
Site Address:	93 Winterslow Drive, Havant, PO9 5DZ		
Proposal:	Erection of 2No 2 bed dwellings with associated parking.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/22/00872	Expiry Date:	01/11/2022
Applicant:	Mr Comley		
Agent:	Miss Roberts	Case Officer:	David Eaves
	Critchley Architecture And		
	Design (CAAD) Ltd		
Ward:	Battins		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

93 Winterslow Drive is located on the north east corner of Winterslow Drive. The property currently benefits from a large plot which measures approximately 20m in width by 30m in depth. The site remains in a poor state and there are no trees on the site. The site is adjacent to Bondfields Plain, a large area of open space.

2 Planning History

APP/19/00833 - Erection of 2 No.2 bed dwelling houses with associated parking. (Revised application). Refused October 2019 for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of the site. The proposed car parking would dominate the frontage of the properties and as such the development would result in a cramped and contrived layout which would have an adverse effect on the amenities of the area and the living conditions of the occupants/owners of the existing and proposed dwellings. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. In the absence of a suitable agreement to secure appropriate mitigation measures, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the Solent Special Protection Areas due to the increase in recreation as a result of the development, and so is contrary to Policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

3. The proposal, in the absence of an assessment of nutrient discharge and without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements in relation to off setting any increase, is likely to have a significant effect on internationally designated ecological sites (Special Protection Areas, Special Area of Conservation and potential SPA designations). The development is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal on the 24th June 2020 with the Inspector raising concerns in relation to:

- Parking and maneuvering and impact on living conditions
- Excessive hard surfacing dominating the site's frontage
- Layout would not be characteristic of the local pattern of development.
- Lack of parking for No.93 (with current parking on access)
- Uncharacteristic, more intensive layout that would be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy
- Conflict with Borough Design Guide re dominance of car parking
- Issues with impacts on SPA
- Adverse effects arising on the character and appearance of the area and on living conditions for existing and future occupiers would outweigh the benefit of two additional homes.

APP/19/00635 - Erection of 2 No.3bed dwelling houses with associated parking.,
Refused on 16/08/2019 for the following reasons:

1 The proposed development would by reason of its size, design and prominent siting be harmful to the existing character and appearance of the area conflicting with the established pattern of development, and visual and spatial characteristics and setting of the street scene of Winterslow Drive. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

2 In the absence of a suitable agreement to secure appropriate mitigation measures, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the Solent Special Protection Areas due to the increase in recreation as a result of the development, and so is contrary to Policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

3 The proposal, in the absence of an assessment of nutrient discharge and without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements in relation to off setting any increase, is likely to have a significant effect on internationally designated ecological sites (Special Protection Areas, Special Area of Conservation and potential SPA designations). The development is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

4 The proposal would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of the site. The proposed car parking would dominate the frontage of the properties and as such the development would result in a cramped and contrived layout which would have an adverse effect on the amenities of the area and the living conditions of the occupants/owners of the existing and proposed dwellings. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

09/70495/005

Erection of 1No. 3 bed and 1No. 1 bed semi detached dwelling with associated car parking and landscaping utilising existing access onto Winterslow Drive.
Refused 16.11.09.

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of the site. The proposed car parking would dominate the frontage of the properties and as such the development would result in a cramped and contrived layout which would have an adverse effect on the amenities of the area and the living conditions of the occupants/owners of the existing and proposed dwellings. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policies D1 and T7 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011, which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework, and Planning Policy Statements 1 and 3.

2. The proposal, without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements to secure a contribution towards the Hampshire County Council Transport Policy, is contrary to the Council's Policy on contributions towards transport infrastructure which, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 13, seeks to ensure that the provision is made from new development towards improvements to the transport infrastructure. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policies T10 and IMP1 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011, which forms part of the Havant Borough Local Development Framework.

Appeal dismissed 18/5/10 - The Inspector concluded that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and due to the proposed parking arrangement would result in the potential to cause significant inconvenience to existing and future residents to the detriment of their living conditions.

