

## **Design and Access Statement for 22 and 22 A Haslemere Gardens Hayling Island PO11 9SD**

The proposal is to demolish the existing 3 bed detached property and replace it with two three bed semi detached properties. The design aims to address the reasons for refusal given in a previous application for the site made in 2014 (APP/14/00803)

The first reason for refusal was

*'The combined scale and built form of the proposed development, which would occupy virtually the entire width of the plot with a large flat topped roof section, and amount of hardstanding proposed to the site frontages for parking would result in a discordant urbanising form of development that has insufficient regard to existing area characteristics or local context. The layout, design, width and form of the new development would therefore represent a dominating and visually incongruous form of development within the street scene of Haslemere Gardens out of keeping with the modest, well spaced detached dwellings within verdant plots.*

*The introduction of such a development would not only be visually incongruous and out of keeping but would also introduce an undesirable form of development, which if replicated would have wider implications to the prevailing character and appearance of the area.'*

Whilst the new design does still occupy the width of the plot with a 1m access down both sides, it should be noted that several properties in the street scene do the same including the property next door to the south which actually is built up to the boundary of the plot.

We do however recognise that due to the existing buildings position, substantially forward of the building line created by the neighbouring properties, and the large form created by the previous proposal, that this created problems.

The new proposal sets the properties back to the line of the neighbouring buildings and creates a step between the two properties to break up mass and reflect the slight step back of the property to the south. In addition this creates additional garden space to the front of the properties that will be landscaped to retain and improve the verdant nature of the street scene and remove the potential for the development to be dominating and visually incongruous.

The second reason for refusal was

*,The proposal development by reason of its combined height, built form and proximity to the shared boundaries with 20 and 24 Haslemere Gardens would create an unacceptable reduction in light levels to immediate neighbours 20 and 24 Haslemere Gardens. The proposal would also reduce outlook and have an overshadowing and overbearing effect from the front habitable windows and amenity spaces of these neighbouring dwellings. The development would therefore have an unacceptable impact on neighbour amenity,*

To address this issue as previously discussed the proposed replacement dwellings will be set back in line with the existing dwellings numbers 20 and 24 to the North and South this will result in the gable ends of the buildings aligning and thus having little or no impact on the neighbouring dwellings, in fact the proposal is likely to greatly improve the outlook and overshadowing currently created by the existing property as they will be set in line.

The third Reason for refusal was

*'The site is a windfall site situated within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the development proposed is classified by the Environment Agency as a More Vulnerable Use. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that the Local Planning Authority undertake a Sequential Test to steer development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. It is considered that there are sequentially preferable sites within the Borough and that the Local Planning Authority can demonstrate a 5 year housing supply. Therefore, there is no overriding justification for the development of an additional dwelling within Flood Zones 2 and 3 which would result in an unacceptable risk to life and property from tidal inundation.'*

As discussed in the flood risk assessment and repeated below

Whilst we recognise that the proposal will result in a small increase in occupancy, we believe that the resulting design does substantially reduce risk of damage to the property and risk to the life of the occupants for the following reasons

1. The existing property has floor levels that are the same or lower than the outside ground levels. The proposed building will be built a minimum of 150mm above existing ground levels thus reducing flood risk.
2. All new electrical ring mains will be run at ceiling height to reduce possible damage. And floors will be concrete rather than timber (as existing)
3. The 3 bedrooms in the existing bungalow are at ground level and thus much more exposed to potential flooding. The proposed dwellings both provide their two bedrooms at first floor level thus substantially reducing risk to life.

Finally the Fourth reason for refusal was

*'This development would increase the number of dwellings within the 5.6km zone identified as significant in potentially increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. Natural England's advice in regard to all new housing development within this zone is that it is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA. In the absence of any mitigation provision to off set the impact of the new residential development the development would result in a cumulative impact to the Solent SPA.'*

Should the proposal be considered to be acceptable for planning approval, the owner will be happy to pay the required mitigation provision fee, once notified by the Planning authority of the fee required.

## Conclusion

We believe that the issues for refusal in the first application are now fully addressed by this proposal and would seek for this application to be considered in the light of these changes.