

Telephone: 023 9247 4174
Fax: 023 9248 0263
Website: www.havant.gov.uk

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA

Membership:

Councillors Buckley, Hughes, Keast, Patrick, Perry, Quantrill and Satchwell

Meeting: Development Management Committee
Date: 12 January 2017
Time: 5.00 pm
Venue: Hurstwood Room, Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road,
Havant, Hampshire PO9 2AX

The business to be transacted is set out below:

Nick Leach
Monitoring Officer

3 January 2017

Contact Officer: Jack Caine 023 92446230
Email: jack.caine@havant.gov.uk

Page

PART A - (Items Open for Public Attendance)

1 Appointment of Chairman

To Appoint a Chairman to the meeting.

2 Apologies for Absence

To receive and record apologies for absence.

3 Minutes

1 - 4

To approve the minutes of the Development Management Committee held on 8 December 2016.

4 Matters Arising

5 Site Viewing Working Party Minutes

To Follow

To receive the minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 5 January 2017

6 Declarations of Interest

To receive and record declarations of interests from members present in respect of the various matters on the agenda for this meeting.

7 Chairman's Report

The Chairman to report the outcome of meetings attended or other information arising since the last meeting of the Committee.

8 Matters to be Considered for Site Viewing and Deferment

The Committee are invited to consider any matters they wish to recommend for site viewing or deferment.

9 Deputations

To receive requests to make a deputation to Committee.

10 Applications for Development and Development Control Matters

5 - 8

Part 1 - Applications Viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party

10(1) APP/16/01113 - 23 South Street Emsworth PO10 7EG

9 - 44

Proposal: Alterations and additions for conversion from a dwelling to a boutique hotel including link to adjacent restaurant (C3 to C1) - Revised Application.

Associated Documents:

<http://tinyurl.com/ha3c8un>

10(2) APP/16/01199 - Tree at The Parchment, Havant

45 - 54

Proposal: Prune 1No. Lime (T1) to provide clearance of lamp post by 1m, subject to TPO 1509; crown reduce 1No. Sycamore (T1) by 2m back to previous pruning points, subject to TPO 1694

Associated Documents:
<http://tinyurl.com/zlhodpd>

10(3) APP/16/01200 - 19 The Parchment, Havant, PO9 1HD 55 - 66

Proposal: Crown reduce height of 1No. Bay by 3m back to previous pruning points; crown reduce 1No. Turkey Oak by 2m back to previous pruning points; crown reduce in height 1No. Alder by 3.5m and laterals by 2m back to previous pruning points. All trees within Conservation Area of St Faiths.

Associated Documents:
<http://tinyurl.com/zeyyu25>

11 Nomination of Chairman 67 - 68

To consider the nomination of Chairman for the next meeting of the Development Management Committee in accordance with the rota.

GENERAL INFORMATION

IF YOU WOULD LIKE A VERSION OF THIS AGENDA IN LARGE PRINT, BRAILLE, AUDIO OR IN ANOTHER LANGUAGE PLEASE CONTACT DEMOCRATIC SERVICES ON 023 92 446 231

Internet

This agenda and its accompanying reports can also be found on the Havant Borough Council website: www.havant.gov.uk. Would you please note that committee reports are subject to changes and you are recommended to regularly check the website and to contact *Jack Caine* (tel no: 023 92446230) on the afternoon prior to the meeting for details of any amendments issued.

Public Attendance and Participation

Members of the public are welcome to attend the Public Service Plaza and observe the meetings. If you wish to address the Committee on a matter included in the agenda, you are required to make a request in writing (an email is acceptable) to the Democratic Services Team. A request must be received by 5pm on **Tuesday, 10 January 2017**. Requests received after this time and date will not be accepted

In all cases, the request must briefly specify the subject on which you wish to speak and whether you wish to support or speak against the matter to be discussed. Requests to make a deputation to the Committee may be sent:

By Email to: jack.caine@havant.gov.uk or DemocraticServicesTeam@havant.gov.uk

By Post to :

Democratic Services Officer
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant, Hants P09 2AX

Delivered at:

Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant, Hants P09 2AX

marked for the Attention of the "Democratic Services Team"



Havant

BOROUGH COUNCIL

PROTOCOL AT MEETINGS – RULES OF DEBATE

Rules of Debate

- Councillors must always address each other as “Councillor ...” and must always address the meeting through the Chairman;
- A motion must relate to the business included on the agenda or accepted by the meeting as urgent business
- A motion must be proposed and seconded before it is debated until it is either accepted or rejected by a vote;
- An amendment can be proposed to the original motion and this must be seconded before it is debated;
- The mover of an original motion may, with the consent of the mover of an amendment, incorporate an amendment into the motion;
- Only one amendment may be moved at a time. No further amendments can be moved until the previous amendment has been dealt with;
- Each amendment must be voted on separately;
- If an amendment is carried, the amended motion becomes the substantive motion to which further amendments may be moved;
- If an amendment is lost, other amendments may be moved to the original motion.
- The mover may withdraw an amendment at any time
- After an amendment has been carried, the Chairman will read out the amended (substantive) motion, before accepting any further amendment, or if there are none, put it to the vote.

Voting

- Voting may be by a show of hands or by a ballot at the discretion of the Chairman;
- Councillors may not vote unless they are present for the full duration of the item;
- Where there is an equality of votes, the Chairman may exercise a second (casting) vote;
- Two Councillors may request, before a vote is taken, that the names of those voting be recorded in the minutes
- Councillors may not vote unless they are in the meeting for the full debate on any particular item
- A Councillor may request that his/her vote be recorded in the minutes

Order of Business

Please note that the agenda order will be revised so that “uncontested” items are considered prior to 6 pm. The Contact Officer for this agenda can be contacted on (023) 9244 6232) on the afternoon prior to the meeting for details of the revised order, details of which are circulated at the meeting.

Who To Contact If You Wish To Know The Outcome Of A Decision

If you wish to know the outcome of a particular item please contact the Contact Officer (contact details are on page i of the agenda)

Disabled Access

The Public Service Plaza has full access and facilities for the disabled.

Emergency Procedure

Please ensure that you are familiar with the location of all emergency exits which are clearly marked. In the unlikely event of an emergency an alarm will sound.

PLEASE EVACUATE THE BUILDING IMMEDIATELY.


