
Site Address: 128A Park Avenue, Waterlooville, PO7 5DP
Proposal: Demolition of existing two storey dwelling and associated outbuildings and erection of part two and part three storey dwelling, balcony and associated works.
Application No: APP/18/01211 Expiry Date: 24/01/2019
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Spurway
Agent: Mr Potter Case Officer: Bee Crawford
 James Potter Associates
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a detached two storey property and detached double garage situated towards the eastern end of a large plot and accessed via a private drive. It has a grey tiled pitched roof and elevations of red multibrick and grey tile hanging at first floor. The site is level, although it is on a higher plane than the adjacent neighbouring properties and Park Avenue. There is open vehicular access to the front with a tarmac drive and grass verges leading to a grassed garden area to the front of the property which is approximately 30 metres deep and a 12 metre deep garden to the rear. The site is enclosed with various boundary treatments including fencing ranging in height from 1 metre to 2 metres, large mature trees and hedging.
- 1.2 The side aspect of a modern two storey detached property in The Limes is to the east, a modern two storey detached property is to the west, the rear gardens of properties in Privett Road are to the north and Purbrook Park School is to the south. The residential properties to the east, west and north are at a lower level to the site. The area is of medium density with detached and semi-detached two storey properties, chalet style dwellings and bungalows of similar and individual age, style and design, with some back land development, together with Purbrook Park School.

2 Planning History

None relevant to this application.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is for the demolition of existing two storey dwelling and associated outbuildings and erection of part two and part three storey detached seven bedroom dwelling, car port, garage, balcony and associated works.

4 Policy Considerations

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

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

- CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

CS21 (Developer Requirements)
CS9 (Housing)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

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

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist, Havant Borough Council

There are trees within the property boundary and off site in the school grounds, in close proximity to the proposed development. In order to ensure they are adequately protected during the course of development an AIA, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan will need to be submitted.

Further comments received following the submission of AIA, method statement, tree protection plan and amended plans:

I have no objection to this and the work should be carried out in strict accordance with the method statement and tree protection plan. Particular attention is drawn to paragraph 6 of the method statement. No work should start until the protective fencing is in place.

Officer comment: *Condition recommended.*

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

No adverse comments on plans as submitted. As the building already exists Requirements B5 and H6 of the Building Regulations concerning fire service and waste collection access do not apply. If the existing building were to be completely demolished these requirements would need to be enforced and the submitted plans do not appear to comply with these issues.

Officer comment: *This would be dealt with by Building Control.*

Community Infrastructure, Planning Policy & Urban Design

CIL Liable. CIL Forms should include the full name of the applicant where applicable and a request has been made to the agent to resubmit forms 1 and 7(1).

SOLENT RECREATION MITIGATION STRATEGY

See

<http://www.havant.gov.uk/unilateral-undertaking-solent-recreation-mitigation-strategy>

Please refer to Paragraph 6.3 of the strategy which requires a developer contribution for every net additional dwelling. As this is a replacement dwelling even though the bedroom numbers are increasing from 3 in the existing dwelling to 7 in the new, a contribution in this respect will not be required.

Southern Water

Southern Water would have no objections to the above proposal.

Southern Water requires a formal application for connections to the public foul and surface water sewers to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Please read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which has now been published and is available to read on our website via the following link
<https://beta.southernwater.co.uk/infrastructure-charges>.

It is the responsibility of the developer to make suitable provision for the disposal of surface water. Part H3 of the Building Regulations prioritises the means of surface water disposal in the order:

- a Adequate soakaway or infiltration system
- b Water course
- c Where neither of the above is practicable sewer

Due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119), www.southernwater.co.uk or by email at developerservices@southernwater.co.uk.

Officer comment: *An informative is recommended as per Southern Water's request. With regard to the discharge of surface water, given that this is an application for a replacement dwelling, it is considered that this issue is a matter for the Building Regulations.*

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No response received.

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

The Highway Authority have no adverse comment to this application.

Portsmouth Water Company

Portsmouth Water have no objections in principle to the proposed development, however due to the sensitivity of the groundwater environment of the proposed site we would wish to see more detail provided regarding the planned drainage and foundation designs for the site.

Site Setting

The site is located in Source Protection Zone 1c (SPZ1c) for the Havant and Bedhampton springs- an essential public water supply source. The SPZ1c relates to

subsurface activity only, where the Chalk aquifer is confined and may be impacted by deep drilling activities. Subterranean activities such as drainage solutions, site investigation boreholes and/or piling may pose a risk to groundwater quality and our supply at Havant and Bedhampton Springs.

Drainage

Based on the information provided in the application form we understand that surface water from the site will discharge via main sewers, this is acceptable to Portsmouth Water in relation to groundwater protection. Southern Water should be consulted on the feasibility of this proposal for surface water disposal.

