

Planning
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

14-11-2018

Dear Sir/Madame

**Design and Access Statement for a revised planning application:
New one-bedroom chalet bungalow on land adjacent to No. 8 Burgess Close,
Hayling Island.**

1.0 The revised proposal

This document accompanies a revised planning application for the construction of a new dwelling on land adjacent to No. 8 Burgess Close.

The proposed new dwelling has been reduced in size and from two-bedrooms to one-bedroom.

Following the original planning refusal (APP/18/00251), further pre-application advice was sought (GEN/18/00756). The response from case officer, Emma Chisnall, confirmed that the revised proposals addresses the concerns of the main reasons for refusal of the original planning application. I will examine this in detail in section 2 below.

The size of the proposed dwelling has been reduced from two-bedroom to one-bedroom. To achieve this the footprint of the proposal has been simplified and

reduced by over 20%. The size of the proposed one-bedroom dwelling is precisely in line with DCLG Nationally described space standards for a one-bedroom unit.

The changes significantly reduce the scale of the development and address officer concerns regarding over development and impact to the pattern of development along Burgess Close.

The division between the gardens of no.8 and the proposal has been rationalized. It runs parallel with the rear boundaries of Burgess Close. The change provides no.8 with a deeper garden. The average depth of the garden of no.8 remains 10m, as previously discussed with the case officer and senior officer on site. The proposal is provided with a very good sized, regular shaped rear garden.

Strategic planting is retained along the drive and in the front garden of no.8 to mitigate visual attenuation from Burgess Close and no.7.

The alterations to the rear fenestration of no.8 are employed and described on the drawings in order to completely mitigate overlooking from no.8.

2.0 Pre-application analysis

Due to the previous submissions and discussions with the case officer, this statement will have a slightly different format to usual. In this section I will concentrate on directly responding, where necessary, to case officer comments contained in the recent pre-application response. To this end I duplicate the officer's letter below and annotate alongside in blue.

Pre-application response, 6 September 2018:

'Site Location: 8 Burgess Close, Hayling Island, PO11 9QT
Re: Erection of 1 No one bedroom dwelling.

Dear Mr Lilley,

I am writing to you further to your enquiry received on the 24 July 2018 regarding the above address. Having dealt with the previous application for a two bedroom dwelling I am familiar with the site and do consider that there is scope for a development in the rear amenity space of No 8. Due to the previous submission, details discussed and information provided this general enquiry will have a slightly different approach and format.

The original application under APP/18/00251 applied for planning permission for a two bedroom dwelling within the rear amenity space of No 8. This application was refused in June 2018 for two reasons. One being regarding the lack of securing a financial contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy.'

I can confirm the applicant will pay the SRMS contribution in advance of the determination of this planning application.

'The second reason was as follows:

Development of the site in the manner proposed would amount to an over-development, in that it would result in a cramped and congested layout. The proposed dwelling would by reason of its size, design and siting be harmful to the existing character and appearance of the area, conflicting with the established pattern of development and spatial characteristics of the more spacious detached dwellings in the vicinity and setting of the street scene. The close proximity to adjacent dwellings and curtilage boundaries result in a poor standard of living causing detrimental affect to the residential amenity of both the future occupiers and the occupiers of No 8 Burgess Close. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

By reducing the dwellinghouse to a one bedroom proposal the scale and size of the work have been reduced which has produced a modestly sized bungalow with a footprint which reflects this. This helps alleviate the original concern over the cramped and congested layout and is considered to offer an improvement. It would be noted that the size change between the proposals is not significantly different and therefore any additional changes to reduce this further would be welcome however that said, it is considered that the changes address this aspect of the development sufficiently enough for the works to be considered worthy of a re-submission at the reduced scale.'

By the reduction from two to one bedroom the building has been reduced by over 20%, a significant change. The extent of the reduction is limited by the allowing the remaining accommodation to maintain amenity to inhabitants.

'The reduction of the developments size also reduces the impact caused to the spatial characteristics of the area and improves the concern raised over the pattern of development as the works appear proportionate to the application site and size which is available.