DO NOT RE-ENTER THE BUILDING UNTIL AUTHORISED TO DO SO

No Smoking Policy

The Public Service Plaza operates a strict No Smoking policy in all of its offices, corridors, meeting rooms and toilets.

Parking

Pay and display car parking is available in the Leisure Centre car park opposite the Civic Offices as shown on the attached plan.



BUS STOP KEY

Services	Bus Stop
20, 21, 39, 63	1
20, 21, 36**, 39	2
23, 36**	3
23, 27**, 37	4
23, 27**, 36**, 37	5

** - also stops "hail and ride" opposite Stop 1 in Civic Centre Road



Public Service Plaza
 Civic Centre Road
 Havant
 Hampshire PO9 2AX

This page is intentionally left blank

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 8 December 2016

Present

Councillors Buckley, Hughes, Keast, Patrick, Perry, Quantrill and Satchwell

58 Appointment of Chairman

RESOLVED that Cllr Clare Satchwell would be chairman for the meeting.

59 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

60 Minutes

It was RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

61 Matters Arising

There were none.

62 Site Viewing Working Party Minutes

The committee received the minutes of the meeting held on the 1 December

63 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations on interest relating to matters on the agenda.

64 Chairman's Report

The Chairman reported that the Havant Borough Council Local Housing Statement 2036 had been approved by Full Council on the 7 December 2016 and it was important for officers and members to work together to deliver the most positive developments possible for the benefit of the residents in the Borough.

65 Matters to be Considered for Site Viewing and Deferment

There were none.

66 Deputations

The following deputation requests were noted by the committee:

- (1) Cllr Edward Rees (Ward Councillor) – APP/16/00928 Aura House, New Road, Havant

67 APP/16/00928 - Aura House, New Road, Havant, PO91DE

(The site was viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party)

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning Services to refuse permission.

The Committee received supplementary information, circulated prior to the meeting which:

- (1) Detailed the level of occupation of Aura House
- (2) Detailed the number of separate business operating at Aura House

The Committee was addressed by the following depute:

- (1) Cllr Edward Rees who objected to the officers recommendation and supported the proposal for the following reasons:

- a) The proposal would provide space for businesses and employment in a ward that has a need.
- b) The initial build of Aura House was very successful and the proposal would seek to increase economic growth.
- c) The grounds for refusal were a subjective judgement and the proposal would seek to add variety and character to the area.
- d) The proposal had not generated any objections from members of the public or ward Councillors
- e) The proposal was in line with Havant Borough Council's parking policy and had not received objections from the Highways Authority
- f) The proposal was supported by a strong business case for further development of the site

The committee discussed the application in detail together with the views raised during the deputation.

Members of the committee considered the economic benefits of the proposal to the local businesses and prosperity of the Borough. Although there were some perceived projected benefits to employment and business in the area, the committee also considered the significant environmental impacts of the proposal and its location. It was considered that the proposal constituted an overdevelopment of the site and was, due to its bulk and prominent location, unsympathetic to the character of the area and an incongruous feature to the street scene. It was therefore

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning be authorised to refuse permission for application APP/16/00928 for the following reason:

1. The proposed Office Extension would by reason of its prominent siting, design, size, materials, height, mass and bulk have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area, detract from the appearance⁴ of the existing building and represent an overdevelopment of this shallow and constricted site. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**68 APP/16/01110 - Boundary Wall in front of 101 - 109 North Street
Emsworth, PO10 7PH**

The Committee considered the written report from the Head of Planning to grant permission.

In response to questions raised by the committee, officers advised that:

1. The variation to the original planning approval was due to further investigation into the retaining wall revealing that part of the wall was safe to repair.

The Committee discussed the application in detail and found no reasons for refusal. It was therefore

RESOLVED that Head of Planning be authorised to grant permission for APP/16/01110 subject to the following conditions:

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission
reason: to comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

- Diversion plan – 001
 - Retaining wall replacement plans and long section – DN 11/003B
 - Materials arrangement – DN: 11/002A
 - Site compound arrangement – DN: 11/003A

reason: to ensure provision of satisfactory development

- 3. The areas of land required to be altered to construct the wall at the front of No's 101-109 North Street shall be reinstated to the previous ground level unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

reason: in the interests of the amenities of the properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

69 Nomination of Chairman

It was RESOLVED that Cllr Gary Hughes be nominated as Chairman for the next meeting of the Development Management Committee.

The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 6.15 pm

.....

Chairman

NON EXEMPT

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Management Committee

APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS REPORT BY THE EXECUTIVE HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Applications to be determined by the Council as the Local Planning Authority

Members are advised that all planning applications have been publicised in accordance with the Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at Minute 207/25/6/92, and have been referred to the Development Management Committee in accordance with the Delegation Procedure for Determining Planning Applications 'Red Card System' approved at minutes 86(1)/4/97 and 19/12/97.

All views of consultees, amenity bodies and local residents will be summarised in the relevant report only if received prior to the report being prepared, **otherwise** only those views contrary to the recommendation of the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment will be reported **verbally** at the meeting of the Development Management Committee.

Members are reminded that all letters received are placed upon the application file and are available for Development Management Committee Members to read on request. Where a member has concerns on such matters, they should speak directly to the officer dealing with the planning application or other development control matter, and if appropriate make the time available to inspect the file and the correspondence thereon prior to the meeting of the Development Management Committee.

The coded conditions and reasons for refusal included in the recommendations are set out in full in the Council's Manual of Model Conditions and Reasons for Refusal. The standard conditions may be modified to meet the specific circumstances of each individual application. Members are advised to bring their copies to the meeting of the Development Management Committee.

In reaching decisions on the applications for development and other development control matters regard should be paid to the approved development plan, all other material considerations, the views of consultees, the recommendations of the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment, and where applicable the views of the Site Viewing Working Party.

