

108 Woodgreen Avenue, Havant, PO9 3EE

Appeal Statement

Mr and Mrs Kerrigan

June 2019

KF Planning Consultancy

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Appeal Site Context	2
3. Appeal Proposals	4
4. Relevant Planning History Context	5
5. Appellants Grounds against Reason for Refusal 1	8
6. Appellants Grounds against Reason for Refusal 2	13
7. Appellants Grounds against Reason for Refusal 3	16
8. Appellants Grounds against Reason for Refusal 4	18
9. Conclusion	19

Appendix 1 – Photographs

Appendix 2 – Plan PL.156.18.14 - Street Scene and Landscape Context

Appendix 3 – Plan PL.156.18.12 - Gable Entrance Local Contextual Examples

Appendix 4 – Plan PL.156.18.13 - Parking and Rear Garden Contextual Examples

Appendix 5 – Parking Survey May 2019

Reference: KFPC/NK/WOOD/002

Address: 8 West Road
Woolston
Southampton
Hampshire
SO19 9AJ

Telephone Number: 07973 859088

Date of Issue: 5 June 2019

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This appeal has been prepared by KF Planning Consultancy on behalf of Mr and Mrs Kerrigan who are the owners of the appeal site 108 Woodgreen Avenue, Bedhampton, Havant.
- 1.2 On 3 September 2018 a full planning application was submitted for 2 no. 1-bed dwellings (LPA Ref: 18/00885).
- 1.3 The application followed an initial pre-application consultation with planning officers following which the appellant made amendments to the proposed scheme.
- 1.4 On 10 December 2018 Havant Borough Council refused the planning application on four grounds relating to the appearance of the dwellings in the street scene, overdevelopment of the plot, restricted private external amenity space and internal floorspace, parking provision and failure to provide an SPA mitigation contribution.
- 1.5 The appeal proposals have been carefully designed to make efficient use of the appeal site (as sought by national planning guidance) whilst also responding to the existing character and appearance of the terrace and wider area around Woodgreen Avenue.
- 1.6 This statement sets out the appellants case for this appeal.

2. Appeal Site Context

- 2.1 Photographs of the context of the site and the appeal site itself are provided at Appendix 1.

Local Context and Character

- 2.2 The application site is located in Bedhampton to the north east of the A27 and M3 junction. Woodgreen Avenue is located at the eastern edge of Bedhampton.
- 2.3 The site is bounded by residential properties to the north, east and south and by Hook's Lane and Havant Rugby Club to the west.
- 2.4 As such, the area around the application site is predominantly residential in character. The houses in the immediate area, including Woodgreen Avenue, are typically terraces of two storey dwellings of brick construction and are typical of post war housing built during the late 1950's and 1960's.
- 2.5 The established character of the area includes corner plots and infill residential developments and these are detailed further within this statement. The area has a mix of 1, 2 and 3-bed dwellings.
- 2.6 Local shops and facilities are located on Bedhampton Road to the south west (including a convenience store, The Golden Lion pub, garage, pharmacy and take away) and Bancroft Way to the north (including a takeaway, convenience store and newsagent).
- 2.7 The area is also served by a range of public transport services being located less than 0.5 miles from Bedhampton train station to the south off West Road (with services to Portsmouth, Brighton, London, Southampton and Bristol) and close to bus stops on New Road, Bedhampton Road and Barncroft Way and with services 21 and 23 providing links through to Havant, Portsmouth, Cosham and Southsea. The site is also only a 20 minute walk from Havant Town Centre to the east with its even wider range of shops and services.
- 2.8 To the west of the application site is Hooks Lane Park (0.3 miles) and to the south west is Bidbury Lane (0.8 miles).

The Site

- 2.9 The application site is situated on the west side of Woodgreen Avenue at the junction with Fraser Road. Nos 102 to 108 are an existing terrace of 4 dwellings. The application site comprises garden land adjacent to no 108 on a large corner plot as detailed on the Location Plan.

- 2.10 The application site (including no.108) measures approximately 458 square metres. Within this, the area proposed for the 2 new dwellings comprises 296 square metres. The existing dwelling no.108 is located on the northern side of the site. The remainder of the site is currently garden with a garage at the rear western boundary of the site adjacent to neighbouring property no. 34 Fraser Road.
- 2.11 The existing detached garage is accessed separately off Fraser Road where there is an existing drop kerb. To the side of the southern elevation of no.108 there is also a small single storey brick outbuilding.
- 2.12 The application site is surrounded along the eastern and southern boundaries by a low level brick wall.

