

65 Andrew Crescent, Waterlooville – Appellants Statement of Case

Please see below highlighted in blue the appeal against the planning officers comments for refusal:

The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse planning permission are:

1. By virtue of the small size of the plot, the proposed development results in a cramped and confined layout that does not respect the more spacious setting and pattern of development found in the immediate vicinity. The siting of the proposed bungalow in such close proximity to boundaries would result in a poor living environment and outlook for future occupiers. The proposed development would be out of keeping with character of surrounding development, harmful to the amenities of the area and future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed dwelling sits 1 mtr off the SE and SW boundaries and still allows for the minimum distance of garden between properties for recreational use.

The existing site is occupied by a prominent garage and therefore this would be replaced with a similar apex design dwelling therefore keeping with a design that does not differ from existing street scenes.

The proposed chalet style bungalow demonstrates similar strong characteristics of that of surrounding dwellings.

2. Having regard to the small size of the plot, its relationship with adjoining development and the proposed siting of the dwelling close to shared boundaries, the proposed development would result in an overbearing and oppressive form of development that would give rise to new noise and activity, harmful to the outlook, living conditions and the quiet enjoyment of the adjoining properties, particularly 67 Andrew Crescent and 2 Margaret Close. The proposal is therefore harmful to neighbouring residential amenity and contrary to policy CS16, clauses c) and e) of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

This would be no different to that of any other dwelling in terms of noise etc.

I believe that this is a random comment with no evidential data to be supported.

The proposed dwelling provides sufficient distance to mitigate disruptive noise.

Our Ref: APP/21/00639

3. On the basis of the information available and in the absence of a detailed drainage investigation and assessment, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the development would not lead to additional on and off site surface water flooding issues to the site and immediate area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS15 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

A detailed drainage plan would be produced to ensure compliance.

This comment can only be added as a concern opposed to a deciding factor to determine application success.

4. In the absence of a Habitats Regulations Assessment and suitable agreement to secure appropriate mitigation measures, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the Solent European Sites. The development would be likely to result in increased recreational pressures from future residents and impact on the water environment and as such, it is contrary to Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations Plan) 2014, policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, emerging Policy E16 and EX1 of the Submission Havant Borough Local Plan, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

A full ecologist and biodiversity report would need to be submitted to ensure compliance.