The following abbreviations are frequently used in the officers' reports:

EHPBR	Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment
HCSPR	Hampshire County Structure Plan - Review
HBLP	Havant Borough Local Plan (comprising the adopted Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies from the District Wide Local Plan 2005. A related emerging document is the Draft Allocations Plan 2012)
HWLP	Hampshire, Portsmouth & Southampton Minerals & Waste Local Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework 2012
HBCCAR	Havant Borough Council Conservation Area Review
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CA	Conservation Area
LB	Listed Building included in the list of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SINC	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
SPA	Site identified as a Special Protection Area for the protection of birds under the Ramsar Convention
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
FP	Definitive Footpath
POS	Public Open Space
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
HBC	Havant Borough Council
GPDO	Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order
DMPO	Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2010 amended
UCO	Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order
S106	Section 106 Agreement
Ha.	Hectare(s)
m.	Metre(s)

RECOMMENDATIONS

To reach decisions on the applications for development and other matters having regard to the approved development plan, all other material considerations, the views of consultees, the recommendations of the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment, and where applicable the views of the Site Viewing Working Party.

Implications

Resources:

None unless detailed in attached report.

Legal:

Details set in the individual reports

Strategy:

The efficient determination of applications and making of other decisions under the Town & Country Planning Acts in an open manner, consistent with the Council's planning policies, Regional Guidance and Central Government Advice and Regulations seeks to ensure the appropriate use of land in the public interest by the protection and enhancement of the natural and historic environment; the promotion of the economy; the re-use of existing buildings and redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites; and the promotion of higher densities and good quality design in all new development all of which matters assist in promoting the aims of the Council's Community Strategy.

Risks:

Details set out in the individual reports

Communications:

Details set out in the individual reports

Background Papers:

Individual Applications with Case Officers

Andrew Biltcliffe
Head of Planning

Nick Leach
Monitoring Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

Site Address: 23 South Street, Emsworth, PO10 7EG
Proposal: Alterations and additions for conversion from a dwelling to a boutique hotel including link to adjacent restaurant (C3 to C1) - Revised Application.
Application No: APP/16/01113 Expiry Date: 17/01/2017
Applicant: Mr Ralls
Oyster Pearl Ltd.
Agent: Mr Critchley Case Officer: Tina Pickup
Martin Critchley, Architect
Ward: Emsworth

Reason for Committee Consideration: At the request of Councillor Cresswell

HPS Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

Executive Summary

The proposed development is for alterations and additions enabling the site to be used as a boutique hotel in connection with the Woosters restaurant adjacent (under the same ownership). The use of the building as a hotel is fully supported and a previous application (APP/15/00928) has been granted with extensions and roof alterations that largely retained the traditional roof form and eaves contiguous with No 21. This application proposes a different mansard style and parapet roof design and it is the visual impact of this revised roof design that is the relevant issue, not the use of the building. The site lies within Emsworth Conservation Area and is immediately adjacent a Listed Building (No 25) and the proposed design is considered to be overly bulky and detrimental to the architectural composition and integrity of this section of South Street, being significantly harmful to these designated heritage assets. It is therefore recommended that the application be refused planning permission.

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located on South Street in Emsworth, in the centre of the Emsworth Conservation Area and the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Located within the defined town centre, South Street is a mixture of residential dwellings and commercial units. There is a public car park located at the rear of the site which has entry and exit points on South Street. No. 23 South Street is a two-storey detached property, built alongside No. 25, (a Listed Building in use as a restaurant, Woosters) and No. 21, a public house, The Coal Exchange. There is a row of Listed terraced cottages opposite the site.
- 1.2 The application site, No. 23, is a detached two storey dwelling of post war construction, finished with a mix of painted render to the ground floor and bricks to first floor, beneath a clay tiled roof. It has an enclosed rear yard with a detached outbuilding.

2 Planning History

APP/15/00928 - Alterations and additions for conversion from a dwelling to a boutique hotel including link to adjacent restaurant (C1 to C3), approved under APP/14/01165. PERMITTED, 04/11/2015

3 Proposal

- 3.1 As can be seen with the planning history, approval has already been granted at 23 South Street for the conversion of the dwelling into a 7no bedroom boutique hotel. This included raising of the ridge height, front and rear pitched roof dormer windows, a two-storey rear extension and a glazed atrium to link the hotel to the adjacent restaurant at No. 25 South Street known as Woosters, which is under the same ownership. The intention would be to run the restaurant and hotel as complementary businesses.
- 3.2 The initial plans for (APP/15/00928) did propose a mansard style roof design. However, following concerns raised at the time from both the Conservation Officer and Chichester Harbour Conservancy, the plans were amended part way through the application to a more sympathetic design which received planning approval. This amendment did include raising the ridge height by 0.39m but essentially retained the existing roof style and included small, pitched roof style dormer windows (see Appendices D and E).
- 3.3 The current application returns to the originally proposed mansard style roof with parapet, the reason for which is to achieve a larger room within the roof space. The raising of the overall ridge would be 0.205m which is marginally lower than the approved scheme however, the style of this roof extension is considerably different in terms of its visual impact.

A mansard style roof can be described as:

'A four sided gambrel style hip roof characterised by two slopes on each of its sides with the lower slope, punctured by dormer windows, at a steeper angle than the upper'.

A parapet can be described as:

'A parapet is a barrier which is an extension of the wall at the edge of a roof, terrace, balcony, walkway or other structure.'

- 3.4 Overall the number of bedrooms within the hotel would reduce from 7 (approved) to 6 (proposed). The design of the frontage would also alter in that it would include more fenestration and a parapet wall, in order to achieve a more distinctive Georgian style frontage.
- 3.5 In terms of materials, the proposed finish would be render and stone coloured paint. All new windows would be painted softwood. The glazed atrium would include a wooden frame also. The roof materials would comprise of a lead mansard and dormers, with the rear extension being plain clay tiles.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
especially Chapter 2 Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres
Chapter 7 Requiring Good Design
Chapter 12 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

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)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS4	(Town, District and Local Centres)
CS5	(Tourism)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM14	(Car and Cycle Parking on Development (excluding residential))

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM20	(Historic Assets)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL3	(Town, District and Local Centres)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable to site itself; adjacent to a Grade II Listed Building (No.25).

Conservation Area: Emsworth

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer - Objection

The main planning considerations relevant to this application are design and Conservation – namely the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the Emsworth Conservation Area and the appearance of South Street in particular.