3. Appeal Proposals

- 3.1 The proposals are detailed within the Planning, Design and Access Statement which accompanied the application submission.
- 3.2 The application site including no.108 comprises 458 square metres and within this the development area for the 2 proposed dwellings comprises 296 square metres. Two no. 1-bed dwellings are proposed at the end of the existing terrace, each comprising 50.8 squares metres gross internal floorspace with associated gardens and parking.
- 3.3 Proposed Dwelling 2 adjoins the existing property with a parking space to the front (through the formation of a new dropped kerb as on neighbouring properties 104 and 106) and a garden to the rear. Proposed Dwelling 1 is the end of terrace with garden to the front side and rear with a parking space accessed from Fraser Road (utilising an existing dropped kerb and parking space serving 108 Woodgreen Avenue).
- 3.4 The layout and relationship between the dwellings and with existing properties is detailed on the Proposed Site Plan on Plan PL.156.18.10C.
- 3.5 The proposed dwellings are two storey in height matching the ridge height, eaves and roofslope of the existing terrace. It is proposed to build the two dwellings in red stock brick with concrete roof tiles and upvc windows, again to match those of the existing terrace.
- 3.6 A rear garden will be retained for no.108 along with garden areas for the new dwellings. A new dropped kerb and parking space is proposed to the frontage of 108 Woodgreen Avenue. A further new space will be created at the front of the terrace and the existing driveway and dropped kerb at the southern boundary of the site served from Fraser Road will be utilised to provide a further parking space for the proposed dwellings.
- 3.7 Notwithstanding the refusal of the planning application there were a number of aspects of the scheme which were established as acceptable. This included the principle of the residential development in this location, that the site is suitable for the development of at least one dwelling, the scheme would not have any detrimental impact on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties, low classification fruit trees could be removed and acceptable cycle parking was provided.

4. Relevant Planning History Context

Appeal Site

- 4.1 There have been no previous applications for planning permission on the application site.
- 4.2 In December 2017 the appellant and their architect prepared a pre-application submission seeking advice on the prospects of securing consent for 2 flats with amenity space and parking.
- 4.3 The proposals were for a 1-bedroom flat at ground floor level and a two bedroom flat above with the second bedroom in the roof space served by dormer windows. The proposed units were part two storey part single storey.
- 4.4 A meeting was held with Mr Eaves on 14 December 2017. In a pre-application response dated 4 January 2014 (LPA Ref: GEN/17/01457) Mr Eaves advised that whilst the principle of development on the site was acceptable, a single dwelling on the site would be preferable. Key issues raised were:
 - Resulting unbalanced appearance of the terrace
 - Proximity of the side elevation to Fraser Road
 - Prominence of the development in the street scene
 - Overdevelopment of the site
 - Out of character with established development
 - Limited external amenity areas (particularly for the 2-bed unit)
 - 1-bed flat below technical housing space standards
 - Under provision of car parking relative to standards
- 4.5 On 3 September 2018 a planning application was submitted for 2 new 1-bed dwellings on the site making efficient use of land whilst responding to the issues raised in the pre-application consultation.
- 4.6 Notwithstanding these amendments the application was refused on 10 December 2018 on the grounds that:

"The proposed development of two houses on this prominent corner plot elevated in relation to the adjacent roads would result in a visually intrusive form of development to the harm of the streetscene removing the existing set back spacious nature of development from the corner of Woodgreen Avenue and Fraser Road. The proposals are considered to result in an overdevelopment of the site and a cramped form of development. Furthermore the two dwellings would not be designed to reflect the width, rhythm, fenestration and design of the existing terrace and host dwelling which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing terrace.

The proposed development would result in restricted private external amenity space to both the existing dwelling (No. 108 Woodgreen Avenue) and to the proposed dwellings to the harm of the residential amenities of the existing and proposed occupants. The proposed dwellings also provide limited internal space for future residents of the new properties. Overall it is considered that the dwellings would fail to provide a suitable living environment for future and existing residents.

The proposed car parking shown in relation to the development fails to meet the Councils car parking standards both in terms of the quantum of parking (for the existing dwelling) and design and usability of the proposed parking spaces.

Without the appropriate financial mitigation, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area."

Surrounding Area

- 4.7 In the application submission reference was made to a number of nearby sites and planning permissions which are considered relevant and material to this appeal.

7A James Road

- 4.8 In August 2015 planning permission was granted for a 1-bed end of terrace dwelling (LPA Ref: APP/15/00603). This is particularly relevant in terms of the principle, the prominence of the site, the two storey development on the boundary, the narrower width of the dwelling relative to the existing terrace, parking provision and amenity space.