The foul water drainage strategy for the site is additionally disposal via main sewer however no information is available to whether the proposed design comprises the connection to an existing drainage system. Portsmouth Water require the use of the highest specification pipework and designs for schemes involving new sewerage systems in SPZ1 to minimise leakage. Please provide details of the proposed foul drainage strategy for the site once available.

Piling & Foundations

The proposed site is situated in a sensitive groundwater catchment and there are potential significant risks associated with groundworks in this area.

Portsmouth Water would have an presumption against piling at this location and therefore, if piling is the proposed foundation solution, no piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, vibration and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Portsmouth Water.

Any piling, if proposed, must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Portsmouth Water require further information on foundation design be submitted for detailed consideration. This should include as a minimum:

- a) the methods to be used;
- b) the design depths of the various structures involved and rationale;
- c) the density of piling, if any; and
- d) details of materials to be removed or imported to site.

Reason: Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can pose a risk to potable supplies from, for example, turbidity, mobilisation of historical contaminants, drilling through different aquifers and creation of preferential pathways. Therefore, penetrative foundation methods have the potential to impact on the underlying groundwater and thus the Havant and Bedhampton Springs public water supply.

Officer comment: *Condition recommended.*

Waste Services Manager

No adverse comment.

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: 14

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

Comment	Officer Comment
With reference to the above planning application I submit an objection to the proposed works as submitted and give in support the following comments/observations, having lived in Purbrook and the proposed development locality since 1951. The proposed Development considered in isolation looks very much in the "Grand Design" format and quite pleasing to the eye. However taking in the overall ambient surroundings that the building is intended to be located in, the proposals are excessive and intrusive for the space available and the affect on surrounding properties. The existing 2 storey 3 bedroom house built in the 1960s sits comfortably within the site, on a North South direction with a single storey double garage and adjoining workshop located towards its South East boundary and next to Purbrook Park School. The siting of the existing property is mainly in relation to No.8 Privett Road which currently has trees tall enough to screen it from that two storey property. It was a requirement at the planning stage that no windows except for a high level one in the bathroom were to face to the North to retain privacy for occupiers of nos. 8 and 6 Privett Road. The Limes development was not built at that time.	See section 7. See section 7.

The proposed 7 bedroom property consisting of 3 and 2 storey accommodation sits tightly in the site. The proposed 3 storey part of the building will be mainly located adjacent No 8 Privett Road and partly located adjacent the end of No 6 Privett Road. Because the three storey building is higher than the existing, it will not be screened by the trees at the end of No.8 and will as a consequence be easily visible especially from Nos. 10,8 and 6 Privett Road. Whilst I note that the only windows directly aimed at the said properties in the North Elevation of the proposals are shown as Velux style roof mounted, it would be possible to look into the property of Nos. 6 and 10 from the proposed West and East Elevations of the 3 storey ground to roof level glazing, thereby intruding into the occupant's privacy.	See section 7.
Although mention is made of existing properties to the North of the development site being set back and the inference therefore that they won't be affected by the proposed development, it should be noted that the surrounding area in that direction slopes down away from the site. The effect of that is that ground floor level of the proposed building will be at approximately first floor level of dwellings to the North of the development in Privett Road. This would in effect create the proposed dwelling looking like a four storey one, with the inevitable effect of overshadowing properties and causing shading to gardens etc. It will certainly change the sky line for all adjacent properties both in Privett Road and The Limes should it be accepted.	See section 7.
I note the objection submitted on 14th December 2018 and can understand their concerns but should that proposal that the whole development be moved at least 5M West it would exasperate the above comments regarding shading overbearing etc. In my view	The siting of the property was not subject to amendment.

the 3 storey section should be reduced to a 2 storey which would reduce but not totally remove the many concerns.

I note from the ecological survey and other supporting documents that there are no trees in the way of the development at the date of the drawings and supporting documents. However prior to those dates and immediately after there were a number of mature trees, tree shrubs and hedgerow type planting adjacent boundaries in the process of being erased especially from the South Boundary area which would have been especially in the way of the proposed 2 storey part of the proposals. I have some photographs of the tops of those trees. Whilst it may not be illegal to remove said trees, (there were apparently no tree preservation orders on them when I checked with HBC planning on the 5th of October 2018 regarding TPOs and whether any applications for planning or discussions had been made /received. I was told there weren't/hadn't been any.), prior to applying for planning. The trees also acted as natural windbreaks. All of the trees removed are still available to see on Google Earth.

I have attached a print taken from Google Earth, showing the trees that existed prior to the Planning Application.

It is a sad way of going about a scheme and in my view is tending towards making a mockery of parts of the planning process as question No.10 on the Planning application document asks are there any trees or hedges on the proposed development site? Answer given NO. Question 12 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Sub Question (a.) Protected and priority species. Answer given 'NO'. Although the answer if a full survey had been properly carried out/researched, should have been

No trees on the site are the subject of tree preservation orders. Conditions will address the protection and retention of the remaining trees on the site.