Character of South Street:

From the Market Square, South Street narrows and leads southwards falling gently to the quayside. This slight change in level downwards from the centre adds to the attraction. Its buildings are mostly simple, small shops and houses which are predominantly two to two and a half storeys. Rarely does a building exceed this to 3 full storeys. The narrow frontages of these plots give the buildings a strong vertical emphasis, which is reflected in the general proportions of elevations, shop fronts, windows and doors. Where infill development has occurred over the years, by conforming to these constraints or 'streetscape rules' of height and width, new development has usually reflected the domestic scale and materials of historic buildings within the Conservation Area. Those that have been constructed with traditional roof treatments and in scale have harmonised more successfully with their surroundings.

Existing Building:

The existing building dates from 1949 (Plaque LW.GM). It is of appropriate scale and proportions and sits easily within the general street scene. It is constructed of poor quality materials – reflective of post war shortages at this time. The front is part render, part facing brick with Flettons used on the remaining elevations. The roof tiles appear to be clay but are shot, the face of the tiles is beginning to delaminate. There is a squat chimney which makes little visual contribution to the conservation area. Timber fenestration is used but of low quality. A modern garage door has been inserted/replacing earlier doors. The building makes a neutral contribution to the conservation area. Its replacement/upgrading using a more sympathetic palette of materials and improved design would enhance the conservation area. The key issue therefore is not the quality of the existing building or any impact on its architectural/historic interest; but the form and quality of the intended replacement/rejuvenated building.

The Proposals:

Although described as a change of use the scheme involves a substantial element of intervention/rebuild and enlargement. Whereas the current building knits successfully into the visual fabric of the street, the proposed reworking creates a building that will stand apart from its neighbours by virtue of its scale and bulk. There are essentially three strands to the proposal, apart from the change of use, which in conservation terms is not particularly controversial. These are:-

1. Raising the height of the building fronting South Street through the creation of a parapet and addition of what is described as a mansard.
2. A two storey rear addition is proposed which adopts a traditional half hipped roof form.
3. Single storey rear extension

Policy Context:

Before proceeding to consider the policy context of the NPPF, it is of primary importance that the correct weight should be attributed to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building from the outset, in accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990:

“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”

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 need for the decision taker to attach considerable or special weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings has been reinforced through two recent high court decisions of: *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited vs. East Northamptonshire District Council et al* (2014); and *North Norfolk District Council vs. DCLG and Mack* (2014).

The above statute and its subsequent and consistent interpretation in recent high court decisions emphasises the need for the policies of the NPPF to be implemented whilst always having regard to the need to give special or greater weight to the preservation of the setting of a listed building.

Where the impact on the setting of a listed building has been assessed in accordance with paragraphs 128 to 132 of the Framework, and has been found to fall within the category of ‘less than substantial harm’ (i.e. paragraph 134), then it is still important that when considering the balance exercise, and therefore the public benefits of any such proposal, that from the outset this is consciously weighed in favour of the need to preserve the setting of the listed building.

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. This supersedes PPS 5, however, English Heritage (web-site 23 April 2012) advises that “the Practice Guide (HEPPG) remains a valid and Government endorsed document pending Government’s review of guidance

supporting national planning policy as set out in its response to the select Committee”.

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 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 (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:

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 of the Proposals:

Mansard roof/second floor extension

While the current building has little individual merit, the proposed design would be unsympathetic due to its design, form, height and marked increase in mass. A full view of the bulky mansard will be gained from South Street when looking towards and from the Harbour. The proposals are over ambitious and not something I could support for these reasons.

This is a similar scheme to initial plans that were submitted for APP/15/00928. I

objected to these proposals with recommendations to alter the scheme in a more sympathetic manner. Further amended plans were submitted by the agent that were deemed appropriate which resulted in the application being approved under the same application reference.

As I have previously commented there is a strong objection to the proposed mansard roof extension on conservation grounds. The proposal site, Coal Exchange PH and 25 South Street and adjacent buildings on the western side of South Street have an existing roofline almost unspoiled by any type of alteration. The addition of a Mansard roof will interrupt the existing roofline of these buildings and detract significantly from the character, introducing an incongruous feature into the roofscape.

It is also considered that raising the height of this building which sits between The Coal Exchange and 25 South Street would have an intrusive impact upon its appearance by unbalancing the unity of the architectural composition and further breaking the original and unique integrity of this historic design. The roofline pattern and rhythm would be clumsily interrupted by the proposed mansard roof extension.

The extension would constitute a dominant and bulky addition and it is, therefore considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the character of the building and to the uniformity of roof form in the terrace and the wider conservation area.

Rear extension

A two storey rear addition is proposed which adopts a traditional half hipped roof form. The proposed two storey extension appears subordinate in nature and is therefore of an acceptable size and massing on the host building. The roof form and design of the extension would also respect the character of the property.

Single storey rear extension

The single storey rear extension potentially has the least visual impact and all other things being equal is potentially acceptable. It is of a design and size that would not cause any adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area. The extension is also in keeping with existing property and would not appear overly dominant or out of character.

In accordance with the NPPF I believe the degree of harm to the heritage assets (nearby listed building and conservation area) would be significant, but on balance, less than substantial. In this context, the NPPF requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Planning Permission APP/15/00928, if implemented, would be sympathetic to the Historic Environment.

Recommendation:

Refuse:

The proposed roof extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Emsworth Conservation Area by reason of its height, scale, bulk, detailed design and prominence in the street scene and wider roofscape of the conservation area and would fail to comply with 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.

Development Engineer - no adverse comment to this application.

Natural England -

Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection

Natural England has assessed this application using the Impact Risk Zones data (IRZs). Natural England advises your authority that the proposal, if undertaken in strict accordance with the details submitted, is not likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and Ramsar and Solent Maritime SAC has been classified. Natural England therefore advises that your Authority is not required to undertake an Appropriate Assessment to assess the implications of this proposal on the site's conservation objectives.¹

In addition, Natural England is satisfied that the proposed development being carried out in strict accordance with the details of the application, as submitted, will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the Chichester Harbour SSSI has been notified. We therefore advise your authority that this SSSI does not represent a constraint in determining this application.

Protected landscapes

The proposed development is for a site within or close to a nationally designated landscape namely Chichester Harbour AONB. Natural England advises that the planning authority uses national and local policies, together with local landscape expertise and information to determine the proposal. The statutory purpose of the AONB is to conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty. You should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm that statutory purpose.

Protected species

We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species. You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.

Biodiversity enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy:

The Conservancy maintains its previous objection.

