
Site Address:	Latchmore House, 99-101 London Road, Cowplain, Waterlooville, PO8 8XJ		
Proposal:	Construction of two storey extension and mansard roof to form 5No. flat.		
Application No:	APP/15/01146	Expiry Date:	08/12/2015
Applicant:	Mr Shirlaw	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr McDermott	Case Officer:	Daphney Haywood
	Town Planning Expert		
Ward:	Cowplain		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 Latchmore House comprises a two storey detached building with associated car park areas located on the west side of London Road and adjacent to the junction with Latchmore Forest Grove. The site is currently vacant.
- 1.2 Prior notification approval was granted in October 2015 (ref APP/15/00943) for the change of use from Class B1(a) office use to C3 residential use (6 dwellings) subject to prior approval covering flooding, highways and transport issues and contamination. The surrounding development is primarily residential with mainly detached housing fronting Latchmore Forest Grove to the west, and flatted development adjoining the site to the north, beyond which lies a mix of residential and commercial development.
- 1.3 Land levels fall to the north and west with the adjoining flat block at Chrisalex Court in London Road and the dwelling at 2 Latchmore Forest Grove being located on lower ground. Additionally the application building is set below the immediately adjoining road level in Latchmore Forest Grove with its southern car park area being at a raised level relative to the building. The western and northern boundaries are marked by mature hedging. The site which is approximately rectangular in shape plus a wedged area to the rear is mainly hardsurfaced.

2 Planning History

APP/15/00943 : Prior notification for change of use from Class B1(a) office use to C3 residential use (6 dwellings) subject to prior approval covering flooding, highways and transport issues and contamination. Granted 2015.

90/50374/002 First floor extension to offices fronting Latchmore Forest Grove Permit 31/01/91

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Construction of two storey extension and mansard roof to form 5 No. flat. The proposed extension would measure approx 9m by 9m and would comprise 3 flats (one on each floor) and a communal stair way. It would occupy part of the southern parking area adjoining the existing southern elevation and be sited up to the pavement with Latchmore Forest Grove. The remainder of this parking area would be retained to provide parking for 7 cars. Parking for 4 further cars would be provided on the

existing hardsurfaced area to the west. Cycle parking and bin store would be provided to the rear adjacent the boundary with 2 Latchmore Forest Grove.

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)
CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS9	(Housing)
DM11	(Planning for More Sustainable Travel)
DM12	(Mitigating the Impacts of Travel)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

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)

Havant Borough Council Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document
(December 2011)

Annual Monitoring Report

Havant Borough Residential Parking and Cycle Provision SPD 2010.

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 **Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations**

Environment Agency No bespoke comments

Building Control, (Fire Access Consultation) No comments to make

Southern Water Informative requested

Engineering/Drainage No comments received

Crime Prevention -Minor AppsNo comments received

Landscape Team

Existing northern and western site boundaries are well defined by existing hedgerow vegetation. I am concerned the proposed bin store, bike stores and extent of block paving substantially encroach across both hedge lines. Loss of this established screening vegetation will be of considerable detriment to neighbouring residents privacy, as well as, the established character of the landscape setting.

The proposed extension positioned immediately adjacent to the public highway, with a ground level FFL approximately 1 metre below the adjacent public footway and residents car park. On this aspect of the proposal, I have several specific concerns:

- Dwellings along Latchmore Forest Grove are set back a consistent distance from the road frontage behind mature, well vegetated front gardens. This arrangement contributes an attractive, well vegetated vista when viewed from London Road. Conversely, the proposed extension block will interrupt this consistency of building line and adversely impact the attractiveness of this vista.
- The proposed development lacks sufficient provision for an appropriate landscape setting.
- The ground floor apartment lacks an appropriate degree of privacy or attractive outlook from windows.

I anticipate both car parks require tracking and the application of visibility splays to demonstrate the amended car park layouts are appropriate. The 3 no parking bays positioned against the proposed extension represent an unacceptable vehicle impact risk – requiring some means of separation to protect the building façade. Presumably there should also be some provision for disabled access parking within the rear 4 bay car park?

