
Site Address:	13-15 Park Parade, Havant, PO9 5AA		
Proposal:	Redevelopment, extension and change of use to form 4No. 2bed flats and re-siting of external staircase.		
Application No:	APP/16/00630	Expiry Date:	07/09/2016
Applicant:	Mr Singh		
	Heathrow Homes		
Agent:	Mr Knight	Case Officer:	Daphney Haywood
	Knight Architectural Design		
Ward:	Battins		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The site is located in Park Parade which is a mixed use development of ground floor commercial units and first floor residential units, purpose built in the 1950s. Rear access to the existing upper floor flats and the commercial units for deliveries is provided from the service road (Tidworth Road).

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Redevelopment, extension and change of use to form 4No. 2bed flats and re-siting of external staircase.

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)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS9	(Housing)
DM10	(Pollution)
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)

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011
Havant Borough Parking SPD 2016

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Development Engineer.

No on site parking provided and occupiers would need to rely on the public car parks. The effect on the availability of parking and economic viability of the shopping area is a planning matter.

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Bin storage size should comply with Approved Document H, Means of escape from first floor windows looks like failing Approved Document B as appear to be top hung only. Other issues may be raised by Building Control regarding location of adjacent windows near to MOE routes when application / scaled plan available

Waste Services Manager

No adverse comments

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No comments received

Public Spaces

No comments received

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

Condition re acoustic mitigation and informative re dust, hours of work and lighting requested.

contamination:-

Park Parade was constructed between 1952 & 1955 on Greenfield land (Billy Lawn, managed parkland between at least 1867 & 1952). No prior potentially contaminative land use is indicated on historic mapping on land coincident with the application site, or it's immediate vicinity.

Asbestos containing materials are considered likely to be present and recommend Asbestos Caution (informative):

"It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that upon completion, the development is safe & suitable for its intended future use. The build-date for this property suggests that Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) are likely to have been used in the original construction. These materials may have been disturbed during prior alterations and could be present at the property as buried demolition wastes within topsoil / made ground under hard-standing or within landscaped areas. It is recommended that a pre-conversion Asbestos survey be undertaken to identify any ACM within the property that might be disturbed during construction works, in order that these may be appropriately managed. Buried demolition waste may be identified during the installation of new below ground services, when accessing enclosed service ducts or voids or undertaking landscaping tasks. In the event that any deposits / inclusions comprising fibrous or any other obvious waste materials be encountered during works, construction should cease in that area of the site until an appropriate

assessment of the nature and extent of possible ACM has been undertaken, and appropriate actions taken to mitigate any identified risk. Your Building Control provider should be notified of any discoveries of buried suspected ACM to ensure that you remain compliant with the provision of controlled Document C. Environmental Health should be notified of any ACM identified within soils, and provided with details of how the material has been dealt with”

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: 12

Number of site notices: one

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

Summary: the documents could not be viewed on line

Comment: this has now been addressed.

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) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Parking provision
- (iv) Contributions and CIL

- (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 Governments 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.

The premises does not front onto a retail parade being located to the rear of the site, and as such there would be no adverse impact on the viability of the retail centre from loss of retail floorspace. Residential use is supported in principle subject to the considerations below.

(ii) Impact upon the streetscene

The development would back onto Tidworth Road which is a service road for the units fronting Park Parade. The proposed 2 storey development would be of flat roofed design in keeping with nearby properties and the character of the area and as such it is considered that the impact on the street scene would be acceptable. The stairway would be set back from the service road and its re siting would have little or no visual impact.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The proposed site lies to the rear of first and second floor flats, fronting but well set back from the service road. The separation is such that the proposal is not considered to adversely impact the existing flats.

In respect to the proposed dwellings these would be 2 storey with a single aspect looking towards the blank wall of the adjacent site at 17 Park Parade. The separation would be in the region of 5m, forming a yard where facilities for refuse and cycles would be provided, together with continued rear access for the commercial units fronting Park Parade and access for the existing residential units on the upper floors. One visitor/delivery short term parking space is also indicated in this area.

Given this restricted siting, the light and outlook for the proposed dwellings, which would be 2 bedroom and hence could accommodate families, would be severely impacted by the proximity to the development to the west. Additionally the dwellings would have no private out door amenity space and the only windows to the open plan living rooms would have little or no privacy as the yard onto which they would face provides access for the exiting flats and commercial units.

Unlike the existing upper floor flats, the proposed dwellings would be located in

proximity to the rear service road and servicing area for the commercial units in Park Parade without any meaningful separation or private amenity space. The poor environment does not provide a suitable location for residential development and the amenities provided for future occupants would be so substandard as to be unacceptable.

(iv) Parking provision

Adopted standards require 2 on site parking spaces for 2 bed room flats, although this can be relaxed in sustainable locations. The site is well served by local facilities and located in proximity to a public car park, for which permits can be purchased. As such it is considered that in this particular case the absence of on site parking provision is acceptable .

(iv) Contributions and CIL

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 applicant has been advised, but the appropriate payment and Deed have not been completed and therefore this requirements has not been met.

8 Conclusion

Whilst in economic and social terms, the provision of additional dwellings within the urban area would accord with the objectives of the NPPF and make a contribution to the Council's housing requirements as set out in the development plan, satisfying a growing need to provide small dwellings, it is considered that the very poor environment that would be provided for future residents would be contrary to the provisions of Paragraph 64 of the NPPF and Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the Havant Borough Design Guide which, require development of poor design to be refused.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/16/00630

for the following reasons:-

- 1 The proposed development owing to its proximity to the service road and poor outlook and environment for future residents would not provide an acceptable level of amenity for residential development, and as such is unsuitable for residential development. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2 The proposed development would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of the site which would not provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupants. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 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.