
Site Address: 1A Milton Road, Waterlooville, PO7 6AB
Proposal: First floor and two storey rear extensions; alterations to the roof including raised eaves levels to front and sides to form 2No. two bedroom properties following demolition of the front porch, and garage with associated parking and landscaping.
Application No: APP/16/00020
Applicant: Mr Miah
Agent: Mr Flint
Ward: Waterloo

Expiry Date: 11/03/2016
Team: Team 2
Case Officer: Heather Lealan

Chris Flint Ass Ltd

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site consists of a detached two storey dwelling with rooms at first floor level built into the eaves. The dwelling has been extended to the rear by a single storey flat roof rear extension which forms the full width of the rear elevation. To the north west is a driveway leading to a double garage. To the front is additional parking.
- 1.2 To the south west is the rear garden area of two dwellings, the most southerly (70 Hambledon Road) is a detached two storey dwelling with hipped roof, the other, (no 72 Hambledon Road) is a modest sized bungalow, both dwellings face out to Hambledon Road. A 1.8m fence, trellis and hedge form the shared boundary.
- 1.3 To the rear is the end section of a rear garden, a thin hedge forms the boundary.
- 1.4 To the north east is a two storey detached dwelling with dormers facing out over the application site.
- 1.5 To the front is a 1.0m wall and a bungalow is sited opposite. This part of Milton Road is characterised substantially by bungalows with vegetated and hard standing gardens and intervening skyline visible between buildings and above the rooflines.

2 Planning History

92/57037/000 - Remove conifer trees and existing front wall and replace with 4ft wall and railings, PERM, 28/02/1992

APP/12/00020 - Rear extension, first floor extension and canopy to front., REF, 12/03/2012

APP/12/00866 - Creation of additional accommodation by first floor and two storey rear extensions; alterations to roof including raised eaves levels to front and sides. Addition of front porch and provision of parking spaces. (Revised Application.), REF, 30/10/2012

APP/13/01214 - First floor and two storey rear extensions; alterations to roof including raised eaves levels to front and sides. Addition of front porch and demolition of garage to rear (Resubmission of APP/12/00866)., REF, 28/02/2014 but subsequently allowed at appeal.

3 Proposal

First floor and two storey rear extensions; alterations to the roof including raised eaves levels to front and sides to form 2No. two bedroom properties following demolition of the front porch, and garage with associated parking and landscaping.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS9	(Housing)
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)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Engineering/Drainage

No observations

Waste Services Manager

No concerns

Development Engineer

I am concerned that the layout shows the parking of four cars in the existing front garden and does not allow the cars to turn on site and enter Milton road. I would like a plan with turning overlays showing the amount of parking that can be accommodated on site along with the required parking and turning. An informed decision can then be made on the acceptability of the proposal

Comment - agent advised of highway comments but amended plans not sought as the principle of the scheme is not acceptable, (see section 7)

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: One

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Summary:

- (a) This appears to be a very contrived subdivision of the building, trying to stay within the profile of the previously allowed application at appeal.
- (b) From the front it does not appear as 2 dwellings with the entrance to the second semi on the side elevation.
- (c) I would like to see a plan which sets out the revised access to the site as two dwellings and position of allocated parking for each dwelling.
- (d) Impact of scale of extension of view and light to adjacent dwelling
- (e) Invasion of privacy into house and garden

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 streetscene
- (iii) Nature of development
- (iv) Impact upon residential amenity
- (v) Impact on highway
- (vi) CIL and SRMP considerations

(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. The proposed extensions to the dwelling house were allowed at appeal and so the merits of these additions, in terms of their built form and impact on adjoining properties, have been established as being acceptable. As such, the key considerations below will assess the impact of the subdivision of the building to form two dwellings.

(ii) Impact upon the streetscene

It is not considered that there will be a great impact to the streetscene, the form of the building has been accepted by the appeal Inspector. There would be a limited streetscene impact from the intensification of the use of this site, principally from the large area of hard surfacing required for car parking. However, given that such an arrangement could be achieved under normal permitted development rights this would not be great enough to warrant a refusal of the application.