19B Ibsley Grove

- 4.9 In October 2010 planning permission was granted for a 2-bed end of terrace dwelling (LPA Ref: APP/10/00491). This is particularly relevant in terms of the

principle, the new building line much closer to the road and the narrower width of the dwelling.

21A Ibsley Grove

- 4.10 In July 2013 planning permission was granted for a 2-bed end of terrace dwelling opposite no.19 (LPA Ref: APP/11/01087). Again, this is particularly relevant in terms of the principle, the new building line much closer to the road, the narrower width of the dwelling and level of amenity space provision.

1 Blendworth Crescent

- 4.11 In January 2014 planning permission was granted for a 3-bed end of terrace dwelling (LPA Ref: APP/13/01108). This permission is particularly relevant given the proposed layout and footprint on a corner plot, proximity to the site boundary and relationship to the established building lines is directly comparable to the relationship of the existing buildings and proposals for the application site and was found to be acceptable by the Council within the same development control policy context.

5. Appellants Grounds against Reason for Refusal 1

"The proposed development of two houses on this prominent corner plot elevated in relation to the adjacent roads would result in a visually intrusive form of development to the harm of the streetscene removing the existing set back spacious nature of development from the corner of Woodgreen Avenue and Fraser Road. The proposals are considered to result in an overdevelopment of the site and a cramped form of development. Furthermore the two dwellings would not be designed to reflect the width, rhythm, fenestration and design of the existing terrace and host dwelling which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing terrace."

Policy Context

- 5.1 Policy CS16 of the **Havant Borough Local Plan** (Core Strategy) 2011 requires high quality design. Of particular relevance to this appeal, design is required to respond to, draw inspiration from and respect local context and produce a positive relationship between buildings, streets and spaces both existing and proposed.
- 5.2 Detailed criterion (c) of the policy include consideration of the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors.
- 5.3 The **Borough Design Guide SPD** 2011 details design guidance to support Policy CS16 including guidance on separation distances, garden depths and private amenity space.
- 5.4 Whilst the scheme seeks to respond to all adopted policies it is considered material that both the Local Plan and the SPD predate both the original NPPF (2012) and subsequent revised NPPF (2018).
- 5.5 The revised **National Planning Policy Framework** (strengthened in the recent revision) seeks to make more efficient use of land to boost housing supply particularly in sustainable locations.
- 5.6 Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development which for decision taking means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.
- 5.7 Paragraph 38 confirms that local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

- 5.8 Paragraph 59 confirms the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes.
- 5.9 Paragraph 68 notes that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. Planning authorities should support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes.
- 5.10 Paragraph 117 confirms that planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.
- 5.11 Paragraph 118 states that planning policies and decisions should achieve a number of goals including giving substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs.
- 5.12 Paragraph 122 confirms that planning decisions should support development which makes efficient use of land taking into account factors such as the identified need for different types of housing, local market conditions, the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services, the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting or of promoting regeneration and change and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.
- 5.13 Paragraph 123 highlights the greater flexibility required to provide good quality housing but the need for flexibility in applying policies or guidance to design issues such as density and daylight and sunlight.
- 5.14 Paragraph 124 confirms that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work.

Assessment

- 5.15 The reason for refusal raises a number of separate issues which are assessed in turn below in the context of the relevant policies and other material considerations.
- 5.16 A key issue is how the character of the area is defined. The Appellants view is that it is more diverse than the council have allowed for in making their decision. Ridge heights, pitched roof and similar materials are all evident in

the area but in addition there is variety in dwelling size, the treatment of gable ends, parking provision, garden sizes and shape.

Visually intrusive development to the harm of the street scene removing the existing set back spacious nature of development