Noted.

'YES on land adjacent to or near the proposed development'. I was under the impression that because of the changes to the planning laws a full survey of a site was required and buildings should as a result be shaped to take account of naturally occurring mature trees and the environment on a site, they were to be used to enhance the ambience of the overall scheme. In this case especially as the original house name is Woodlands although currently there is not much woodland left on the proposed development site now! The following wildlife has been disturbed as a consequence and is or was known to be in the local area. Woodpecker Great Spotted <i>Dendrocopos major</i>, Squirrels (albeit grey ones <i>Sciurus carolinensis</i>), Rooks <i>Corvus frugilegus</i> all of those have left, (the mature trees were used by them as 'roosting' and 'nesting' as a part of their community). It should also be noted there are Newts Caudata both smooth and palmate and grass Frogs <i>Rana temporaria</i> locally (e.g., breeding in both of my ponds and there are other garden ponds in the area), and Slow Worms <i>Anguis fragilis</i> breeding in my garden (these are by law protected). All of these are part of the local ecology and in my experience, it is safe to assume that they are not restricted to my garden only as they are, being wild animals not necessarily restricted by human made boundaries. Visitors to my garden and others include Hedgehogs <i>Erinaceus europaeus</i> (currently on the At Risk List) is a resident red fox <i>Vulpes vulpes</i>. On the application, no mention is made of the demolition of the Garage/Workshop block, only the 1 existing house, although its existence is noted in the Design Access Statement under (2) as a detached outbuilding. It would need to be demolished as it is in the way of the	No trees on the site are the subject of tree preservation orders. Conditions will address the protection and retention of the remaining trees on the site. The site does not fall within any designated sites of ecology. Noted.
--	---

proposed 2 storey part of the development. As the existing house is occupied, no mention is made of temporary buildings to accommodate persons during the proposed works.	This is not a material planning consideration.
I am concerned as to the duration of the proposed works and to the times of day and or weekends that any works would be allowed to be carried out especially as this is listed as a self build project which would affect the pleasure/life of the neighbour's, wildlife and potentially lessons at the adjacent Purbrook Park School. I am also concerned about noise and vibration due to demolition, debris/dust created and there may be asbestos involved in the existing buildings construction, given its age, etc.	The scale of the development would not typically warrant a condition to control the hours of operation of the construction or associated traffic and it is advised that any concerns regarding noise during building works would be an issue for the Council's Environmental Health Section.
It should be noted that a tunnel was constructed for the original occupiers of Purbrook Park house to enable staff to move between the House and separate kitchens located North of the house, and out of site and smell of the residents of the House. (similar to Uppark House in Sussex). This tunnel or parts of it are still in existence to my knowledge and cross North/South under the lawned area in the West of the proposed development site. They entered Purbrook Park House in what is the boiler room/cellar to the now school and are 'bricked up' there. Its location may be of importance especially when constructing drainage requirements towards Park Avenue or loadings of any heavy plant etc, onto the proposed site.	This is not a material planning consideration and would need to be addressed by the Council's Environmental Health section.
I note the comments on the document 'Consultee Comments for Planning Application APP/18/01211' regarding B5 'Fire Access' and H6 'Waste Storage' of the building Regulations as the plans as submitted do not appear to comply and would need to be enforced if the existing buildings were to be completely demolished.	This is not a material planning consideration and would be addressed by Building Control.
	This would be addressed by Building Control.

I also note the comments by the HBC Arboriculturalist on the 14th December 2018 regarding trees on and off the proposed development site and the requirements to submit a tree protection plan and method statement.	The appropriate documents were submitted and considered by the Council's Arboriculturalist.
I note that, in site plan, no hedges or trees were declared. In fact, there is a hedge of laurel, some 10' high, on the east boundary. It extends from the north corner, on the boundary with our property, and continues south behind a house in The Limes. There remains one tall conifer to the north-east of the existing house. I fear, though I may be wrong, that the new house with no hedge between us and no tree may overlook us and next door, no. 10 although I have not yet discussed it with that resident.	Conditions will address the protection and retention of the remaining trees on the site.
I object to this application on the following grounds: 1. An existing two-storey chalet-type house would be replaced with one which is three storeys high. The plot is already higher than the surrounding plots and the addition of a third storey would cause the building to loom large from the perspective of neighbouring dwellings. The sight line of the proposed building would be much higher blocking out a significant amount of sky. This would be further magnified due to the fact that the footprint of the building would be significantly enlarged, due to the addition of a major extension of the same height. 2. The building has a massive glass front which will face directly onto my property, severely compromising my privacy and looming large over my bedrooms, downstairs master bedroom, lounge and dining room. The aforementioned extension would also have a balcony which would look diagonally across my property and be a further intrusion on my privacy. (Please note that drawing no.18061-PL-001 is incorrect in that my house is not at an	The existing property is a two storey detached dwelling. See section 7. See section 7. Noted.

