
Site Address:	14 Park Lane, Bedhampton, Havant, PO9 3HH		
Proposal:	Erection of 1No. 1 bedroom bungalow and detached single garage to rear of 14 Park Lane, Bedhampton.		
Application No:	APP/16/01158	Expiry Date:	06/01/2017
Applicant:	Mr Stallard		
Agent:	Mr Power	Case Officer:	David Eaves
	Thorns Young Ltd		
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site lies to the eastern side of Park Lane within a road of mixed dwelling types. The existing dwelling is a semi-detached bungalow with render and clay tiles. The property has a rear single storey extension. The land slopes down to the rear gently and there is also a slight slope from north to south.

To the north No.16 is the attached neighbour which also has a rear extension and conservatory. To the south is a detached chalet style property with side dormer. To the east are two storey semi-detached houses fronting Lester Avenue.

2 Planning History

94/50642/003 - Rear Extension, PERM,06/10/1994

3 Proposal

Erection of 1No. 1 bedroom bungalow and detached single garage to rear of 14 Park Lane, Bedhampton.

The proposal would result in the demolition of the existing side garage and car port to allow for rear vehicular access.

The proposal is for the erection of a bungalow to the rear of the site which is shown as a 1 bedroom property, however a study of 6sqm is shown and this could form a second bedroom. The bungalow would have a traditional pitched roof and be brick and render with concrete tile roof. A garage to serve the proposed bungalow is proposed with an external parking and turning area.

It is understood that the new bungalow would be occupied by the applicant and partner with the existing bungalow being occupied by the applicants daughter, however, the application description does not in itself reflect this link between the properties.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
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)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD 2016

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control

Further details of the proposed access to the dwelling should be provided to ensure compliance with requirement B5 (Fire Authority Access).

Bin storage to be provided.

Disabled access from the parking area should be considered.

Community Infrastructure

No comments received.

Development Engineer (Highway):

I note the Planning Statement states that the two properties would remain as one but I would like a parking layout showing the areas of parking turning and access for the existing property once the new property is constructed.

Waste Services Manager

No comments received.

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No comments received.

Public Spaces

No comments received.

Portsmouth Water Company

No comments received.

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: 7

Number of site notices: 2

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 5

Summary (4 objections):

Overlooking

Loss of Light

Noise pollution

Gardens too small

Precedence

Down grading areas charm and character

No similar living dwelling in area

Car fumes

Impact on residential amenities

Loss of privacy

Visually intrusive

Impact on security - increased access to rear of properties

Drainage concerns

Inaccurate plans - **Officer Comment:** The plans omit the rear extension to the existing property which is intended to be retained. This has been discussed with the agent and applicant and is reflected in this report. Given the recommendation to refuse planning permission amended plans have not been requested at this stage, however the impact of the rear extension has been assessed on site and in this report.

Fire brigade access

Health impacts from car fumes

Enfocability concerns in relation to not selling properties separately

Own hobby room not a precedent

Construction noise and pollution - **Officer Comment:** This is not an issue that would prevent development.

Summary (1 Support)

Applicant has owned property some 10 years

Due to age and disability starting to find rear garden a job to maintain to reasonable standard

Applicant very happy with location of his property to local shops and family.

Has asked myself and daughter if we would consider moving into the existing bungalow so we can look after them as they get older.

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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Drainage/source protection
- (v) Impact on tree
- (vi) Car parking and highway issues
- (vii) Developer contributions

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. As such, the addition of a further dwelling in such a location would in principle make a modest contribution to the Council's housing requirements.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

The proposal would result in the provision of a new dwelling to the rear of the existing property. The area is characterised by properties fronting Park Lane or Lester Avenue and the proposal would be out of character with the established pattern of frontage development. There are no other examples of similar 'backland' development in the immediate vicinity of the site.

The proposed site plan does not show the existing rear extensions to No.14 which project approximately 8m to the rear of the property. The retained property would have a very restricted rear garden which would provide a substandard outside amenity space for the property. The proposed bungalow would be located adjacent to the northern and eastern boundary. As a result of the proposed layout the proposed dwelling and the retained dwelling would appear cramped and the site would appear overdeveloped. This would contrast with the existing pattern of residential development.

It is noted that the proposed garage as shown would measure 2.8m x 5.7m which is sub-standard in terms of the Council's Parking SPD which requires minimum 6 x 3m internal space. A larger garage would further impact on the cramped nature of the development.

Overall the development is considered harmful to the established character of the area and would result in a cramped and overdeveloped site. Furthermore if permitted the proposal could set a precedent for further development to the rear of properties in this area which would cumulatively further erode the character of the area.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The main impacts in terms of residential amenity are considered to be to No.12 and 16 Park Lane and to No.19-23 Lester Avenue. In addition it is necessary to consider the residential amenities of both the existing dwelling at No.14 and the proposed dwelling to the rear.

In relation to No.12 Park Lane, this property is located to the south of the application site and adjacent to the proposed access. The demolition of the car port and garage to No.14 would open up the common boundary between 12 and 14. Access to the rear of the property to serve the proposed bungalow would lead to an increase in entry and access from the site and additional activity. If planning permission were granted a

boundary treatment condition could have been imposed which would help to mitigate the impacts. Given the single storey nature of the proposed bungalow it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable overlooking.