A safe, clearly defined pedestrian route from Latchmore Forest Grove via the 7 bay carpark to the Communal stairs is also recommended.

Highways The car park and drive from London Road require tracking and the application of visibility splays to demonstrate that it is acceptable to the Highway Authority.

The Planning Authority is advised that using HBC Parking Standards The 6 two bed flats two spaces require 12 spaces and the 5 one bed flats 5 spaces. That is a total of 17 spaces. Also cycle storage facilities need to be shown. The applicant has incorporated 11 spaces into the design 7 spaces in the foreshorten existing car park and 4 in a car park taking access from London road

I leave it the Planning Authority to determine the amenity impact of the shortfall of 6 spaces.

Public Spaces Development Manager No comments received

Traffic Management Team No comments received

Waste Services Manager No adverse comments

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: 19

Number of site notices: One

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

Summary:

- Inadequate parking- nowhere for visitor parking, The occupants of the flats are likely to be couples possible with 2 cars

- Noise and fume pollution from increased traffic
- Proximity of parking and building up to the highway near to junction leading to risk of accidents. Inadequate turning provision
- Drainage unable to cope- exacerbate existing drainage problems
- subsidence
- extension would tower over and result in loss of light to 2 Latchmore Forest Drive
- yew tree in garden to No 2 is less than 10m from extension
- Impact of bin store adjacent boundary
- No amenity space or outside drying area

Comment:

The drainage details are covered under the building regulations. Subsidence is a private matter. See section 7 in respect to the other points.

7 Planning Considerations

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) Design of the Proposal and Impact upon the streetscene
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highways
- (v) CIL and Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs)

(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. Policies CS9, and CS17 of the Core Strategy together with Policies AL1 and AL2 support residential development within the built up area and the need to provide small units to meet housing demand, which is also identified in the Annual Monitoring report.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development however this should not be to the detriment of the local area.

Paragraph 6 makes it clear that regard must be had to the document as a whole in determining what the Government's view of sustainable development means in practice. It promotes the effective use of land through the re-use of previously developed land. With paragraph 49 stating that *"housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."*

However, paragraph 56 makes it clear that *"Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."* Paragraph 58, bullet 4 seeks to ensure that development responds to local character, with bullet 6 requiring good architecture.

Paragraph 59 seeks to ensure the sustainable construction of the dwellings, whilst paragraphs 60 and 61 seek to ensure the development is designed well accounting for local context. Paragraph 64 however, requires development of poor design to be refused.

Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy Local Development Framework 2011 seeks to reflect the requirements of the NPPF at a local level. It and the local plan policies encourages the principle of development within the settlement area, provided that any new development pays proper regard to the character and appearance of the area, design and neighbour amenity.

(ii) Design of the Proposal and Impact upon the streetscene

The proposal indicates the provision of a mansard roof to accommodate 2 flats and the construction of an extension providing 3 floors of accommodation which would be of similar design and materials to the main building. In respect to the proposed mansard extension, whilst this would increase the bulk of development the height would be similar and the mansard extension to the existing building, which has been designed to compliment the existing building, would not adversely impact the streetscene.

Regarding the proposed two storey plus mansard extension to the south, this would be sited up to the pavement, and whilst it would be sited on part of the existing tarmac parking area because of its prominent siting forward in the streetscene it would be an over dominant feature to the detriment of the character and visual amenities of the area.

The submitted plans indicate that the existing hedging on the boundary with No 2 would be retained to provide screening, however, given the proposed proximity of the bin and cycle stores there is concern that the hedge would be impacted and the potential loss of this screening would result in the store areas being prominent in the street scene to the detriment of visual amenities. Similar consideration apply to the hedge on the northern boundary and the impact of the block paving.