angle to the applicant's existing house but faces it directly.) 3. On the drawings it was stated that my property, which is at a lower level than the existing house, would be screened by trees. This is not the case as the trees are pine, some of which have no branches, some of which have few branches that become even more sparse at a higher level. The consequence of this is that the existing house and its lights can be seen from my house and garden. The massive glass front of the proposed house will, when the lights are on, cause light pollution to my home and garden and indeed to the other surrounding gardens. 4. The proposed building would use non-traditional materials and finishes which are not in keeping with the surrounding houses. For example, aluminium cladding and glass sheeting from ground to eaves.	Conditions will address the protection and retention of the remaining trees on the site and landscaping. The property is situated in an established urban area and any excessive levels of lighting would be controlled by the Council's Environmental Health section. The proposed property is of a contemporary design and samples of all materials to be used would need to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Council by way of condition.
1. The proposed new dwelling is 4m closer to my property than the building it replaces and closer in the revised application than in the original application. 2. I understand that the regulations require there to be at least 28m between properties for privacy reasons. Does this take into account the overall size of the development, both in height and footprint? The proposed development is three storeys high and in scale dominates the surrounding properties. The enormous glass frontage (from ground level to apex) faces directly on to my house (my sitting room side) and will severely encroach my privacy. Has the committee given any consideration to that? 3. I understand that the existing trees and shrubs are to be in a protected area until the new building is complete. What guarantee is there that after completion these won't be removed? Presumably the screening effect of	The proposed amended plans show the property to be 0.4 metres closer to this property rather than 4 metres. Paragraph 5.05 of the The Havant Borough Council design guide recommends a minimum back to back separation distance of 20 metres with an additional 4 metres per storey. The rear elevation of the three storey element of the proposal is approximately 35 metres from the rear elevation of this property and therefore meets the requirements of the design guide. The planning application is being determined under delegated powers. Conditions will address the protection and retention of the remaining trees on the site.

these trees was assumed by the planning committee and a factor in their decision. 4. Should the existing trees be removed in due course is it possible to stipulate that they would have to be replaced by mature trees to offer some protection to my privacy? Are you aware that my garden is only 9m deep to the boundary? Can you imagine the potential for light pollution in my sitting room? 5. The surrounding houses are traditionally built and none are three storeys high with complete glass frontage. The proposed new property dwarves the surrounding properties and is completely out of character with the plot and surrounding area.	The planning application is being determined under delegated powers. Conditions will address the protection and retention of the remaining trees on the site. The property is situated in an established urban area and any excessive levels of lighting would be controlled by the Council's Environmental Health section. See section 7.
With reference to the letter from Havant Borough Council Planning Development Department dated 5th June 2019 regarding the Planning Application for site address 128A Park Avenue, Waterlooville, Hampshire P07 SDP. And subsequent amendments to the original application referred to in your previous letter dated 6th December 2018. My previous comments in a letter dated 29th December 2018 hand delivered, but not logged on to the planning portal until the 2nd of January 2019 regarding the original application remain from my point of view the same. However I give further comments for consideration as follows because of the proposed changes now given to the original application. I note that the alterations proposed to the East end of the development now appear to be more favourable to those properties in the Limes and Nos. 10 & 12 in Privett Road, by in particular introducing single storey parts and a hipped end to the three and two storey parts. The reduction of full height glazing to that	

end of the three storey part is also an improvement as to privacy for surrounding properties to the East of the site and part of the North boundary.

However no alterations have been shown as to neighbours to the North West end of the site where for reasons mentioned in my previous letter the height (three storeys looking like four storeys to adjacent properties because of the differing ground levels involved) and the full height glazing. This could be overcome in part by introducing a hipped end to the roof at the West end similar to that proposed for the East end. This in my view having worked as a professional in an Architectural Practice for over 32 years would not greatly reduce the architectural statement to that elevation.

I note that there has now been a tree impact assessment report provided by a consultant. I propose that a mistake may have been made regarding comments in that report concerning the tree areas 7 and 9 shown on the plans which form a part of that report. The description of those areas 7 and 9 shown, having been transposed in the associated table. Tree area 9 being stated as a "Row of trees in adjoining garden Appears to have been reduced in height at same point in the post" and therefore the root protection radius is only 3.6M. To my knowledge those trees have not been reduced in height having lived close by since 1951. However the trees in area 7 on the plans have to my knowledge been reduced in height about 4 years ago but the report states, "Row of conifers offering screening of boundary of site". Root protection radius is given as 5.4M. From observation both stands of trees are at present of a similar growth height. This should create a similar root protection radius? My point being that the proposed building will need to be built with due regard to the advice

See section 7.