Objection to APP/15/00928 (prior to amended plans being submitted):

Whereas the Conservancy takes no issue with the proposed use, to be used in conjunction with the restaurant at 25 South Street under APP/14/01165, there are real concerns about the remodelling of the roof, to form a mansard roof. The Conservancy considers this would be visually discordant and not meet the tests of CS11, CS12, CS16, DM9 and DM20, which are given further expression in the Emsworth Conservation Area Character Appraisal/Management Plan and the following Built Environment Design Considerations of the Emsworth Design Statement: 3.3 (Harm to character of the street), 3.5 (Not in scale with its neighbours), 3.7 (Discordant to consistent roof line of its neighbours), 3.8 (Number of dormer windows considered disproportionate to roof surface, given the character of other dormer windows in the immediate surrounds), 3.9 (Loss of chimney which adds character to the roofscape), 3.10/3.11 (No consideration given to salvaging and re-use of existing plain tiles) and 3.22 (Overall erosion of the character of the Conservation Area).

Whilst it is appreciated that the applicant needs to increase headroom to create the 'loft' accommodation, altering the pitch to increase the roof height to be no higher than the ridge level of the Coal Exchange PH, may be an option to achieve that.

With fewer (say 3) and more discrete dormer windows to the front and perhaps a single wider dormer to the rear to give headroom at the top of the staircase and maybe only one bedroom with associated en-suite, perhaps some revised plans could be negotiated, re-using the existing plain tiles. The Conservancy therefore lodges a holding objection at this time, but is supportive of the overall aim to create a quality boutique hotel that would bring people to enjoy the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and act as a base for people to explore the area.

Economic Development - Retail and Town Centres:

Support the application as it will increase employment in the area and bring further economic benefits from visitors.

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: 44

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 02/12/2016

Number of representations received: None at the time of drafting this report (publicity expiry 20/12/2016)

Members will be updated in the event that any representations are received prior to the Committee meeting.

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 the design within the Conservation Area and AONB, and in relation to the adjacent Listed Building
- (iii) Impact on the neighbouring properties
- (iv) Effect on the town centre
- (v) Parking
- (vi) Developer Contributions

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within a town centre location as defined by Policy CS4 of the Local Plan. The proposal is for a tourism use which is defined by CS4 as a town centre use. Policy CS5 states that planning permission will be granted for appropriate development proposals that provide hotel and other types of tourist accommodation. The principle of the development, in terms of its use, has already been accepted through the granting of planning permission for the earlier application (APP15/00928). However, the revised proposal is subject to other development management considerations such as the impact on the conservation area of the revised design approach which is discussed in more detail below.

- (ii) Appropriateness of the design within the Conservation Area and AONB, and in relation to the adjacent Listed Building

Relevant Planning Policy Consideration:

- 7.3 The site is located on South Street within the centre of the Emsworth Conservation Area. It is also immediately adjacent to a Grade II Listed Building (No. 25). Given this context the local planning authority has a statutory duty to ensure that the impact of development proposals on the conservation area and the setting of the Listed Building are given considerable weight. The National Planning Policy Framework (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 NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset (conservation areas and listed buildings), 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.

In addition, Local Plan policies CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough), Policy CS16 (Design) and Allocations Plan Policy DM20 (Historic Assets) are relevant. Policy CS11 advises that planning permission will be granted for development that protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas.

- 7.4 With regards to the setting of the Listed Building, Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 advises that:

“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”

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.

- 7.5 In terms of urban form, the Emsworth Conservation Area is that of a small, historic harbourside town and the character of the old historic core remains and it has generally managed to retain its small scale, intimate character and charm. The Emsworth Conservation Area Character Appraisal (adopted in 2010) recognises the differing features of the Conservation Area and identifies two main character sub-areas and within these, describes distinct roads/areas. It is noteworthy that the application site does not fall within the High Street which is characterised by dignified 3 storey Georgian buildings

but rather is sited within the low key, simpler area of South Street and the Town Quay. The Conservation Officer describes the character of South Street as follows:

'From the Market Square, South Street narrows and leads southwards falling gently to the quayside. This slight change in level downwards from the centre adds to the attraction. Its buildings are mostly simple, small shops and house which are predominately two to two and a half storeys. Rarely does a building exceed this to 3 full storeys. The narrow frontages of these plots give the buildings a strong vertical emphasis, which is reflected in the general proportions of elevations, shop fronts, windows and doors. Where infill development has occurred over the years, by conforming to these constraints or 'streetscape rules' of height and width, new development has usually reflected the domestic scale and materials of historic buildings within the Conservation Area. Those that have been constructed with traditional roof treatments and in scale have harmonised more successfully with their surroundings'.

The Emsworth Conservation Area Character Appraisal (adopted in 2010) states:

'From the market square the street narrows and lead southwards falling gently down the quayside. Its buildings are mostly simple, small shops and houses' (para 3.10)

Impact of the revised roof design:

- 7.6 The proposal would include the raising of the ridge height by 0.205m and the building up of the roof mass by incorporating a 'mansard' style roof and parapet wall. The north and south elevation drawings and sections (see **Appendices G and J**) show the change to roof profile which would include a flat section 2.8m wide and flat roof dormers. The existing pitch is 40 degrees and the proposed mansard has a pitch of 60 degrees, which, together with the flat top results in a bulky box like profile. The other significant change is within the eaves line - the approved plans kept the eaves line contiguous with No 21, the Coal Exchange PH, whereas the current proposal utilises a parapet which has the visual effect of increasing the eaves compared to adjacent buildings. It is this change to roof profile and additional bulk, and its effect on the skyline, particularly when set between two traditional roof profiles, that is considered to be the key issue in the determination of this application. By contrast the two storey and single storey rear extensions largely follow the design principles of the previous approval and no objection is raised in design terms to these more traditionally-designed additions to the building.
- 7.7 In his response, the Conservation Officer has raised concerns with the mansard roof element of the scheme. In comparison to that previously approved, this design would be unsympathetic due to its design, form, height and marked increase in mass. The proposal site, Coal Exchange PH and 25 South Street and adjacent buildings on the western side of South Street have an existing roofline almost unspoiled by any type of alteration. The proposed roof extension would be clearly visible from the conservation area as a full view of the bulky "mansard" will be gained from South Street when looking towards and from the Harbour. It would also interrupt the existing roofline of these buildings and detract significantly from the character, introducing an incongruous feature into the roofscape. It would have an intrusive visual impact by unbalancing the unity of the architectural composition and further breaking the original and unique integrity of this historic design. The roofline pattern and rhythm would be clumsily interrupted by the proposed mansard roof extension.
- 7.8 This concern is emphasised by Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC) who raised an objection to the original proposals in APP/15/00928 which is now being proposed again in the roof form for this application. CHC advise they have real concerns over a mansard style roof which would be visually discordant and harmful to the character of the Emsworth Conservation Area and the Chichester Harbour AONB, being contrary to local Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