Due to the site levels and design of the development the ground floor windows in the southwest elevation would suffer from loss of privacy and outlook and an adverse impact from the on site parking or proximity to footpath. Additionally there is no amenity space for the occupants, and the proposed development lacks sufficient provision for an appropriate landscape setting.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The main impacts relate to the flats in Chrisalex Court and 2 Latchmore Forest Grove. The flats, which lie to the north are located on lower ground and have kitchen and bedroom windows in proximity to the boundary. The existing building results in some loss of light, and whilst the provision of a mansard extension would further impact light, this would be relatively limited and in itself would not support refusal.

The 4 parking spaces to the rear of the building would be served by an existing access running adjacent the boundary with Chrisalex House, and owing to the close relationship traffic using this access inevitable result in some disturbance from noise and fumes, however, the access exists and was previously used by the office occupiers, and whilst the nature of use will alter, the impact is not so great as to support refusal.

Regarding 2 Latchmore Forest Drive, the existing building is located approx 13m from the bungalow on this site. The proposed mansard roof will increase the bulk of

development but given this distance, and even taking account of the lower level of No2, the impact will not be excessive. The proposed side extension is located further from the dwelling on the site, and achieves an acceptable relationship with the bungalow, however, it may be sited within the root protection of an existing yew tree on the site, and in the absence of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment it has not been demonstrated that there would be no impact on the tree.

The proposed location of the bin store, cycle stores and block paving has the potential to result in damage to hedging. This provides screening, landscaping and separation for the adjoining dwellings and its loss would adversely impact the amenities of these neighbouring properties.

(iv) Highways

The car park and drive from London Road require tracking and the application of visibility splays to demonstrate that it is acceptable to the Highway Authority.

The Development Engineer has advised that using HBC Parking Standards The 6 two bed flats two spaces require 12 spaces and the 5 one bed flats 5 spaces. That is a total of 17 spaces. Also cycle storage facilities need to be shown. The applicant has incorporated 11 spaces into the design 7 spaces in the foreshorten existing car park and 4 in a car park taking access from London road. Whilst the parking provision falls below the adopted standard, the site is located in proximity to the Complain local centre and close to the existing bus stop in London road, and in this particular case the provision of one space per units for these one and two bedroom properties is considered acceptable.

In respect to the impact of the car parking and turning near the junction with London Road, the number of parking spaces in this location will be reduced and hence a potential reduction in traffic from the site. Highways has not raised objection.

(v) CIL, Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) and Affordable Housing

The development is CIL liable and the applicant has been advised accordingly.

The proposal is also subject to a financial contribution in respect of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership pursuant to Policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan, and the appropriate Deed has not been completed and payment has not been received, and therefore the requirements of the Policy have not been met.

8 Conclusion

As set out in the planning considerations the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and the amenities of the neighbouring properties and fails to provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants. This must be balanced against the presumption in favour of development and that the proposal would provide small dwellings meeting an identified housing need. It is considered that the adverse impact on visual amenities and neighbouring properties as set out above are of such weight as to warrant refusing the application.

In conclusion, the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable in

principle as it would represent an overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with, and harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In addition it is considered that the development would result in harm to the residential amenities of existing neighbours as well as those of future occupants.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/15/01146

for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed extension owing to the bulk of development and prominent siting in proximity to highway and sited forward in the street scene would be a dominant feature out of character with the general pattern of development in the road and detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 2 The proposed development would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of site which would not provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupants and would have an adverse effect on the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 3 On the basis of the limited information available to the Local Planning Authority it is not considered that the proposed development could be undertaken in a satisfactory manner in that it has not been demonstrated that safe and satisfactory access can be provided onto London Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 4 On the basis of the limited information available to the Local Planning Authority it is not considered that the proposed development could be undertaken in a satisfactory manner in respect to the existing boundary hedging and the yew tree on the adjoining site. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 5 The proposal, without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements to secure a contribution towards the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project, is contrary to the Council's Policy on contributions towards measures of mitigation adopted by the LPA 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 policies 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