Following comments from the Council's Arboriculturalist, conditions will address the protection and retention of the remaining trees on the site.

given in the report and should therefore be checked as to the root radius actually occurring when foundations are being considered. The trees in question at the end of property No.8 Privett Road are being used as part screening of the proposed development and should be maintained in good health for that reason and mention in the report and on the revised plans submitted.

I note that on Page 11 of the tree assessment document that paragraph 4.19 states that "there are no proposed changes to hard surfaces within root protection areas. In particular there are no works proposed (other than resurfacing) along the driveway that extends out to Park Avenue". Note the existing hard standing immediately to the west of the existing house will now be within the proposed building development.

That being the case, what proposals are there for installing main foul drainage and a gas supply to the property given that neither exist currently (as of 12-06-2019), according to the relevant service suppliers none exist and that currently there is a cesspit or similar method for foul drainage in the rear garden and oil storage tank for central heating also. I cannot see on any of the plans, provision for an oil storage facility. The existing foul disposal system being within or close to the footprint of the proposed building will need replacement/resizing at least if it is the intention not to connect to a Main Foul Sewer system.

Paragraph 4.20 therefore needs further explanation as to how the "existing services and utilities will be-reused".

I note Portsmouth Water Co. Concerns as to regard possible damage to the water Source Protection Zone 1c (SPZ1c) as to the sensitivity of the ground water environment and

Conditions will address the drainage.

The provision of a gas supply is not a material planning consideration.

This is not a material planning consideration.

This will be dealt with by way of a condition.

their "wish to see more detail provided regarding the planned drainage and foundation designs for the site". Given that my previous paragraphs point out that foul water removal does not exist via connection to a public sewer, and that the proposed development will have facilities to cater for more persons living in it with extra load on such services I feel that Portsmouth Water's need for extra information should be provided now. I know that level of detail is not usually required at planning stage, but as the subject has been brought up by the tree report as a statement of intent and Portsmouth Water in their request for further information, for the reasons given should in my opinion be researched and information provided to interested parties now given the seriousness of their concerns.	
I note that there has been no report asked for or provided by Southern Water who in this area of the country are responsible for providing/overseeing the disposal of Foul and Surface water services.	Southern Water have been consulted and have no objections to the scheme. With regard to the discharge of surface water, it is considered that this issue is a matter for the Building Regulations.
It is also possible given the scale of increase in size of the proposals that there may be the need to upgrade or at the very least moving the entrance of the electrical service to the proposed property footprint, and this may require trenching along the route of the driveway with potential damage to trees as outlined in the report.	This is not a material planning consideration. Conditions will address the protection and retention of the remaining trees on the site.
I am concerned that given the age of the existing property that there is a high chance that materials e.g. asbestos, used in its construction may be detrimental to the health of persons in the vicinity not only residents but pupils and staff in the adjacent school. No mention has been made or appears to have been asked for from a consultant as to if any such materials are present and a method of removal.	This is not a material planning consideration and would need to be addressed by the Council's Environmental Health section.

I am also concerned that no mention has been made as to duration of the proposed works, time of working, given the building's tight location within the site and proximity of neighbouring properties such that neighbours do not suffer a loss of pleasure, etc., and quality of everyday life. My objections and concerns to the proposals stand for the reasons given previously and above.	This is not a material planning consideration, although any permission given would need to be implemented within three years of the date of the decision notice.
The main effects these new plans will have on my property are:- A. As both properties are on a slope, with mine being lower, the new building will be totally overbearing. B. As the proposed new build is considerably larger than the existing house, the natural light to my property will be substantially reduced. C. The new main house and the secondary garage/accommodation block, which is proposed to be joined into one large building will make a continuous wall of brick and wood obliterating the quality of view from the west side of my property. To make this worse the existing garage is a single storey building, whereas the new garage/accommodation block is a two storey building making our western view unattractive and vastly restricting natural light to my house. If this redevelopment must proceed I would suggest that the whole new build be moved west by a substantial amount (at least 5 metres) to give a greater separation from my home, as there is sufficient land on the west side to allow this. Also consideration should be given to keeping the garage/accommodation block to a single storey building.	See section 7. See section 7. The loss of a view is not a material planning consideration. See section 7. See section 7.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways and parking
- (v) Developer contributions

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area

7.3 The proposal is for the construction of a two and three storey seven bedroom detached property of a contemporary design to replace the existing two storey three bedroom detached property. The site is accessed via a private drive and the front elevation of the new property will be situated approximately 75 metres from the public highway and will only be partially visible from the public realm. It is noted the site is at a higher level than the adjoining neighbouring properties to the north, east and west, although no part of the proposal is immediately adjacent to any of these boundaries.

