



Town Planners

THE PLANNING BUREAU LIMITED

Bournemouth • London • Manchester • Coventry
York • Glasgow



Architects

REPLY TO: 1 EMBANKMENT WAY, RINGWOOD, BH24 1EU TEL: 01425 322095

gian.b@theplanningbureau.ltd.uk

22 November 2017

Ms Rachel McMurray : Planner
Development Management
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Dear Rachael,

PA APP/17/00633 ERECTION OF 25 RETIREMENT LIVING APARTMENTS WITH COMMUNAL FACILITIES AND CAR PARKING. THE ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTERN AVENUE, EMSWORTH,

I refer to the above mentioned application. Further to the submitted revisions on 26th October 2017 and in response to your comments set out in your e-mail of 9th November 2017 I would advise you as follows.

As per the drawings submitted on 26th October 2017, the building remains in its re-sited position further into the site which has resulted in part of the rear section being "cut off". The smaller building results in a change in the level of accommodation from 25 x 2 bed to 24 x 2 bed & 4 x 1 bed units. The resiting has also allowed the retention of T12 Chestnut at the front of the site.

Further to the above changes, the scheme has been further reviewed in the light of the comments received on the 9th November 2017.

The layout has been revised so that there is a larger landscape/buffer area adjacent to 1C Beach Road (the chalet bungalow adjacent the access driveway into the site). This has been achieved by a slight narrowing of the access drive and the removal of what was Car Parking Space No 1. I have given consideration to its resitting elsewhere but on balance felt that the level of parking proposed remains reasonable. If however it is felt essential that the additional space is provided, this could be achieved by a combination of tightening up the parking at the rear, and some minor changes to the landscaping areas. This could be a matter which could be dealt by way of a planning condition.

In response to the desire to maintain a denser hedge to the rear of the site, I would advise that the landscaping has been altered so as to retain it to a depth of 2.5m. This is shown on landscape plan SO-2379-03-LA-MCS587 Drg02 REV L and the issue can be re-enforced by an appropriately worded

planning condition. The proposed planting to replace T7 has also been revised to that suggested i.e. *Fagus sylvatica* Dawyck - Fastigate Beech.

In the light of the various changes but principally due to the retention of T2 Chestnut, the drainage scheme has also been updated. I would advise that the changes are essentially to drain runs/attenuation tanks and there are no material changes to the drainage philosophy/calculations previously submitted and considered acceptable by your consultees.

I note your reservations/comments regarding the relationship of the balcony of Unit 22 to 1C Beach Road (or 1A if my information is incorrect – although I believe that we have established that we are referring to the same dwelling and are not at cross purposes).

I interpret the concern to be the potential for what I would term “active” or at least the appearance of “active” overlooking in contrast to what I term “casual” overlooking from say a window. I think the potential overlooking point can be overcome by a glazed screen to a height of say 1.6m. The glass would need to be frosted to some degree to preclude the degree of overlooking that is of concern to you. This can be dealt with way of a condition but I have asked for a drawing so that my comments can be better understood. I will submit this as soon as possible.

I also need to touch on the Affordable Housing position. As you will recall after discussion between DSP and Alder King a without prejudice offer of £285K was made on grounds of commercial expediency. Since then the scheme has been revised from 25 x 2 beds to 21 x 2 beds and 4 x 1 beds. Albeit that the building is smaller, the fact is that the changes have resulted in a reduction in GDV etc etc which would in our opinion remove the need for any contribution. However, my Client is presently willing on a without prejudice basis to maintain the same offer on grounds of commercial expediency.

On the broader issues of the NPPF, benefits etc, these are aspects covered in the submitted documentation. There is also a separate document which deals with the 5 year housing land supply point (it would be helpful if you could confirm that the LPA accepts the conclusions of the submitted report). These are all issues in support of the proposal and which I will not repeat in this letter.

Lastly, please accept this e-mail as agreement to extend the determination date to 24th December 2017.

Yours sincerely

Gian Bendinelli
Principal Planning Associate
The Planning Bureau Ltd