

From: Stuart Bone
Sent: 21 October 2019 17:55
To: 'Weaver, Steve'
Subject: APP/19/00003 - Belmont Castle Rest Home, Portsdown Hill Road, Havant [Filed 05 Nov 2019 14:43]

Steve

I have gone back to your original e-mail on the three outstanding matters on the rear stand alone extension to Belmont Castle.

We have addressed each point you raised in turn.

Highways & parking

The submitted Transport Statement states that on completion the development would have 28 car parking spaces. We have read the response to the Transport Statement from Havant's Traffic team to you dated 11th January 2019, as below.

"The Traffic Team would like to raise the issue that the minimum parking standards for staff and visitors are not met, as per HBC Supplementary Planning Document July 2016. We would ask that should the proposal be agreed then an amount of £7000 is set aside for any Traffic regulation order that maybe needed on the surrounding road network in the 5 years after completion of the proposal. KRC "

What we read here is that if the planning officer accepts the reduced parking proposed then the Traffic Team require a payment through a presumable S106 agreement.

We have sent over the criteria for the additional parking surveys to our Transport Consultant and their response is that this will be very difficult to carry out. The existing car park is not currently marked out in parking bays and as we know this can mean that a car park which on paper has a certain capacity, in reality without bays to help staff and visitors, the capacity can be significantly reduced. Furthermore the second car park on the east of the site is only 14.2m wide at its narrowest point and at it's widest end only allows a 5 metre 'backing out zone'. As this car park is also unlined and bounded on the west by a vertical fence means that users tend to park with the vehicles leaving a further reduction in backing out space.

The conclusion by the Transport consultant was that if bays were clearly marked the capacity of the car park could be increased with further additional parking bays added as on the proposed drawings.

However despite the Transport Statement concluding that sufficient parking spaces were being provided this does not appear to be totally agreed with by council officers. Therefore we have re-looked at the landscaping and site plans to see if some improvements can be made and the results are shown on our attached revised drawings. The changes are as follows:

Front Car Park: This is the principle public view of the home and being a Grade II listed building we have been keen not to over use this car parking area. However at present it is well underused. Some lower ground floor rooms on the south elevation have windows facing onto this area and it would be unfortunate to put parking immediately in front of these windows which could be a staff carer parked there for many hours. Instead of this we have created a defensible planning zone immediately outside the windows, and created 2 No. Doctors only spaces. Doctors spaces are important for the function of the home but will not be lengthily occupied and we felt this was a good compromise.

East Car Park: Given our assessment of the shortcomings of this car park above, and the proposed reworking of the garden area particularly with the removal of the ramp feature, we feel there is an opportunity for this car park to be marginally widened to allow for a more formal parking regime to work. This will help improve access to the new extension to the rear.

Extension access road: The extension access route already exists but there is no formal turning facility. On the previously approved scheme there was a small car parking area at the east side of the new build and this was lost. However without the loss of more trees we have designed a small turning head for 'allowed' vehicles to get to the front entrance of the extension. At the end of the turning head we have shown 2 bays of double parked vehicles. These would be allocated to staff only cars and could be managed as is found in many local care home facilities. It needs to be remembered that the access road to the extension will only be used occasionally and certainly not for visitors.

Therefore the numbers are that, rather than the originally proposed 28 spaces, We have created an additional 6 spaces totalling **34 on the site**. We trust that this increase is now a sufficient increase in the parking required. If you still feel that a S106 agreement is necessary I will further discuss this with the client but we would assume that any S106 would only require payment on the start of the works on site.

Drawings attached as supporting information are as follows: 4055/1260G, 1270G, 1280G, 1290C & 1500B

Landscaping

The Landscape architect who carried out the submitted visual impact assessment has provided the tree planting scheme. He has sensibly worked together with the original Arboriculturist (eco-urban) to propose a scheme with a suitable mix of trees, well sited and addressing the points you raised directly. The amendments made to the East Car Park has seen the loss of 2 Class C trees and these are shown on the landscape Architects drawing. To mitigate their loss the Landscape architect proposes a replacement specimen tree.

Drawings attached as supporting information are as follows: Belmont Castle Planting Plan 1/200 Sept 2019 Rev A

impact of new development in the Borough on its European designated sites (SPA and SAC)

Since your e-mail it seems that HBC's policy is somewhat clearer and we have therefore concentrated on the term Nutrient Neutrality. To this end a Dr Paul Garrad a Consultant Hydrologist has prepared a report which demonstrates that the new extension will be Nutrient Neutral. In summary of this report the approach taken is that there is a current care home for 40 people already on site. There is an extant permission for an extension of 36 new rooms. Therefore with the proposed extension of 48 rooms there are effectively 12 new bedrooms which could potentially increase nutrient levels. The old care home is of an age where nothing has been done in the way of water efficiencies, and the report highlights that proposed water saving measures within the old care home will counteract the 12 new residents. See attached report: Nutrient Neutrality-Belmont Castle Care Home Extension 2.

We would respectfully ask to the LPA to take serious consideration of this mitigation strategy, it has been well considered and it needs to be remembered that Care homes requires us to present a different site specific strategy somewhat different to a typical housing scheme.

Fortunately the report has not had to go further than this in order to prove the results but as the new extension is likely to be for people requiring greater nursing care, it is highly likely that sanitary pads will be used by many of these residents and as this waste does not enter into the sewerage system (having to be bagged up and removed) the waste water from introduction of the new residents is likely to be significantly less than the report predicts.

We trust that these points support the current application and we can now progress towards an approval.

Stuart

Stuart Bone

BA (Hons) Dip Arch

DIRECTOR

e: s.bone@pwp-architects.com



PWP Architects, 61 South Street, Havant, Hants,
PO9 1BZ.

t: 023 9248 2494

f: 023 9248 1152

w: www.pwp-architects.com

This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. It may contain information that is confidential, copyright material and/or subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended addressee this e-mail has been sent to you in error and you must not copy, distribute or use it in any way whatsoever. Please inform the sender of the error immediately. This e-mail is believed to be free of viruses but it is your responsibility to carry out all necessary checks and PWP do not accept any liability in connection therewith. PWP Architects is the Trading Name of PWP Architects Ltd. Registered in England No. 3930872. Registered Office: 61 South Street, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 1BZ.