7.4 The proposal includes a two storey section to the southern part of the property with a car port, garage, office and master suite with a west facing balcony at first floor, linked by a two storey mid section which consists of a boot room, hall, utility room and kitchen at ground floor and a galleried landing and bathroom at first floor. This in turn leads to the main accommodation which is over three floors with a lounge, play room and dining room at ground floor and bedrooms at first and second floor.

7.5 Officer concerns were raised with the originally submitted scheme regarding the eastern elevation of the proposal and the potential effect on the property to the east at 1 The Limes, which is part of a modern development of four detached properties accessed via Privett Road. The primary concerns included the proposed amount of glazing in the northern part of the main building, together with the first and second floor of the new property coming closer to the eastern boundary. It was also considered the massing would be overbearing. Following extensive discussion with the agent, amended plans were submitted and accepted on 4 June.

7.6 The revisions to the proposal are the reduction in depth of northern part of the first and second floor of the main building by approximately 3.4 metres, together with a reduction in the amount of glazing on the eastern elevation with no glazing at second floor level on this elevation and a barn hip to the roof. The southern part of the main building has been reduced in depth at first floor level by approximately 4.45 metres together with the hiping back of the roof. It is considered the changes reduces the overall massing of the scheme.

7.7 The roof of the existing property is pitched with a flat roofed single storey rear extension. The approximate height of the roof is 5 metres to the eaves and 7.7

metres to the ridge. The roof of the proposed new dwelling incorporates a pitched roof running from north to south, a pitched roof with a hipped back element to the east on the southern part of the dwelling and a pitched roof with a half barn hip to the east on the northern part of the dwelling. The eaves height is 5 metres with the ridge height of the mid section 7 metres, the southern section 7.9 metres and the northern section 9 metres. Therefore there is a maximum increase of 1.3 metres although this is pertinent only to the northern section of the property. There is also a flat roofed single storey rear extension.

- 7.8 It is acknowledged the proposed dwelling is much larger than the existing traditional two storey property it is to replace, and of a contemporary design. Whilst the development would change the immediate character of the area in relation to the properties adjoining the site to the north, east and west, there is school to the south of the site and the new property would be a significant distance from the highway. It is therefore considered the property would not significantly adversely affect the character of the area or street scene sufficiently to warrant a defensible reason for refusal.
- 7.9 The proposed new dwelling is of a substantial size, although it is situated on a plot of a generous proportions and can be comfortably accommodated within the extent of the site. It is not considered to be disproportionate and would not constitute overdevelopment. It does not project beyond the northern elevation of the existing property. There would be the provision of sufficient amenity space for the new dwelling, and whilst the main garden is to the front of the property, there is also a reasonable amount of garden to the rear. It would also provide parking in accordance with the Council's adopted standards for a seven bedroom house. Overall therefore the scheme would not result in a cramped and congested layout, being able to provide adequate amenity space and parking provision.
- 7.10 The revised design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context and is therefore judged to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). It is considered that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

7.11 Impact on 1 The Limes

The rear boundary of this property abuts the eastern elevation of the site, with a side garden immediately adjacent. It is noted this property is situated at a lower level than the application site. There are two windows serving the kitchen at ground floor and a small landing window and small secondary bedroom window at first floor in the western elevation of this property. The single storey element of the proposed new dwelling would be approximately 9.2 metres reducing to 2.6 metres at the southern end from this boundary. Following extensive negotiations with the agent, revisions have been made to the eastern elevation of the northern element of the new dwelling removing all glazing at third floor and significantly reducing the amount of glazing at first floor. The depth of northern part of the first and second floor of the main building has been reduced by approximately 3 metres and would not project beyond the building line of the first floor of the existing building, maintaining the 12.2 metre distance to this boundary. The depth of the first floor part of the southern element of the dwelling has been reduced by approximately 4.8 metres. The roof of the southern element of the dwelling has been hipped back and the design of roof of the northern element of the dwelling has been changed to a half barn hip. With regard to potential overlooking, a condition is recommended for the windows in the bathroom and stairwell to be obscure glazed. The proposed first floor bedroom window would be

opposite the garage of this property, and whilst it is larger than the existing window it is situated at a lower level. It is therefore judged any impact from this window would be negligible. It is considered the revisions submitted would lessen the perception of mass and the impact on this property and would not result in any additional overlooking or loss of privacy. The impact is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