7.9 Overall therefore it is considered that the mansard roof extension would constitute a dominant and bulky addition which would be detrimental to the character of the building and to the uniformity of roof form in the terrace and the wider conservation area. This is clearly contrary to the areas of policy concerned with the protection and enhancement of designated heritage assets as set out in para 7.3 both at a national and local level and policies concerned with high quality design and for this reason should be recommended for refusal unless there are compelling reasons indicating a decision should be taken to the contrary.

(iii) Impact upon neighbouring properties

7.10 The neighbour to the south of the site No. 25 is the restaurant business which will operate in conjunction with the hotel. The neighbour to the north at No. 21 is the Coal Exchange Public House. This has a large extension at the rear which extends along the shared boundary. The proposed two-storey extension would extend out the northern half of the building by 5.595m with a width of 4.34m and would include a half hip on the gable end of the roof. The extension would not impede past the rear building line of the adjacent extension so the visual impact of the extension, from the pub garden at the rear of No. 21, would be limited. No windows are proposed for the north elevation of the extension. Application APP/15/00928 has already approved a similar two storey rear projection of dimensions 5.615m x 4.480m.

7.11 The southern half of the building would be extended with a 8.7m deep single storey conservatory style extension having a lantern roof. This would provide dining space and would link to the adjacent Woosters restaurant. This single storey extension does not impede past the rear building of No 25 and would have limited impact.

(iv) Effect on the town centre

7.12 Policy CS4 supports development proposals which enhance the evening economy of the town centres, retain and enhance local markets, supports small and independent businesses and encourages high quality, mixed use development in designated centres that retain active ground floor frontages. The hotel would attract a flow of visitors to the town centre, providing the opportunity to utilise other small businesses such as pubs, restaurants and shops. Whilst the ground floor would not be active in terms of a shop front, it would be more active as a result of visitor arrivals and departures than the existing dwelling which offers no active frontage. It is considered that the loss of a dwelling is outweighed by the benefits of a new business within a designated town centre location. Policy CS5 supports proposals which provide additional hotels in the Borough and identifies Emsworth Town Centre and its harbour as distinctive tourism locations. It also advises that town centres will be favoured for new hotels in order to promote their vitality and viability. The proposal therefore accords with both policy CS4 and CS5 by offering a new hotel in both a defined town centre location and recognised tourism hub, and it is noted that the Economic Development team support the application.

7.13 However, it is noteworthy that the LPA has already offered its support for the principal of the business in its granting of permission APP/15/00928. That layout provided 7 en-suite bedrooms for the boutique hotel. The applicants have not implemented this scheme in preference for the current layout which would provide a reception area and 6 rooms, one being in the enlarged roof as a VIP suite. However it is a speculative business decision that predicts this VIP suite and reception area would be popular and more lucrative than the approved 7 room layout. No proven need has been demonstrated for this particular design and layout and the LPA is of the view that the benefits associated with a boutique hotel have been adequately supported in the extant permission. There have therefore been no compelling grounds put forward for the form of development proposed – as opposed to that approved – which would indicate that a decision should be taken contrary

to the design conclusions in part (ii) of this report.

(v) Parking

- 7.14 The proposal does not include any specified parking provision for visitors or staff. However, this is similar to the majority of other businesses within the town centre. Immediately to the rear of the site is a large public car park which can provide overnight parking and on street parking and other car parks are within reasonable walking distance. Being located within a town centre, the site is also sustainable in terms of being accessible via bus and train. A bike store is provided in the rear external space with long stay cycle parking for staff. The Highways Officer has been consulted and does not raise any objections.

(vi) Developer Contributions

- 7.15 No contributions are required for this development – the form of development being not liable to Community Infrastructure Levy or Solent Recreation Mitigation Project contributions.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposal to convert the property to a boutique hotel has previously been supported in principle and permission was granted under APP/15/00928 for this use of the application site with appropriately-designed additions. The proposed use is therefore supported; however, the current application returns to a design which incorporates a mansard style roof and parapet extension. This was previously found to be unacceptable and remains so as it would have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area and setting of the adjacent Listed Building. As such the current proposal is contrary to local and national planning policy which relates to the protection of designated heritage assets, and there are no compelling reasons why these policies should be set aside. For this reason the application is recommended for refusal.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/16/01113 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed mansard style roof extension on a building which sits in between No. 25 South Street and the Coal Exchange Public House, by reason of its height, scale, bulk, detailed design and prominence in the street scene and wider roofscape of the conservation area, would have an intrusive impact on the setting of the adjacent Listed Building at No. 25 South Street and the character of the Emsworth Conservation Area and streetscene, by unbalancing the unity of the architectural composition of this section of South Street and further breaking the original and unique integrity of this historic design. For this reason, the proposal would fail to comply with policies CS11 and CS16 (1a) of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, policy DM20 of the Havant Allocations Plan 2014 and national guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.


Appendices:

- Appendix A Location Plan noting Listed Buildings
- Appendix B Existing Elevations
- Appendix C Existing Floor Plans
- Appendix D Approved East and North Elevations (from APP/15/00928)
- Appendix E Approved West and South Elevations (from APP/15/00928)
- Appendix F Proposed East and North Elevations
- Appendix G Proposed West and South Elevations
- Appendix H Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- Appendix I Proposed Floor Plans
- Appendix J Draft Sections
- Appendix K Site Street Scene Photo

This page is intentionally left blank


LOCATION PLAN

APPENDIX A



© Crown copyright and database rights Ordnance Survey. Licence number 100019217

Listed Buildings



23 South Street, Emsworth
APP/16/01113
 Scale: 1:1250


Please note objectors and supporters are not marked on this plan.