(iii) Nature of development

It is considered that the subdivision of the site as proposed would result in a cramped and congested layout to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers of the site. The garden areas would not accord with the adopted Borough Design Guide's minimum 10m depth and the arrangement of the parking area directly to the front of the dwellings would result in the area to the front of the building appearing cramped

also. The tandem and close proximity of the parking spaces to each other would result in an inadequate layout that would be difficult to use for daily activities. The door to one of the proposed dwellings would be to the side elevation of the dwelling house resulting in an overall building that wasn't easily legible and that would have the appearance of being one dwelling not two. There may also be management issues as there would be a good degree of shared amenity space.

(iv) Impact upon residential amenity

It is considered that the intensification of the use of the site may impact the amenities of the occupiers of the surrounding dwellings but that the greatest impact will be to the amenities of any future occupiers of the site. The impact of the increased building bulk has been considered by the appeal Inspector as acceptable.

(v) Impact on highway

The Highway Engineer has raised concerns regarding the proposed parking layout and that adequate turning has not been demonstrated that will allow vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. This is considered a significant failing of this scheme given the site's location on the busy Milton Road, which is a bus route, and close proximity to the Milton Road/Hambledon Road roundabout, and the layout is considered likely to have a significant and unacceptable impact on the safe and convenient operation of the highway network as a result.

(vi) CIL and SRMP considerations

The CIL rates to be applied to development are set out in the Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which was adopted by the council on the 20th February 2013. This followed two public consultation exercises and an Examination into the Charging Schedule by an independent Examiner. The Examiners Report concluded that the Havant Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule provided an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the borough. The levy is charged at £80 per square metre on new floorspace (measured as gross internal area).

It is considered that there is a CIL liability for this site. The agent has completed the CIL planning form and confirmed that the net additional gross internal floor space will be 44 sqm and as such this will require a CIL payment of £4,227.14.

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 unless mitigated. The measures of mitigation adopted by the LPA at the end of June 2014 requires a payment of £174 per dwelling to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership.

An assessment of the proposed development has therefore been conducted under Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) (The Habitats Regulations). The proposal would lead to a net increase in population (households), which would be likely to lead to a significant effect (as described in Regulation 61 (1) (a) of the Habitats Regulations) on the Solent Special Protection Area (SPA). The development is not necessary for the management of the SPA.

The applicant has proposed a mitigation package based on the methodology set out above - 2 new homes are proposed in lieu of 1 existing. As such, the scale of mitigation has been calculated as £174 (plus monitoring and administration fees). The applicant has confirmed that they would be willing to enter into a unilateral undertaking to secure the mitigation package in line with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, however on basis of a refusal for other reasons as set out above, these factors must be included in the scope of reasons for refusal.

8 Conclusion

It is considered that the scheme will result in a congested and cramped site layout to the detriment of the amenities of any future occupiers of the site, and it has not been demonstrated that vehicles can enter and leave the site in a safe and convenient manner. Therefore it is considered that the scheme does not accord with the requirements of the NPPF and policies CS16 and DM13 of the Core Strategy.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/16/00020 for the following reasons:

- 1 Development of the site in the manner proposed would amount to an over-intensive use of the site, in that it would give rise to unsatisfactory plot sizes and to a cramped and congested layout, to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers of the development. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 2 The proposal does not incorporate adequate facilities to enable a vehicle to turn on the site and so enter the highway in a forward gear, which is considered essential in the interests of road safety and the convenience of other road users, and without which the residual cumulative impacts of the development would be severe. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16, CS20, and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 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 Partnership, is contrary to the Council's Policy on contributions towards measures of mitigation adopted by the Local Planning Authority which seeks to ensure that the provision is made from new development towards mitigating against increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. It is therefore contrary to Policy 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.