7.12 Impact on 128b Park Avenue

The rear boundary of this property abuts the western elevation of the site and the western most part of the proposed new dwelling would be 4 metres closer to this boundary. It is noted this property is situated at a lower level than the application site. With respect to potential overlooking and loss of privacy, paragraph 5.05 of the The Havant Borough Council Design Guide recommends a minimum back to back separation distance of 20 metres with an additional 4 metres per storey. The rear elevation of the three storey element of the proposal is approximately 35 metres from the rear elevation of this property and therefore meets the requirements of the design guide. With respect to the glazing on the western elevation of the property, a condition is recommended for the submission of samples of all materials to be used and the Council will be seeking an appropriate style of glazing to moderate the level of illumination from these windows. There is a first floor balcony on the western elevation of the proposal which is a minimum distance of 36.2 metres and a maximum distance of 37.4 metres from the rear elevation of this property. It is judged that the proposed balcony is at a sufficient distance away from this property not to result in significant overlooking or loss of privacy to justify a reason for refusal on this issue. There is existing screening to the western boundary of the site and following consultation with the Council's Arboriculturalist a condition is recommended for the work to be carried out in strict accordance with the method statement and tree protection plan. No work should start until the protective fencing is in place. In addition a further condition is recommended to retain all existing trees and hedges. Overall having regard to the to the above it is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of this property to justify a reason for refusal on this matter.

7.13 Impact on 6 and 8 Privett Road

The rear boundaries of these properties abut the northern elevation of the site and the rear elevations of both properties are a minimum distance of 23 metres away from this boundary. It is noted these properties are situated at a lower level than the application site. The northern elevation of the proposal does not extend any further towards the northern boundary than the existing dwelling, maintaining the existing 2.5 metre distance to the northern boundary. Paragraph 5.05 of the The Havant Borough Council Design Guide recommends a minimum back to back separation distance of 20 metres with an additional 4 metres per storey. The northern elevation of the of the proposal is approximately 25.5 metres from the rear elevation of these properties and therefore meets the requirements of the design guide. With respect to potential overlooking and loss of privacy, there are no windows at first floor and high level roof lights in the northern elevation of the part of the property closest to the northern boundary. Whilst there is one window at first floor level in the northern elevation of the southern part of the property, this is approximately 19 metres from the northern boundary. The impact is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

7.14 Impact on 2 and 4 Privett Road

The rear boundaries of these properties abut the northern elevation of the site and the rear elevations of both properties are a minimum distance of 30 metres away from this boundary. It is noted these properties are situated at a lower level than the application

site. The rear elevation of the proposal is set back 17.6 metres from the eastern boundary of number 2 and 7.2 metres from the eastern boundary of number 4 and would maintain the existing 2.5 metre distance to the northern boundary. The impact is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

7.15 Impact on 10 Privett Road

The rear boundary of this property abuts the northern elevation of the site with the rear elevation approximately 28 metres away from this boundary. It is noted this property is situated at a lower level than the application site. The single storey element of the proposal extends 0.8 metres beyond the western boundary of this property and would maintain the existing 2.5 metre distance to the northern boundary. With respect to potential overlooking and loss of privacy, there are no windows at first floor and high level roof lights in the northern elevation of the part of the property closest to the northern boundary. Whilst there is one window at first floor level in the northern elevation of the southern part of the property, this is approximately 19 metres from the northern boundary. The impact is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

7.16 Impact on Purbrook Park School

There is a distance of approximately 7 metres from the proposal and the nearest part of the school and there is a limited amount of glazing to the southern elevation of the dwelling. Given the nature of the neighbouring building to the south, it is considered any resulting impact would be negligible.

- 7.17 Taking all these factors together subject to suitable conditions, to include removing permitted development rights it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties with regard to loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or overbearing impact. The development would therefore comply with policy CS16 of the Core Strategy, the Design SPD and the NPPF.

(iv) Highways and parking

- 7.18 There are seven bedrooms proposed in the property, subsequently there will be a requirement for three on site parking spaces as recommended in the HBC Parking SPD (July 2016). The proposed block plan submitted reflects this.

(v) Developer contributions

- 7.19 The CIL rates to be applied to development are set out in the Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which was adopted by the council on the 20 February 2013. This followed two public consultation exercises and an Examination into the Charging Schedule by an independent Examiner. The Examiners Report concluded that the Havant Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule provided an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the borough. The levy is charged at £80 per square metre (plus indexing) on new floorspace (measured as gross internal area) in Waterlooville.

- 7.20 The construction of the replacement dwelling would result in additional floorspace to that of the existing property which is Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable and the appropriate forms have been submitted. The gross new added internal floor space for the dwelling has been calculated by the agent as 280.07 sqm which generates a total CIL liability of approximately £31,307.83. It is noted that self build exemption has not been claimed in relation to the development.