Havant
 BOROUGH COUNCIL
 © Havant Borough Council


This page is intentionally left blank




EAST



NORTH




WEST




SOUTH

This page is intentionally left blank




FIRST



ROOF


This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank



WEST
4480 PROPOSED ADDITION
4300 PROPOSED ATRIUM




NEW ROOF
8685 PROPOSED ATRIUM
SOUTH

This page is intentionally left blank




This page is intentionally left blank




This page is intentionally left blank




This page is intentionally left blank



FIRST




SECOND



ROOF

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

Site Address: 19 The Parchment, Havant, PO9 1HD

Proposal: Prune 1No. Lime (T1) to provide clearance of lamp post by 1m, subject to TPO 1509; crown reduce 1No. Sycamore (T1) by 2m back to previous pruning points, subject to TPO 1694.

Application No: APP/16/01199

Expiry Date: 13/01/2017

Applicant: Mr D Guest

Agent: Mr M Reed

Case Officer: Jamie Gargett

Ward: St. Faiths

Reason for Committee Consideration: Application submitted on behalf of Councillor Guest

HNS Recommendation: **GRANT TPO CONSENT**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The Parchment is a modern development located within the Havant area. There are various mature trees found through the development.
- 1.2 The application proposes to prune one Lime tree which occupies a prominent location within a parking area with an overlooking aspect from both the frontage and rear of a number of properties, with passing views from the main street scene through the entrance of the parking area. The Sycamore which is also the subject of this application is located in another parking area on the opposite side of The Parchment in close proximity to a Turkey Oak tree. Similar to the Lime tree, it possesses views from the frontage of and rear of properties and can be seen from the street scene through the entrance of the parking area.

2 Planning History

98/57184/005 - Remove deadwood and epicormic growth on a Lime tree (T1) subject to TPO 1509, PERM,31/03/1998

08/72928/000 - Replacement of flat UPVC roof to existing conservatory with new UPVC pitched roof., PERM,23/05/2008

APP/13/00906 - Crown reduce 1No. Beech (T2) by 3m, subject to TPO 0979; remove epicormic growth of 1No. Lime (T1), subject to TPO 1509.,PERM,18/10/2013

APP/13/00925 - Reduce 1No. Bay by 3m in height, crown reduce 1No. Oak by 2.5m to previous pruning points; crown reduce 1No. Alder by 3m to previous pruning points; crown reduce 1No. Sycamore by 2.5m to previous pruning points; crown reduce 1No. Alder by 2.5m overall. All trees within Conservation Area of St Faiths., RNO,16/10/2013

3 Proposal

- 3.1 This report considers the application to prune one Lime tree, which is subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 1509. The tree is a mature specimen with lateral branches reaching to an adjacent lamp post approximately 3m away from the main

stem. The application requests pruning the lateral branches near to the lamp post to give a 1m clearance around it.

- 3.2 The application also proposes works to crown reduce one Sycamore, subject to Tree Preservation Order 1694. The reduction would be to the previous pruning points for the purposes of general maintenance of the tree.

4 Policy Considerations

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Tree Protection Orders: A Guide to the law and good practice 2009 and addendum 2009/2012.

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Principal Conservation Planner

No objection received for this application

Senior Landscape Architect

Officer raises no objection to the tree work.

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: 1

Number of representations received: 0

7 Planning Considerations

- 7.1 The main planning considerations include:

- i. Amenity value and condition
- ii. The basis for proposed works

i. Amenity Value and Condition

- 7.2 The Lime tree is a mature specimen in the street scene displaying what appears normal

vigour and vitality. The base is set within a rockery garden verge of the parking area. As the tree has an overlooking aspect from the frontage of a number of properties, it contributes well to the amenity of the area as well as being a long-standing feature of the landscape. The tree can be seen from the main street scene through the entrance of the parking area and can be seen from the surrounding areas having grown well above the roof tops to a height exceeding 14m.

- 7.3 The Sycamore is situated within the verge of a parking area located on the other side of The Parchment. The main stem sits approximately 3m from a Turkey Oak tree, with the base surrounded by shrubs. The tree is a semi-mature specimen that is displaying what appears normal vigour and vitality. It possesses a high amenity value with views from the frontages of the nearby dwellings and with the other nearby trees, creates an important aesthetic quality to the area.

ii. The Basis for Proposed Works

- 7.4 The proposed works to the Lime tree requests pruning to lateral branches closest to the adjacent lamp post so as to give a 1m clearance. The purpose of this application is for general maintenance and to reduce the interference of the tree on the public street lighting.
- 7.5 The crown reduction of the Sycamore by 2m is for the purposes of general maintenance which will decrease shading to the nearby properties and to preserve a good relationship between the Sycamore and the nearby Turkey Oak tree.

Summary of planning considerations

- 7.6 The works to the Lime tree as outlined in the application are considered well within a reasonable level of cyclical management for a tree of this size and maturity. The reduction around the light column to give a 1m clearance will maintain a harmonious relationship between the tree, the lamp post and the local residents.
- 7.7 The pruning will help to improve the amount of night time street lighting, which will contribute to the feeling of security of residents within the community while not causing detriment to the health of the tree or to its amenity value.
- 7.8 Similarly, the works in relation to the Sycamore tree are of a cyclical management nature that would not detriment the amenity value or the health of the tree. The crown reduction of 2m would decrease shading to the nearby properties and would manage the tree's canopy growth in relation with the Turkey Oak located close to the main stem.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 For the reasons discussed throughout this report and summarised in 7.6-7.8 above, it is recommended that the current application be permitted.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **GRANT CONSENT** for application APP/16/01199 subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The tree works for which consent is hereby granted shall not be carried out

otherwise than in full accordance with all relevant content of BS 3998 (2010).

Reason: In the interests of tree health and safety.

- 2 The tree pruning/surgery for which consent is hereby granted shall not exceed the following: Prune 1No. Lime (T1) to provide clearance of lamp post by 1m, subject to TPO 1509; crown reduce 1No. Sycamore (T1) by 2m back to previous pruning points, subject to TPO 1694..


Reason: To safeguard the health and well being of the trees and their importance in the local landscape.

- 3 The tree works for which consent is hereby granted shall be carried out and completed no later than 12/01/18.

