(v) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.24 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

(vi) Flood risk

- 7.25 The site is located within Flood Zone 3 . A Flood risk Assessment has been provided with this application providing mitigation measures which include durable flooring, raised electrical points and sleeping accommodation to be retained at first floor level.

(vii) Parking

- 7.26 The proposal would result in two bedrooms plus an office . Even if the office was to be viewed as a bedroom this would not result in an increase in the number of parking spaces required.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposed development would by reason of its design, height, mass and bulk would result in an overdeveloped and non subservient appearance to what is currently a modestly sized dwelling contrary to policies CS11 ,CS12 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011.
- 8.2 The proposed development would by reason of its design and siting result in a harmful impact on the amenity of adjacent properties, resulting in an overbearing and overshadowing development . As such the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy, Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/25/00368 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would by reason of its design, height, mass and bulk result in overly large, non-subservient additions to the existing dwelling to the harm of the buildings existing modest scale together with its attractive character and appearance. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, , policies D1, D2 and D3 of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2036 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development would by reason of its height, design and siting result in a harmful impact on the amenity of adjacent properties, resulting in an overbearing and overshadowing development in particular to No's. 13 and 15 Bridgefoot Path , resulting in an oppressive outlook to windows and private amenity spaces . As such the development would be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy framework.