- 5.17 The appeal site is a corner plot but as shown in the photographs within Appendix 1 the existing character of the area includes low level planting and exposed brick 2 storey gable ends prominent in the street scene (such as at no.79 Woodgreen Avenue opposite the appeal site).
- 5.18 The proposed two storey flank elevation of the proposed new dwellings is set back 2.5 metres from Fraser Road. The building line of the proposed two storey element would be located only 1.2 metres beyond the existing two storey flank building line of 79 Woodgreen Avenue opposite. Building lines on Fraser Road are more staggered and form part of its character (as seen opposite the application site) and hence the proposals do not conflict with this.
- 5.19 The distance maintained from the boundary is more spacious than in other local developments such as 7a James Road (around the corner from the appeal site) where the two storey flank brick wall abuts the boundary. Of particular relevance is 1 Blendworth Crescent (to the north east of the appeal site on a similar style estate) where the proposed layout and footprint on a corner plot, the proximity to the site boundary and relationship to the established building lines are all directly comparable to the relationship of the existing buildings and proposals for the appeal site. That development was found to be acceptable by the Council within the same development control policy context but this has not been given sufficient weight by the Council in determining the application.
- 5.20 Whilst there is a low level brick wall fronting Fraser Road, the gable end will also be viewed in the context of retained and enhanced landscaping. The plan within Appendix 2 provides a street scene visual of this elevation and provides a realistic view of the development from the road in this context. Any such landscaping could be secured by a reasonably worded condition if the appeal was allowed.

Overdevelopment of the site and cramped form of development

- 5.21 The revised NPPF requires, as a fundamental principle, the efficient use of land in urban areas to boost housing supply. This can be achieved on the appeal site by providing 2 new smaller dwellings as opposed to one larger unit without detriment to character.
- 5.22 The proposals represent a balanced development comprising 101.6 square metres built footprint on a plot of 296 squares (ie 34% of the plot) allowing

for the retention of a good size garden and parking space for the existing dwelling (no. 108) and the provision of both private amenity space and parking for the new dwellings.

- 5.23 It is not unusual for an urban area to have a mix of dwelling sizes and it is not considered reasonable in the context of the NPPF, to expect a one bed house to provide a 10 metre deep garden as compared to a 2 or 3-bed family dwelling. It is appropriate for the provision of some private amenity space for the enjoyment of future occupiers and this is achieved within the appeal scheme.

Detrimental to character and appearance of existing terrace

- 5.24 There is a strong estate design character in the area with regard to building height, eave height, roof pitch, materials and fenestration on the terraces including nos 102 to 108 Woodgreen Avenue as detailed in the photographs within Appendix 1.
- 5.25 Policy CS16 does make reference to local context *informing* design but does not state that design should *replicate* it.
- 5.26 The appeal proposals fully respond to this established character and as such the appellant strongly disputes that the proposed design can be considered detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing terrace.
- 5.27 This is particularly detailed on the proposed elevation Plan PL.156.18.10C which shows a clear continuation of the design from 108 Woodgreen Avenue through its ridge and eaves heights, materials, window and door fenestration.
- 5.28 Although proposing two 1-bed dwellings, careful consideration has been given to the design, purposely following the rhythm and character of the existing properties. In particular one of the dwelling entrances has been positioned on the side gable with a porch detail to avoid the more dense grouping of doors and windows which would have resulted if both dwellings had been accessed from the Woodgreen Avenue frontage.
- 5.29 Side gable entrances are part of the established existing local character of the area and this is shown in the examples on Plan PL.156.18.12 at Appendix 3.
- 5.30 Further to the above, it is considered a significant material consideration that in August 2015 the Council approved a 1-bed end of terrace dwelling at 7 James Road with a narrower width and different fenestration to the existing terrace (LPA Ref: APP/15/00603). We would request that the Inspector view the frontage of this property from the road as part of their site visit.
- 5.31 Overall, therefore it is not considered that any of the aspects of the reason for refusal are justified in the context of policies, the local context or these other

material considerations. The proposals respond to the requirements of Policy CS16, the Design SPD and NPPF.

6. Appellants Grounds against Reason for Refusal 2

"The proposed development would result in restricted private external amenity space to both the existing dwelling (No. 108 Woodgreen Avenue) and to the proposed dwellings to the harm of the residential amenities of the existing and proposed occupants. The proposed dwellings also provide limited internal space for future residents of the new properties. Overall it is considered that the dwellings would fail to provide a suitable living environment for future and existing residents".

Policy Context

- 6.1 Policy CS16 of the **Havant Borough Local Plan** (Core Strategy) 2011 requires high quality design referencing consideration of any established local pattern of plot widths and depths.
- 6.2 The **Borough Design Guide SPD** 2011 details design guidance to support Policy CS16 including guidance on separation distances, garden depths and private amenity space. It indicates that it will seek garden depths of 10 metres.
- 6.3 Whilst the scheme seeks to respond to all adopted policies it is considered material that both the Local Plan and the SPD predate both the original NPPF (2012) and subsequent revised NPPF (2018).
- 6.4 The revised **National Planning Policy Framework** (strengthened in the recent revision) seeks to make more efficient use of land to boost housing supply particularly in sustainable locations.
- 6.5 Paragraph 117 confirms that planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.
- 6.6 Paragraph 118 states that planning policies and decisions should achieve a number of goals including giving substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs.
- 6.7 Paragraph 123 highlights the greater flexibility required to provide good quality housing but the need for flexibility in applying policies or guidance to design issues such as density and daylight and sunlight.
- 6.8 Paragraph 124 confirms that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work.