08/70495/004

Erection of 2No. 3 bed detached dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping utilising existing access onto Winterslow Drive.
Refused 15/10/08
Dismissed at appeal 15/01/09.

The application was refused for the following reason:

The proposal would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of the site. The proposed car parking would dominate the frontage of the properties and as such the development would result in a cramped and contrived layout which would have an adverse effect on the amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policies D1 and T7 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1996-2011.

07/70495/003 - Construction of 2No. 2 bedroom houses with associated car parking and cycle stores. , REFUSED,19/04/2007

The application was refused for two reasons:

1. Development of the site in the manner proposed would not provide adequate and usable provision of car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's adopted standards and would therefore encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway which would interrupt the free flow of traffic, detrimental to highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies UB3, T2, T5 and H7 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 2006-2011 and policies D1, H2 and T7 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan.

2. The proposal would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of the site. The proposed car parking would dominate the frontage of the properties and as such the development would have an adverse effect on the amenities of the area. the proposal is therefore contrary to policies UB3, T2, and T5 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan 2006-2011 and policies D1 and T7 of the Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan.

06/70495/002

Outline application for 1No. detached dwelling. Resolved to grant consent under delegated powers. However, the Section 106 Agreement was never signed. Therefore letter was sent to Mr Lewry (previous application) at 24 Hazelton Way stating that if we have not received a response within 14 days the application would be recorded as not proceeded with. No response therefore the application was not proceeded with.

06/70495/001 - Outline Application for detached dwelling house., WD,07/04/2006

05/70495/000 - Two storey side extension., PERMITTED,31/10/2005

3 Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of 2No 2 bed dwellings with associated parking. The dwellings would be two storey dwellings but with roof lights to the rear roof slopes and a small rear window.

The dwellings would continue an existing terrace of four properties by the addition of two dwellings set back from the front of No.93 by approximately 3m. The proposal includes a ground floor walkway between 93 and the proposed dwellings.

In terms of proposed parking the proposed site plan shows four parking spaces in front of proposed dwelling 93A with hardsurfacing in front of 93A and 93B. There is a proposed pedestrian route from the existing footpath from in front of No.95 to serve the new dwellings and No.93. There are small landscaping strips shown between the access drive and the proposed footpath and to the rear of the parking spaces.

4 **Policy Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

- CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
- 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)
- AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Building Regulation consent required for this work

Front entrance door clashes with the staircase 400 mm clearance at base of stair is needed

Access to front or rear doors should comply with Approved Document M re disabled access

Flue out let might be an issue with 93 B due to boundary location

Further comments may be made when checked by Building Control

Community Infrastructure

CIL Liable: <http://www.havant.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy-charging-schedule>.

Additionally, pending a response from Natural England on the 'HRA', instructions should be passed by the Case Officer to the CI Team to:

(a) Issue the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Unilateral Undertaking, based on the number of additional dwellings and their respective number of bedrooms. See <http://www.havant.gov.uk/unilateralundertaking-solent-recreation-mitigation-strategy>.

b) Issue the Nutrient Neutrality Unilateral Undertaking. See <https://www.havant.gov.uk/nitrogen-developers>

Conservation Officer

No comments received

Councillor Kristine Tindall - Battins

No comments received

Councillor T Moutray

No comments received

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No comments received

Southern Water

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk and please read our New Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link: southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

The Council's Building Control officers or technical staff should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development.

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

Website: southernwater.co.uk or by email at: SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk

Engineering/Drainage

No comments received

Hampshire Highways

The Highway Authority wish to make the following comments.

Due to the scale of the proposal and that there is no change to the vehicular access, HCC's standing advice should be referred to in the first instance. As a result, the Highway Authority will not provide detailed comments on this planning application. For more information on standing advice please use the following link: www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/consultation

Natural England Government Team

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Further information on when to consult Natural England on planning proposals is here
Planning and transport authorities: get environmental advice on planning - GOV.UK
(www.gov.uk)

Natural England is not able to provide specific advice on this application and therefore has no comment to make on its details. Although we have not been able to assess the potential impacts of this proposal on statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes, we offer the further advice and references to Standing Advice.

