

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE: APP/25/01010

APPLICATION TYPE: Retrospective Planning Permission

PROPOSAL: Retrospective Planning Application for proposed boundary wall and fence.

SITE ADDRESS: 9 Beacon Square, Emsworth, PO10 7HU

AGENT DETAILS: Mrs Grinstead

APPLICANT DETAILS: Mrs Buchanan

CASE OFFICER: Denise Sheath

TARGET DATE FOR DECISION: 02 February 2026

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT RETROSPECTIVE PERMISSION

1 Site Description

9 Beacon Square, Emsworth is a two storey detached dwelling constructed with brown brick with brown clay hung tiles to the first floor elevations. The property is located on the south eastern corner plot of the square of Beacon Square with the front entrance facing the west. A detached garage is located adjacent the rear north east corner boundary with an access and gravel driveway. The rest of the garden to the front and south side elevation is laid to lawn. The property currently features brick pillars with a low brick wall with fencing atop to the western boundary, with close boarded fencing to the southern boundary – it is this boundary treatment which is the subject of this application.

2 Planning History

94/58895/000 - Two storey rear extension and bay window to side of dwelling and front extension to detached garage. – Permit 10 March 1994

97/58895/002 - Dormer window to roof space and single storey orangery to south elevation – Permit 11 June 1997.

APP/25/00835 - Single storey side extension. – Permit

3 Proposal

Retrospective Planning Application for proposed boundary wall and fence. The boundary treatments in question comprise a height of c.1.8m. A statement submitted by the applicants sets out:

“The boundary wall was badly damaged (by tree roots) and required replacement. The hedging was very overgrown and out of keeping with the general good standard of surrounding properties..... The wall we built was designed to fit in with other similar boundary walls around the Square. We copied 2 such boundary walls and used the same contractor as one of the other properties to ensure ours fitted in with their design. Most surrounding properties have tall hedges so we feel the wall and fence we have added is in keeping with the overall look of the area and a substantial improvement on what pre-existed the wall.....This property does not have a back garden so maintaining some privacy at the front of the property is much valued, particularly as the road

alongside the boundary is a popular parking area for walkers to the coast path. There are often have several cars parked outside."

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

ENP_D1 (General Design Policy)
ENP_D2 (Height, Mass and Materials)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None Required

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: 6

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2 in total (1 Objection, 1 letter of support)

Objection:

- The wall and fencing around the entire frontage of this corner house has a combined height of approximately 2m, apart from the opening to the drive on the west side which does not currently have a gate or any other type of barrier. The height of the wall and fencing is within the limit for a back or side boundary to a property but planning regulations state a front boundary wall or fence should only be a maximum of 1m. The boundary going round a corner should also only be 1m to ensure visibility and safety for those on the pathway. The owner has treated the boundary as if the whole of the land around the property is a back garden. There must be a side of the house considered to be the front - as for the other 3 corner properties on the 'inner island' of Beacon Square and the wall/fence on this side and at the corner should be a maximum of 1m. If additional height is required for privacy the owner could consider a hedge.

- The properties in Beacon Square, Seafield's and I believe Esmond Close, were designed and built with very low front walls and together with the grass verges this has given an open feel to these roads even when hedges have been planted. The high corner wall and high fencing along the southern side of Beacon Square - the expected front side of the house - has had an adverse visual impact on this part of Beacon Square and the length of the high wall and fence combined has resulted in an unappealing prison camp feel to the property itself.

Officer Comment: *The impact of the development on the character of the locality is assessed at section 7 below*

Support:

- A very dilapidated house and garden has been given a lovely makeover. The wall is lovely and keeps overhanging bushes off the pavement. The wall appears to be of a good quality and in keeping with the area.

Officer Comment: *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) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

(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 area

7.3 The proposal includes a boundary wall and fence along the southern and western boundaries of the subject property, comprising a brick wall up to 0.75 m high with close-boarded fencing to 1.65 m, and brick pillars of around 1.8 m to the western boundary; and a low lying brick wall with fencing atop to the southern boundary at a maximum height of 1.8m. A timber gate on the western boundary reaches 1.6 m. A 1.8m timber double gate is located to the southern eastern boundary. These works replaced what the applicants have described as a deteriorated low brick wall and hedging damaged by roots.

7.4 While Beacon Square generally features properties with low brick walls with higher hedging, similar higher boundary treatments exist at other corner properties in the locality, including Nos. 15 and 19, which also use brick walls, pillars and fencing to enclose their gardens. As such the proposal is not wholly out of keeping with other boundary treatments in the locality.

7.5 The context of the site is also considered to be of relevance, in that the application site lies opposite properties in Beacon Square which feature high, dense hedgerow boundary treatments. Street View imagery also reveals that the application site previously featured similarly dense greenery. The character of the immediate vicinity is not therefore one of open gardens, and the impact of enclosure of the garden of No.9 with the wall and fencing is mitigated by this context. The tonal qualities of the fencing material can also be expected to weather with time, with the result that it will become more recessive in the street scene.

7.6 Taken together, although it is acknowledged that the proposal has had an impact upon the visual character of the streetscene, and the third party concerns in that regard are recognised, when taking into account similar boundary treatments on other corner plots in the locality, coupled with the immediate context of boundary treatments adjacent to and opposite the site, means this impact is not considered significant enough to warrant a refusal of the application.

7.7 On this basis the design and appearance of the proposal is, on balance, 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 has resulted in a limited and acceptable impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

7.8 The boundary treatment works to the street side boundaries of No.9 Beacon Square are not considered to cause overshadowing or appear overbearing to Nos. 7 or 11 Beacon Square which directly adjoin the application site, and are not considered harmful to neighbour amenity

7.9 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal does not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and has a 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) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

8 Conclusion

8.1 The retention of the proposed development is acceptable in principle; is, on balance, appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area; and has a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Development Manager be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/25/01010 subject to the following conditions

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

Applicant Statement – Received 08 December 2025

Block Plan – Received 08 December 2025

Location Plan – Received 08 December 2025

Boundary Wall Plan and Typical Elevations – Drawing No. 9BEACON-25 –
Received 08 December 2025

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

Informatives:Informative 1

In accordance with paragraphs 38-50 of the NPPF Havant Borough Council (HBC) takes a positive and proactive approach and works with applicants/agents on development proposals in a manner focused on solutions by:

Offering a pre-application advice service, and

Updating you of any issues that may arise in the processing of your application and where possible suggesting solutions, and,

In this instance:

Your application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.