- 7.21 The Council has conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the proposed development under Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, this includes an Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. Natural England's advice regarding all new housing development within 5.6 km of the boundaries of the Solent SPA is that there is likely to be a significant effect on the SPA. Policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan, covers this issue and allows for a financial contribution to be made towards mitigation measures for every net additional dwelling within this zone. However, the proposal is for the construction of a replacement dwelling following the demolition of the existing 3 bedroom property and as such a SRMS financial contribution is not payable in this instance. The proposal therefore accords with Policies CS11, CS21 (Developer Contributions) and DM24.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Taking into consideration the revisions submitted, the proposal for the replacement dwelling is considered to be acceptable and based on the planning considerations discussed above in this report, is recommended for approval.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/18/01211 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 Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or a full specification of the materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Only the materials so approved shall be used, in accordance with any terms of such approval.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 3 No development shall take place until finished floor levels for the proposed building(s) relative to agreed off-site datum point(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 4 No development hereby permitted shall commence until plans and particulars specifying the layout, depth and capacity of all foul and surface water drains and sewers proposed to serve the same, and details of any other proposed ancillary drainage works/plant (e.g. pumping stations) have been submitted to

and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use prior to the completion of the implementation of all such drainage provision in full accordance with such plans and particulars as are thus approved by the Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and ensure that all such drainage provision is constructed to an appropriate standard and quality and having due regard to policies and proposals CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

- 5 No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, vibration and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Portsmouth Water. Any piling, if proposed, must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can pose a risk to potable supplies from, for example, turbidity, mobilisation of historical contaminants, drilling through different aquifers and creation of preferential pathways. Therefore, penetrative foundation methods have the potential to impact on the underlying groundwater and thus the Havant and Bedhampton Springs public water supply. This condition is therefore necessary having due regard to policies and proposals CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

- 6 The works hereby permitted should be carried out in strict accordance with the arboricultural method statement dated 22/01/19 and tree protection plan drawing no. 1191-KC-XX-YTREE_TPP01 Rev0 supplied by Keen Arboricultural Consultants. Particular attention is drawn to paragraph 6 of the method statement, with no works commencing until the protective fencing is in place.

Reason: Policy DM8 to protect the conservation and enhancement of existing natural features.

- 7 No development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a detailed soft landscaping scheme for all open parts of the site not proposed to be hardsurfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall specify the proposed finished ground levels in relation to the existing levels, the distribution and species of ground cover to be planted, the positions, species and planting sizes of the trees and shrubs to be planted and/or retained, and timing provisions for completion of the implementation of all such landscaping works. The implementation of all such approved landscaping shall be completed in full accordance with such approved timing provisions. Any tree or shrub planted or retained as part of such approved landscaping scheme which dies or is otherwise removed within the first 5 years shall be replaced with another of the same species and size in the same position during the first available planting season.

Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and having due regard to policies CS11.1, CS11.2, CS11.4, CS12, CS16, DM8 and DM9 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the

National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

- 8 No development hereby permitted shall commence until a specification of the materials to be used for the surfacing of all open parts of the site proposed to be hardsurfaced has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until the implementation of all such hardsurfacing has been completed in full accordance with that specification.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and having due regard to policies CS11.1, CS11.4, CS16, and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 9 No development hereby permitted shall commence until plans and particulars specifying the alignment, type, height and, where appropriate, construction materials and design of all proposed screen walls, fences, hedges and other means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless agreed otherwise in writing by the Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not commence prior to the completion of the installation of all screening provision as is thus approved by the Authority. At all times thereafter, all of that screening provision shall be retained in a wholly sound and effective condition.
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and occupiers of neighbouring property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
- 10 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the building hereby permitted the window in the first floor on the eastern elevation serving the hall shall be fitted with textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018
- 11 Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extension building hereby permitted the window and glazing in the first floor and roofslope on the eastern elevation shall be fitted with non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018
- 12 All existing trees and hedges shall be retained, unless shown on the approved drawings as being removed. All trees and hedges on the site shall be protected from damage for the duration of the works on the site and in conjunction with the tree protection plan drawing no. 1191-KC-XX-YTREE_TPP01 Rev0 supplied by Keen Arboricultural Consultants. Any trees or hedges removed without the Local Planning Authority's consent or which die or become, in the opinion of the Local

Planning Authority, seriously diseased or otherwise damaged within five years following contractual practical completion of the approved development shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable and, in any case, by not later than the end of the first available planting season, with plants of such size and species and in such positions as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity afforded by existing trees and hedges and having due regard to policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

- 13 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A, B, C, D, E, G or Part 2 Class A of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018

- 14 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order, with or without modification), no windows at first or second floor, other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall, at any time, be constructed in the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

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

Drg no. 18061-PL-501 Location and block plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-502 Existing ground and first floor plans
Drg no. 18061-PL-503 Existing elevations plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-504 Proposed ground floor plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-505 Proposed first floor plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-506 Proposed second floor plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-507 Proposed west and east elevations plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-508 Proposed north and south elevations plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-509 Proposed parking plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-510 Comparison ground and first floor plans
Drg no. 18061-PL-511 Comparison east elevations plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-512 3D visual of front (west) elevation plan
Drg no. 18061-PL-513 Plan demonstrating permitted development options

Design review

Additional information incorporating flood risk assessment

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.