Assessment

- 6.9 The reason for refusal raises two key issues which are assessed in turn below in the context of national and local planning policies and other material considerations.

Provision of private amenity space

- 6.10 The proposals are for 2 no. 1-bed dwellings and as such are not larger family housing units. Private rear gardens are provided for both dwellings. These offer sufficient area for a patio, seating area and planting. In addition to this, dwelling 1 has a further front garden area.
- 6.11 A review of the local area and context shows that a number of nearby properties have smaller garden areas and these are highlighted on Plan PL.156.18.13 at Appendix 4. This includes adjacent property 34 Fraser Road (which is a larger dwelling) and this and other gardens (such as 40 Fraser Road a few doors down) have irregular shaped gardens. Again, whilst not to exacting standards in the SPD, these provide suitable space for occupiers and form part of the existing context and character around the appeal site.
- 6.12 The Council have raised concerns that the garden area will not be private but this is no different to the corner plot garden opposite (79 Woodgreen Avenue) and others nearby where the entire garden is open to public views. Further to this, soft landscape planting will offer some further screening.
- 6.13 In 2010 the Council approved a comparable 1-bed dwelling in a similar estate position at 19 Ibsley Grove to the north west (LPA Ref: APP/10/00491) which resulted in a reduction in the garden for the existing property and a garden for a new dwelling 6 metres in depth.
- 6.14 It is also important to note that in terms of wider amenity space provision, there are two large parks in walking distance of the appeal site including Hooks Lane offering further access to amenity space.
- 6.15 It is important that detailed design is balanced against the up to date intentions and requirements of the NPPF. A slightly reduced garden size does not need to be detrimental to living quality when it is planned with consideration and is considered in the context of the size of a proposed dwelling. It is considered that the appeal scheme achieves this balance.

Internal space provision

- 6.16 The two proposed dwellings offer good quality accommodation as detailed within the proposed floorplans PL.156.18.10C. The layout provides for a porch, downstairs cloakroom, downstairs store cupboard and open plan kitchen, diner and lounge with patio doors to the garden and stairs up to a good size bedroom and bathroom with good storage space. As such, the dwellings will provide good sized and layout of accommodation for future occupiers notwithstanding an assessment against space standards.
- 6.17 In any case, the two proposed 1-bed units each have a gross internal floorspace of 50.8 squares metres and hence meet the national technical standards for a 1 bed unit.
- 6.18 Again, it is considered both material and relevant in the context of the Councils approach on other sites within the estate that the 1 bed dwelling approved and built out at 7a James Road (around the corner, just to the south east of the appeal site off Fraser Road) comprises 49 square metres, below the floorspace of the proposed dwellings on the appeal site (approved 2015 – LPA Ref: APP/15/00603).
- 6.19 As such, the appeal scheme will provide good quality accommodation for future occupiers and for the future occupier of 108 Woodgreen Avenue. As such, the proposals respond to the requirements of Policy CS16, the Design SPD and NPPF.

7. Appellants Grounds against Reason for Refusal 3

"The proposed car parking shown in relation to the development fails to meet the Councils car parking standards both in terms of the quantum of parking (for the existing dwelling) and design and usability of the proposed parking spaces."

Policy Context

- 7.1 Policy DM13 of the **Havant Borough Local Plan** (Core Strategy) 2011 states that residential development will only be permitted where it provides car parking and cycle storage in accordance with the standards set out in the Residential Car Parking and Cycle Provision Supplementary Planning Document.
- 7.2 The **Parking SPD** 2016 requires 1 parking space per 1-bed dwelling and 2 parking spaces per 2-bed dwelling. 1 long stay cycle parking space is required for a 1-bed dwelling and 2 long stay spaces for a 2-bed dwelling. It indicates that parking spaces should measure 2.4 metres wide by 4.8 metres deep.
- 7.3 The SPD recognises more sustainable locations close to train stations including Bedhampton train station of which the appeal site is within walking distance. Paragraph 3.06 confirms that on brownfield sites outside the town centres, it may be possible to reduce the number of car parking spaces required where developments are within a reasonable distance of good public transport links.
- 7.4 Paragraph 105 of the revised NPPF states that in setting local parking standards for residential development policies should take into account various factors including the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of development and the availability of and opportunities for public transport. Paragraph 109 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Assessment

- 7.5 The appeal proposals provide 1 car parking space for each new unit and the retention of 1 car parking space in the curtilage of no.108 accessed from Woodgreen Avenue.
- 7.6 The parking layout is detailed on the Block Plan on Plan PL.156.18.10C.