The position of the dwellinghouse would appear to be in close proximity to the boundaries to the rear and side and this was raised as a concern under the previous application as it was considered to adversely impact the standards of living to any occupant. What has now been altered is the internal layout so that the primary rooms are served by windows in other elevations not in close proximity to a boundary therefore affording a better view and standard of living. Windows have been removed that were along these elevations apart from a single room which is served by one window in close proximity to a boundary however this is a bathroom and is considered therefore to have an acceptable impact.

It is noted that the new proposal positions the unit in closer proximity to the boundaries than the original two bedroom proposal. Although it is understood why this has been proposed it is considered that the proposal should achieve a 1m set off and reduced scale of the works if necessary.'

In order to satisfy this request and further reduce the size of the proposal in line with previous comments, I have marginally reduced the plan further to accommodate a clearance of 1m from the boundary.

'The removal of one bedroom reduces the associated level of activity that comes with it which would offer an improvement on the proposal and is viewed favourably.

As with any proposal for a new dwelling the proposed development would be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy, details of which are available on the Council's website:

<http://www.havant.gov.uk/planning-policy-design/community-infrastructure-levy>

The relevant charging schedule is currently based on £100 per square metre for sites within Emsworth and Hayling Island; and £80 per square metre for the rest of the Borough, but with both amounts indexed according to the year.

The development would also be liable to a contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy due to the impact of new residential development on the Special Protection Area of Chichester and Langstone Harbours. The contribution is based on bedroom numbers and is currently £373.85 for a 1 bedroom unit.

Further information in relation to CIL and SRMS is provided in the Developers Contribution Guide:

<http://www.havant.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/planning-policy/community-infrastructure-levy/developer-contributions-guide>

The potential impacts caused to neighbouring amenities could only be fully assessed at the stage where an application is formally submitted. This would also depend on any representations received regarding the application from

neighbouring dwellings and could not be commented on further at this time. Any neighbour assessment would need to take into account the impact caused to No 8 Burgess close and it would be advised that with any formal submission that floor and elevation plans of No 8 are submitted. This is so that an assessment can be undergone on whether No 8 can accommodate the window alterations proposed and the rooms sufficiently served as a result. This information has not been submitted with this pre-application enquiry and therefore cannot be commented on further.'

In addition to the previously submitted rear elevation of no.8, showing the changes to the fenestration in order to mitigate overlooking of the proposal. I submit full floor plans and elevations to facilitate your assessment that no.8 is sufficiently served.

'Please be aware of the guidance offered under the Borough Design Guide when it comes to acceptable amenity spaces. A 10m deep garden space is considered to be necessary in order to serve the dwellings appropriately and from the plans submitted this is considered to be achieved.
<https://www.havant.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/SPD%20Borough%20Design%20Guide.pdf>

Conclusion

It is considered that the reduced scale of the proposal in terms of its bedroom numbers and size is worthy of a planning application. The proposal reduces the scale of development, offers positive improvements to the activity associated with the unit and standards of living to any occupier which is viewed favourably. Planning application forms can be found using the following link:

<http://www.havant.gov.uk/planning-application-forms>

The fee for this application is £462 however as the previous decision was refused and you have not had any additional submissions free of charge for the same site since that time, if you were to submit a revised application by the 11th June 2019 then this new submission would be free of charge.

I hope that this has been of use.

Please note that the above comments are the opinion of individual Planning Officers and are in no way binding upon the Council when determining any future applications for planning permission and nor will they prejudice the outcome of any applications submitted.

This advice also only relates to planning matters, and does not relate to any other application that may be required under Building Regulations or under any other Act, Regulation, Byelaw or Order where the Council's approval may be needed. For further guidance as to the need for consent under the Building Regulations please phone 02392 446571

Yours sincerely,
Emma Chisnall

Mrs E Chisnall
Planning officer
Our Ref: GEN/18/00756'

I trust the changes to the scheme since the previous planning application coupled with the subsequent further clarification and changes contained within this submission will ensure continued officer support of the proposal.

Kind regards

Roger Lilley, RIBA