Natural England advises Local Planning Authorities to use the following tools to assess the impacts of the proposal on the natural environment:

Impact Risk Zones:

Natural England has provided Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) with Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) which can be used to determine whether the proposal impacts statutory nature conservation sites. Natural England recommends that the LPA uses these IRZs to assess potential impacts. If proposals do not trigger an Impact Risk Zone then Natural England will provide an auto-response email.

Standing Advice:

Natural England has published Standing Advice. Links to standing advice are in Annex A

If after using these tools, you consider there are significant risks to statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes, please set out the specific areas on which you require Natural England's advice.

Further information on LPA duties relating to protected sites and areas is here-
Protected sites and areas: how to review planning applications - GOV.UK
(www.gov.uk)

Further guidance is also set out in Planning Practice Guidance on the natural environment

Natural environment - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) and on Habitats Regulations Assessment

Appropriate assessment - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Norse South East
No comments received

Portsmouth Water have reviewed the application and associated documents for APP/22/00872 and have no concerns regarding impacts to groundwater quality. Therefore, we do not recommend any planning conditions to be included on the planning permission.

No comments received

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 site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 7 representations objecting to the proposals (8 names).

Comment	Officer Comment
<u>Vehicle parking:</u> 93 has parking spot on site along with other vehicles parked on entrance drive from layby. Not enough parking for 3 houses Access road concern Existing parking problem Parking on verges and pavements Safety issue Blocked drives Children's safety Have to park away from house Construction would further limit parking	Officer Comment: Parking and access considered in part 7
No. 93 has a drive which has 3 vehicles parked on it	Officer Comment: This would be a temporary issue and in itself would not be a reason for refusal.

Are losing verges and grassland to the amount of vehicles present, no layby space Parking has not allowed for present tenant and their three vehicles parked on drive and layby space Weekend parking issue	
<u>Flood risk:</u> Site within 20m of stream, brook Locals had insurances declined because of flooding Getting worse Flooding Problem with rain run off down hill - houses lower than road Gardens flood - gullies not coping with rain More concrete, tarmac and bricks will make matters worse	Officer Comment: Flood risk is considered in part 7.
<u>Trees and Hedges</u> Were trees, every few months a team of men along with a truck attend and cut all boundary trees and shrubs.	Noted
<u>Biodiversity</u> Did have bat population at one point - can't say seen lately - can only assume tree/hedge works has meant we may have lost them.	Noted
<u>Housing Need</u> Read HBC not keeping up with demand for housing - for profit not to help Council - many large sites being constructed around Havant	Officer Comment: Housing need is considered in part 7.
<u>Character of Area / Impact on Neighbours</u> Over Crowding Noise Overlooking garden Impact on privacy	Officer Comment: Impacts on neighbours are considered in part 7

7 Planning Considerations

- 7.1 The Council has conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), including Appropriate Assessment (AA), of the proposed development under Regulation 63 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The Council's assessment as competent Authority under those regulations is included in the case file. The screening under Regulation 63(1)(a) found that there was likely to be a significant effect on several Solent European Sites (as defined in the applications HRA) due to both the increase in recreation and the decrease in water quality that would be a result of the proposed development.
- 7.2 The planning application was then subject to Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. This included two packages of avoidance and mitigation packages. The first is a package of measures based on the suggested scale of mitigation in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. The second is a package of measures based on the Position Statement and Mitigation Plan for Nutrient Neutral Development. The applicant has indicated a willingness to enter into a legal agreement to secure the mitigation packages.
- 7.3 The Appropriate Assessment concluded that the avoidance and mitigation packages are sufficient to remove the significant effects on European Sites which would otherwise have been likely to occur. The HRA was subject to consultation with Natural England as the appropriate nature conservation body under Regulation 63(3), however, no response has been received in relation to this consultation and the statutory consultation period has now elapsed. The applicant has indicated a willingness to enter into a legal agreement to secure the mitigation packages.
- 7.4 The unilateral agreement and mitigation packages have now been received.
- 7.5 In other respects, 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) Impact on highways and parking
 - (v) Flood Risk
 - (vi) Developer contributions
- (i) Principle of development
- 7.6 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. The provision of two new dwellings would make a modest contribution to the Council's overall housing needs and it is accepted that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing supply. The NPPF paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 11 continues that for decision taking this means (c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay and (d) *where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*

(ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

- 7.7 In this case where the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply this effectively means that a 'tilted balance' applies to the consideration of this application, however, importantly there remains a need to ensure that any adverse impacts in approving an application would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

- 7.8 The creation of high quality buildings and places is a fundamental aim and paragraph 130 notes that *Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:*

(b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

Paragraph 134 states;

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes.

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

- 7.9 Both the immediate vicinity and wider locality are residential in character. The residential layout generally comprises terraces of four properties or pairs of semi-detached properties set back from the highway, which use similar materials in the form of brick and tiles. This gives the area a distinctive character. There are generally gardens to the front and rear with generous side garden areas provided where terraces adjoin street corners. Some properties in the vicinity have front garden parking spaces. There are also several grassed areas in the vicinity in the form of verges which together with the set back of houses and parking bays, contribute to a sense of openness. The amenity space provided to the west of the existing dwelling at 93 Winterslow Drive forms a part of the spacious residential character of the vicinity. Previous applications (before the application APP/19/00883) were refused and dismissed at appeal by virtue of having a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Application APP/19/00883 was refused as an over-intensive use of the site with the car parking dominating the frontage and resulting in a cramped and contrived layout with an adverse effect on the amenities of the area and the living conditions of the occupants/owners of the existing and proposed dwellings. Other reasons for refusal were related to SPA impacts not being addressed. The application was then subject to an appeal.

7.10 APP/19/00883 Appeal decision stated:

At several houses close to the site, a front garden parking space has been formed near to the living room of an adjacent house, thereby potentially resulting in a level of disturbance when a car is manoeuvred. This relationship would be replicated at the appeal site with the 4 parking spaces set about 1m from the front wall of the houses. Yet the impact on living conditions would be more intense at the appeal site, given the number of parking spaces, the need to turn on site and to pass close to the front and side of 93 Winterslow Drive. The appellant points out that the Highway Authority is supportive of the parking layout, but their comments are technical, relating to function rather than to amenity considerations.

The parking and turning area would result in an extensive hard surfaced area that would dominate the site's frontage. This would be screened to some degree by front garden walls and parked cars and there would be two soft landscaped areas. But the layout would not be characteristic of the local pattern of development. The number of spaces seems to be in accordance with the Council's parking standards, but there would not appear to be a dedicated parking area for no.93, and the current practice of parking on the access strip would no longer be available if access is to be maintained to the new houses.

The appellant has referred to some front gardens nearby having been totally hard surfaced in relation to permitted development allowances, but this is insufficient reason to diminish assessment of the proposal in relation to relevant development plan policies. The proposal would result in an uncharacteristic, more intensive layout that would be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) (HCS). This requires high quality design for development that responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and which does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through matters including in relation to noise.

7.11 In comparing the latest appeal with the current application it is noted that the layout remains similar in relation to the buildings but there are some changes in relation to the site frontage and parking layout. The APP/19/00883 application included 4 parking spaces with parking end on to the front of proposed units 93A and 93B. There were two small landscaping areas to the north of the access and to the west of the site. The frontage was car and hard-surfacing dominated. The current proposals again show four parking spaces to the front of proposed units 93A and 93B. These would include spaces along the western side of the site and maneuvering/turning to the front of the new dwellings. Whilst there would be a marginal increase in the set off to the front of the dwellings from the parking this area would remain open and hard surfaced. The Landscaping to western side would be reduced compared to the appeal scheme. There would be a separate path to the front of No.93 separated from the vehicular access by a narrow strip of landscaping.