- 7.7 Dwelling 1 requires 1 parking space and 1 cycle parking space. A parking space meeting the dimensions set out in the SPD (and forming part of an existing driveway serving no.108) is provided to the rear, accessed from Fraser Road. A cycle parking space can be provided within the secure shed.
- 7.8 Dwelling 2 also requires 1 parking space and 1 cycle parking space. A car parking space is shown at the front of the property accessed from Woodgreen Avenue and is comparable to the space for no 108 and other parking spaces on adjacent properties on the terrace. Again, a secure cycle parking space can be provided within the shed.
- 7.9 The retained dwelling 108 has two existing parking spaces to the rear. It is proposed to provide one parking space at the front of the property.
- 7.10 Photo 5 in Appendix 1 shows that a good size family car can be accommodated on such a driveway.
- 7.11 It is important to note, and considered material to this appeal, that a number of family houses (mainly 2 and 3-beds) on Woodgreen Avenue, Fraser Road and other surrounding roads on the estate have no off-road parking so retaining 1 space is beneficial for future occupiers of no. 108.
- 7.12 During pre-application discussions the Council suggested a parking survey be provided to show the availability for parking spaces in the area. This was provided by the appellant with the application.
- 7.13 During the determination of the application this survey was queried. On this basis, as part of this appeal, the appellant has instructed a further parking survey. This was undertaken by 360TSL Traffic Data Collection over two nights on 8 and 9 May 2019. The survey follows the recognised best practice approach of the London Borough of Lambeth methodology. The report is attached at Appendix 5 and confirms the findings of the previous survey that there is significant spare parking capacity on Woodgreen Avenue and even greater spare capacity on adjacent roads.
- 7.14 In addition to this, the appeal site is in a sustainable location within the built-up area of Bedhampton, in close proximity to local shops and services and within walking distance of both bus services and Bedhampton train station. In light of this, and as referenced in the Parking SPD, this could be considered a location where a reduced level of parking could be considered acceptable.
- 7.15 Overall, proposed parking provision (with a space for both the retained and proposed dwellings), the sustainability credentials of the area and the spare on-road parking capacity it is considered that proposals are acceptable and meet the requirements of Policy DM13, the Parking SPD and the NPPF.

8. Appellants Grounds against Reason for Refusal 4

"Without the appropriate financial mitigation, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area"

Policy Context

- 8.1 Policy DM24 of the **Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations Plan)** (related to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017) confirms planning permission will be granted for residential developments that avoid or mitigate a likely significant effect on the SPAs including under part (a) a financial contribution.

Assessment

- 8.2 It is acknowledged that the mitigation payment is required in relation to this development of 2 no. 1-bed dwellings. As such, a Unilateral Undertaking has been prepared in co-ordination with the Community Infrastructure Officer at Havant Borough Council and a copy accompanies this appeal. The appellant has already paid the Council the required contribution.
- 8.3 As such, there is no longer any basis for this reason for refusal.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1 The appellant has sought to consult with the Council through a pre-application consultation and have amended their proposals to address all the policy requirements for a development of 2 no. 1-bed dwellings at 108 Woodgreen Avenue.
- 9.2 The scheme has been carefully designed to balance a response to the character and appearance of the existing terrace and surrounding area and the opportunity to make efficient use of this infill site for 2 new dwellings.
- 9.3 The design follows the height and scale and appearance of the existing terrace. It respects the existing character and layout of the estate and will not be detrimental to it.
- 9.4 The proposed internal layout ensures good quality living accommodation for the future occupiers with direct access to private rear garden amenity space.
- 9.5 The proposals ensure that parking is provided for each dwelling notwithstanding that there is also spare on road parking capacity).
- 9.6 A unilateral undertaking has been submitted with the appeal to confirm the payment of the required SPA recreation mitigation strategy contribution.
- 9.7 Overall, the appeal proposals meet the requirements of both national and local planning policies and will provide a high quality development of two 1-bed dwellings in a sustainable location, within walking distance of Bedhampton train station and other local shops and facilities.
- 9.8 As such it is respectfully requested that the appeal be allowed.