
Site Address:	1 Brookfield Close, Havant, PO9 3BB		
Proposal:	Erection of 1No. attached two bedroom dwelling.		
Application No:	APP/16/00660	Expiry Date:	26/08/2016
Applicant:	Mr Matthews		
Agent:	Mr Carrington	Case Officer:	David Eaves
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site lies in a corner location on Brookfield Close and is at the end of a staggered terrace of two storey houses. The site is partly enclosed by hedge and fences but is open to the frontage and prominent from Brookfield Close.

2 Planning History

06/71359/000 - Pre-cast concrete shed to rear of 1 Brookfield Close.,
PERM,10/10/2006

3 Proposal

Erection of 1No. attached two bedroom dwelling. The dwelling would be two-storey in height with the ridge height set slightly lower than No.1 Brookfield Close. The house would be less wide than the host dwelling with a width of 4m compared to 5.5m for the attached dwelling. There would be a small rear projection at ground floor level.

Car parking would be provided to the rear of the site for the new dwelling (2 spaces) in this area there would also be two spaces for No.1 and a garage and a space for No.2 the latter parking being outside the red line site area.

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)
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 Borough Design Guide SPD 2011.

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD 2016

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control

The proposed dwelling may be within 3m of a public sewer according to sewer map. Exact location of sewer to be found on site.

Location of solid waste bin store not indicated in plan should comply with Approved Document H.

First floor windows should open to allow means of escape (appears to comply).

Southern Water

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul sewer - Informative requested.

Councils Building Control officers or technical staff should comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development.

The proposed development would lie within a Source Protection Zone. Southern Water will rely on your consultations with the EA to ensure the protection of the water supply source.

Arboriculturalist

No comments received

Waste

No concerns over waste collection regarding this planning application.

Development Engineer Highways

The Highway Authority has no adverse comment to this application subject to the provision of a new dropped kerb vehicular access.

I would suggest the Planning Authority asks for two parking space. However the layout shows these two spaces in a group of six spaces. A standard car parking space is 2.4m wide and 4.8m long. However this does not allow the car doors to be opened without using adjacent space for example in a car park a parked vehicles doors open into the next car parking space. If a 2.4m by 4.8m parking space is located between hard boundaries e.g. walls, fences, or landscaping it is very difficult for the cars occupants to exit the car. I would suggest that the submitted parking layout is checked.

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No comments received.

Public Spaces

No comments received.

Traffic Management, HBC

Provided the following dimensional requirements for the proposed parking spaces/garages are met, the traffic team has no adverse comments to make on this application.

An individual car parking space should measure a minimum 2.4m in width by 4.8m in length.

A single garage should measure a minimum of 3m in width by 6m in length internally. This will allow room for a modern car to be parked and still allow room for access down the side of the vehicle. The length is to allow room for storage, particularly cycles.

These should be regarded as minimum lengths as cars continue to increase in size. Space should also be provided for car doors to be opened and car boots to be accessed or garage doors to be opened.

Failure to meet these dimensional requirements may lead to additional on street parking close to the development site which may be detrimental to road safety.

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre:

Within 50m of Protected and Notable Species Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle

Within 50m Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh

Officer Comment- It is not considered that these ecological assets are likely to be harmed by the proposed development.

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: 2

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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) Highway matters
- (v) Drainage
- (vi) Developer contributions

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further residential development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria.

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

The site is located in a prominent corner position at the end of a terrace of two storey houses. The proposal would in built form projecting out to approximately 0.6m from the boundary with the highway at two storey height with a gable end. As a result the existing area of landscaping would be removed.

The proposed dwelling would conflict with the established pattern of residential development which is characterised by larger dwellings with relatively substantial rear gardens. The proposal would provide a smaller dwelling and the garden would be very restricted and further compromised by rear parking for the new dwelling and for the adjacent properties.

The development would result in existing landscaping including a hedge and tree being removed, these add to the character of the area although the tree is not considered suitable for a TPO.

It is considered that the provision of the dwelling would result in a cramped form of development out of keeping with the established pattern of development. Furthermore, the building would dominate the corner of Brookfield Close and be overbearing in the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

In relation to residential amenities it is necessary to consider the impact on No.1 Brookfield Close and the quality of the residential amenities of the occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

No.1. would have a reduced garden size as a result of the plot sub-division and the encroachment of the remaining garden by car parking to No1a. The main part of the garden would be reduced from a depth of 10m to approximately 7.5m. A small less usable area would remain to the rear of the parking/garage area. As a result of the reduction in depth and width of the rear garden to No.1 there would be a usable garden area of approximately 7.5 x 5.75m to the rear of the property. This combined with the parking to No1a would result in a restricted rear amenity area detracting from the living environment for residents within No.1.

No.1a would have an even more restricted garden with a depth of approximately 6m and a width of 4.5m. This would provide inadequate and sub-standard rear amenity space for future occupants of this two bedroom property. The Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 states that *'Garden length should normally allow 10 metres between the dwelling and the boundary'*.

No.1. currently has a first floor staircase window which would be removed as a result of the development, however, the loss of this window would not in itself be sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

In conclusion, the proposed development would result in inadequate rear amenity space for the proposed and host dwellings.

(iv) Highway matters

The proposal would result in the provision of a widened access point onto Brookfield Close and the provision of two car parking spaces for the proposed dwelling, this would meet the Council's Car Parking standards. No objection has been received from the Development Engineer.

(v) Drainage

The site lies outside of any flood zone and it is considered that adequate drainage can be provided. The site lies within the Source Protection Area, however the application is recommended for refusal. If permission were to be recommended a condition in relation to construction methods could be imposed to ensure that ground water quality was not negatively impacted.

(vi) Developer contributions

The development would be liable to CIL should permission have been granted, an informative to that effect is recommended.

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 all new housing development within this zone is that it is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA. The measures of mitigation adopted by the LPA at the end of June 2014 require a payment of £176 per dwelling to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project together with £20 administration and £8.80 monitoring fee. As the proposal is recommended for refusal the SRMP has not been pursued at this stage.

8 Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed development is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would provide inadequate private amenity space for future residents and for No.1. Brookfield Close.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/16/00660

(A) for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed dwelling would by reason of its design, height, mass and bulk on this prominent and cramped site result in a visually intrusive form of development to the harm of the character and amenities of Brookfield Close. Furthermore the proposed building and plot would contrast with the established pattern of residential development further detracting from the

character of the area. The development would therefore be contrary to Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 policy CS16, Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2 The proposed development would result in an unacceptable amount and quality of private outside amenity space for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling and for the occupiers of the retained dwelling No.1 Brookfield Close. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 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.