7.12 Overall the frontage of the site would remain dominated by parking and hardsurfacing and this would contrast with the established pattern of development. The development would therefore conflict with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan which requires high quality that responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context. In addition Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 states in paragraph 5.18: *As stated in the seven key principles of good design, the layout of new schemes should not be dominated by the car or highways.*

- 7.13 The proposed houses themselves would be set back from the existing terrace and their design picks up on the existing buildings. Overall, the dwellings themselves are considered acceptable (as per APP/19/883), however, overall a satisfactory development is not achieved in design terms due to the parking and hardsurfacing proposed at the site conflicting with the character and appearance of the surroundings and the dominance of parking.
- 7.14 On the above basis, it is considered that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area as it would introduce a more intensive form of development into an area that is defined by its spacious character. The harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area would outweigh the benefits of providing 2 dwellings, which comprises two bedroom units.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.15 It is considered that the proposed dwellings have been reasonably designed in terms of potential overlooking to the residential property 87 Winterslow Gardens. The windows are approximately 24m away from side elevation of No.87 Winterslow Drive and therefore given this degree of separation it is not considered that the development would have a significant adverse impact with regard to overlooking. Furthermore it is considered that the development by virtue of its layout, size and scale would not result in a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties with regard to loss of sunlight/daylight or overbearing impact.
- 7.16 The main concerns relate to the impacts of the parking on the proposed occupiers of No.93A and No.93B. This proposal would still dominate the frontage of the properties, and as such the development would result in a cramped and contrived layout which would have an adverse effect on the amenities of the area and the living conditions of the occupants/owners of the proposed dwellings. Notwithstanding the amended layout, the proposed parking arrangement would result in manoeuvring very close to the doors of the proposed dwellings, and given the limited space result in awkward manoeuvring to access the parking area, and to leave the site. As such it is considered that the revised parking layout has not addressed the concerns raised by the previous Inspectors in dismissing those appeals.

(iv) Impact on highways and parking

- 7.17 The proposed development requires two car parking spaces per unit and as such there would be a requirement for four off road parking spaces to meet the requirements of the Borough Parking SPD. This application does provide the required number of spaces, however as outlined above concerns exist over the feasibility and use of these spaces in terms of their impact on the living conditions of residents. It is noted that significant concerns have been raised by a number of local residents that the proposal would result in the loss of existing parking provision, in an area where parking spaces are in short supply as many of the dwellings in the area do not have off-street parking. This proposal would utilise the existing crossover and access to the site from the highway, and therefore the proposed development will not decrease the amount of on street parking.
- 7.18 Overall it is not considered that this proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the safety or free flow of the highway network to justify a reason for refusal of this matter.

(v) Flood Risk

- 7.19 The site lies in Flood Zone 1 which is the lowest flood risk. It is noted that concerns have been raised by nearby residents in relation to local drainage issues. It is considered that should planning permission have been recommended conditions could have been imposed to address these concerns and ensure suitable drainage proposals.

(vi) Developer contributions

- 7.20 As set out above the development would result in an impact on the SPA in terms of nutrients and Solent Special Protection Area requirements. A unilateral undertaking has been provided and financial contributions received of £3,137.98. This equates to:

Nutrient Mitigation Contribution £1,909.68
SRMS Contribution £1,182.30
Administration fee £46

- 7.21 The impacts on the SPA have therefore been addressed with this application and therefore will not need to result in a reason for refusal for this application.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 In conclusion the development would be dominated by the frontage parking and hard standing which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and detract from the established pattern of development. Furthermore the use of the parking area would have a harmful impact on the future residents of the development with parking and vehicular maneuvering within very close proximity to the front of the proposed dwellings. The proposal is considered to result in unacceptable harm which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed dwelling units.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/22/00872 for the following reason

- 1 The proposed car parking would dominate the frontage of the properties and as such the development would result in a cramped and contrived layout which would have an adverse effect on the amenities of the area and the living conditions of the occupants/owners of the proposed dwellings. Furthermore the parking and hardstanding would not reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.