With regard to the impact on No.16 (objection received from this property), the access drive would be set off the common boundary with this property. No 16 is the attached bungalow to No.14. Again, given the single storey nature of the proposed development it is not considered that the proposal would lead to overlooking or loss of light to an unacceptable degree.

No's 19-23 Lester Avenue are 2 storey houses set approx 35m from the proposed bungalow. Whilst it is recognised that the building would be close to these properties rear boundaries, there would be no windows facing the boundary and given the distance between the proposed dwelling and the houses it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable relationship between properties.

In relation to the existing dwelling, it is noted that the site plan does not accurately reflect the external amenity space that would remain for this property given the rear extensions that have previously been added. The front garden is laid to hard surfacing and would be used for car parking. The rear garden would be 'L' shaped and narrow. The property would also have the access to the rear bungalow running to the side and parking/garaging to the rear. It is considered that this constrained arrangement is contrary to the Councils Design Guidance and policy CS16 and fail to provide adequate and acceptable outside amenity space..

The proposed bungalow would only have outside amenity space to the front, however this would be dominated by parking and turning space. There would however be a slightly more usable garden area than that of the retained dwelling.

In conclusion, the proposal would, given its backland siting lead to unusual relationships with neighbouring properties, however these are not in themselves considered to cause sufficient harm to warrant refusal. The main concerns relate to the cramped and constricted outside amenity areas for the existing dwelling and the impact of vehicles and associated parking and maneuvering. It is considered that the cramped nature of the proposals would unacceptably impact the residents of the existing and proposed dwelling.

(iv) Drainage/source protection

In relation to drainage, a third party raised the matter of a filled stream. Building control have not raised drainage issues and if planning permission were to be recommended conditions to address drainage would be imposed.

The site is within a source protection area and Portsmouth Water were consulted as a result, no response has been received. It is considered that conditions could be imposed to address potential concerns had permission been recommended.

(v) Impact on tree

To the north of the site boundary is a fir tree. This is located close to the proposed bungalow. The tree is considered to add to the visual amenities of the area, although this impact is localised and the tree is not currently considered worthy of a TPO. No details have been submitted in relation to the Arboricultural Impact of the development on the tree. Given that the application is not supported (and following discussion with

the agent), it is not considered proportionate to pursue Arboricultural requirements at this stage.

(vi) Car parking and highway issues

In relation to car parking, the Council's parking standards would require 2 or 3 spaces for the existing dwelling (3 spaces are already provided to the site frontage (northern side)).

The proposed bungalow would require 2 spaces (as the study is bedroom sized). These could be accommodated in a slightly larger garage and with external parking. As refusal is recommended the garage alteration has not been pursued.

Cycle parking could be provided in the enlarged garage and would also be required for the retained dwelling.

(vii) Developer contributions

In relation to Developer Contributions The development would be liable to CIL had permission been recommended, this would need to be calculated on the basis of the new floorspace of the bungalow and garage - the demolished garage floorspace at a rate of £80/sqm + indexing.

This development would also 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 all new housing development within this zone is that it is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA. Policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan which was adopted on 30 June 2014, covers this issue and allows for a financial contribution to be made towards mitigation measures. This is set at £176 per dwelling to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project. For the proposed dwelling, plus admin and monitoring fee, a payment of £204.80 is due. This payment has not been pursued at this stage given the other concerns in relation to the application. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policies CS11, CS21 (Developer Contributions) and DM24 .

Since the application is recommended for refusal the absence of the SRMP financial contributions can form a further reason for refusal, and in the event of an appeal, both this contribution and the CIL payment can be subsequently made to address these issues.

8 Conclusion

In conclusion whilst the site lies within the built up area where residential development is considered acceptable in principle, and the addition of a further dwelling in such a location would make a modest contribution to the Council's housing requirements, in this case the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and be contrary to the established pattern of residential development. In addition it would result in a cramped form of development and a poor quality of external amenity space. These adverse environmental and social impacts are considered to outweigh the economic and social benefits of the proposed dwelling. Finally SRMP contributions have not been secured to mitigate the impact of the development on the SPA as required under the Habitat Regulations. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/16/01158 for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed bungalow to the rear of 14 Park Lane would introduce a form of development contrary to the established pattern of residential development in the locality. This would by reason of its backland siting, design and use be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore the development in combination with the existing dwelling would result in the site appearing cramped and overdeveloped in contrast to the lower density existing character. The site would also be dominated by parking, drive and turning areas. Finally the development would appear to be likely to negatively impact the adjacent tree to the north in the garden of No16 Park Lane and no arboricultural impact assessment or mitigation has been provided. The tree is considered to add to the visual amenities of the immediate locality and on the basis of the information available its long term health and vitality is likely to be compromised. The development is therefore contrary to policies CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed development would lead to an unacceptable level and quality of private amenity space for the retained and proposed dwellings. The limited garden areas would also be dominated by car parking, drives and turning areas. This would result in dwellings which have the potential to provide family accommodation being compromised unacceptably in terms of their residential amenities and providing unsuitable living environments for future occupants. The proposals are therefore contrary to policy CS16 of Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 The proposal, without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements to secure a contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project, is contrary to the Council's Policy on contributions towards measures of mitigation adopted by the Local Planning Authority. These seek to ensure that the provision is made from new development towards mitigating against increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. The development is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.