Reason: To control the timing of the works

Appendices:

- (A) Site Location Plan
- (B) Photographs




This page is intentionally left blank



LIME

This page is intentionally left blank



SYCAMORE

This page is intentionally left blank

Site Address: 19 The Parchment, Havant, PO9 1HD

Proposal: Crown reduce height of 1No. Bay by 3m back to previous pruning points; crown reduce 1No. Turkey Oak by 2m back to previous pruning points; crown reduce in height 1No. Alder by 3.5m and laterals by 2m back to previous pruning points. All trees within Conservation Area of St Faiths.

Application No: APP/16/01200
Applicant: Mr D Guest
Agent: Mr M Reed
Ward: St. Faiths

Expiry Date: 30/12/2016
Case Officer: Jamie Gargett

Reason for Committee Consideration: Application submitted on behalf of Councillor Guest

HNS Recommendation: **RAISE NO OBJECTION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The Parchment is a modern development located within the Havant area. There are a number of mature trees found throughout the development.
- 1.2 The application proposes to crown reduce one Bay shrub which surrounds the main stem of a Scots Pine tree and is found on the boundary verge of a parking area to the rear of a number of properties.
- 1.3 Also within the application are works to a Turkey Oak tree and an Alder tree, both are located in a parking area on the northern aspect of The Parchment.
- 1.4 The Turkey Oak tree is located approximately 3m away from a Sycamore and in front of several properties, and the Alder is located to the edge of the parking area with a brick wall immediately to the north of the main stem.

2 Planning History

98/57184/005 - Remove deadwood and epicormic growth on a Lime tree (T1) subject to TPO 1509, PERM,31/03/1998
08/72928/000 - Replacement of flat UPVC roof to existing conservatory with new UPVC pitched roof., PERM,23/05/2008
APP/13/00906 - Crown reduce 1No. Beech (T2) by 3m, subject to TPO 0979; remove epicormic growth of 1No. Lime (T1), subject to TPO 1509.,PERM,18/10/2013
APP/13/00925 - Reduce 1No. Bay by 3m in height, crown reduce 1No. Oak by 2.5m to previous pruning points; crown reduce 1No. Alder by 3m to previous pruning points; crown reduce 1No. Sycamore by 2.5m to previous pruning points; crown reduce 1No. Alder by 2.5m overall. All trees within Conservation Area of St Faiths., RNO,16/10/2013

3 Proposal

- 3.1 This report considers the application to crown reduce one Bay tree by 3m to previous pruning points, a crown reduction of one Turkey Oak tree by 2m to its previous

pruning points and to crown reduce one Alder tree by 3.5m in height and laterally by 2m back to its previous pruning points. All reside within the St. Faiths Conservation Area. The stated reasons for the works are for general maintenance of the area.

4 Policy Considerations

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Tree Protection Orders: A Guide to the law and good practice 2009 and addendum 2009/2012.

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Principal Conservation Planner

No objection received for this application

Senior Landscape Architect

Officer raises no objection to the tree work.

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: 10

Number of site notices: 1

Number of representations received: 0

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 The main planning considerations include:

- i. Amenity value and condition
- ii. The basis for proposed works

i. Amenity Value and Condition

7.2 The Bay is an over mature shrub displaying what appears normal vigour and vitality. It is set in a boundary verge of the parking area and surrounds the stem of a mature Scots Pine tree. It has minimal amenity value as it cannot be viewed from the street scene but contributes to the green aesthetics of the area.

7.3 The mature Turkey Oak tree is situated within the verge of a parking area located on the other side of The Parchment. The main stem sits approximately 3m from a

Sycamore tree to the eastern aspect and the frontages of dwellings to its west, with the base surrounded by shrubs. It appears to be displaying what is normal vigour and vitality but shows signs of previous heavy pruning to maintain the relationship between the tree and the nearby homes. It possesses a good degree of public amenity value with views from the frontages of the nearby dwellings and with the other nearby trees, creates an important group value to the area.

- 7.4 The Alder is located at the boundary of the parking area with the brick wall to the north of the main stem. The tree appears to be displaying what is normal vigour and vitality and is a mature specimen of the species. The tree is overlooked by the frontages of properties in the parking area and has views from the main street scene through the entrance to the parking area. Therefore the tree possesses a high amenity and contributes well to the area.

ii. The Basis for Proposed Works

- 7.5 The proposed works to the Bay tree requests a crown reduction of 3m. The purpose of this application is for general maintenance and to reduce the encroachment of the shrub on the parking area.
- 7.6 The crown reduction of the Turkey Oak by 2m back to the previous pruning points is to keep the tree well maintained, which will decrease shading to the nearby properties and to preserve a good relationship between the Turkey Oak and the nearby Sycamore tree.
- 7.7 The Alder requires some cyclical management since the tree is producing a large amount of shading and is overhanging the boundary wall into the neighbouring property.

Summary of planning considerations

- 7.8 The works to the Bay tree outlined in the application are considered reasonable cyclical management. The reduction will help to stop any encroachment into the parking bays without detriment to the health of the tree or public amenity value.
- 7.9 A crown reduction of 2m to the Turkey Oak would decrease shading to the nearby properties and would manage the tree's canopy size in connection with the Sycamore located close to the main stem. These works would maintain the harmonious relationship between trees, buildings and residents. This level of cyclical management would not detriment the amenity value or the health of the tree.
- 7.10 The crown reduction to the Alder in height of 3.5m and reduction laterally of 2m would be an acceptable level of maintenance for a tree of this size and location without detriment to the health of the tree or its amenity value. It would minimise the intrusion over the boundary wall into the neighbouring land but continue to provide privacy for the residents.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 For the reasons discussed throughout this report and summarised in 7.8-7.10 above, it is recommended that the current application be permitted.


RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **RAISE NO OBJECTION** to

application APP/16/01200.

Appendices:

- (A) Site Location Plan
- (B) Photographs



This page is intentionally left blank



BAY

This page is intentionally left blank



TURKEY OAK

This page is intentionally left blank



ALDER

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 11

The Rota for the Chairman of the Development Management Committee for the
Municipal Year 2016/17:

Councillor Paul Buckley

Councillor David Keast

Councillor Dianna Patrick

Councillor John Perry

Councillor Lance Quantrill

Councillor Claire Satchwell

Councillor Gary Hughes

This page is intentionally left blank