
Site Address:	Land Adjacent 50 Southfield Walk, Havant, PO9 4HY		
Proposal:	Outline application for 1No. 4 bed end of terrace dwelling house, with all matters reserved.		
Application No:	APP/15/00510	Expiry Date:	15/09/2015
Applicant:	Mr West	Team:	Team 2
	Vale Builders Southern Ltd		
Agent:		Case Officer:	Richard Nash
Ward:	Warren Park		

Recommendation: **REFUSE OUTLINE CONSENT**

1 Site Description

The application site comprises an area of open grassed amenity space at the eastern end of Southfield Walk, a terrace of dwellings located on the north side of Berrydown Road. The site is owned by Portsmouth City Council and falls within the extent of the public highway.

The adjoining terraced dwellings are two storey properties of traditional character and design, with a mainly brick and tile finish, located within modest plots featuring attached single garages to the road frontage. In conjunction with an adjoining hammerhead the site provides a significant gap in the street scene, between Southfield Walk and the terrace of dwellings running at approximate right angles to the east. The area is mainly characterised by high density residential land use, with various areas of open space between – a little to the north east of the site is an expansive wooded area known as The Warren.

2 Planning History

None

3 Proposal

The current application is in outline for the construction of 1 No. 4 bed end of terrace dwelling house, with all matters reserved.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

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)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control: The proposed building will be within 3 metres of a storm water public sewer.

Development Engineer: This area is shown on the records as adopted highway. Even if the title to the land is in the applicant's hands the Highway Rights have not been extinguished. It is possible to give permission on this land but it could never be implemented unless the Highway Authority agrees. It looks to me that there is not sufficient frontage to Berrydown Road to allow access for the parking of two vehicles. However it is in a sustainable location. If the Highway Authority have previously stated that the area is needed to gain emergency access to Hatch Court then this could be used as a reason for refusal.

NB: A separate application has been made to the Local Highway Authority to stop up this area of public highway. The right of access over land, including for emergency vehicles, is not a material planning consideration.

Waste Services Manager: None received.

Crime Prevention: None received.

Southern Water: Provided plan of sewer records showing approximate position of public surface water sewer within site. The exact position of the public sewers must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised. No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 metres either side of the centreline of the public sewer and all existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works. No new soakaways should be located within 5 metres of a public sewer. Due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 1 October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water. Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul and surface water sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent: A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk.

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: 6

Number of site notices: 2

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 54

Summary:

Land used as access for emergency vehicles; Impact on parking; Should re-generate garage areas instead of green spaces; Loss of amenity space; Impact on neighbouring amenity; Disruption during building; No requirement for new housing; Visual impact; Impact on character of locality; Impact on ecology; Loss of designated highway; Overlooking; Overshadowing.

Comment:

Right of access over land, including for emergency vehicles, is not a material planning consideration – as noted above, a separate application has been made to stop up this area of public highway and this might therefore be a consideration under the relevant legislation. Disruption caused during building work is not a material planning consideration. Other matters raised are discussed below.

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) Impact on the application site and locality
- (iii) Impact on neighbouring amenity
- (iv) Parking and other matters

(i) Principle of development

The application site is located within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. The provision of a new dwelling would contribute to the target of providing 6300 new homes across the Borough under policy CS9.

(ii) Impact on the application site and locality

Although in outline, the application includes a drawing showing how a 4 bedroom dwelling could be accommodated on the site. The dwelling is described as 'end of terrace' but is in fact shown as slightly detached from the existing end of terrace property. The length of the rear garden serving the dwelling would not meet the criteria of the Design Guide – it would however reflect the garden lengths of the existing adjoining terrace.

The main part of the proposed building would be approximately 30% wider than that of each of the existing dwellings in the terrace. It is considered that this comparative increase in footprint, allied with the resultant increase in bulk, means the proposal would not respond to, draw inspiration from or respect its local context as it would not use the characteristics of the locality to help inform its design in terms of massing and plot width. It is also of note that, in response to the application to extinguish the highway use of the land, the Highway Authority has required that a 1.8 metre wide strip be retained around the site. This would mean that the dwelling shown on the submitted drawing could not be constructed.

As noted above, in conjunction with an adjoining hammerhead, the site provides a significant gap in the street scene, with views through to expansive open space at the rear. Given the extent of nearby open space that is readily accessible, it is considered that a reason for refusal based on a loss of amenity space would not be sustainable.

However, the use of similar grassed areas to punctuate built development is a feature of the locality. The proposal would result in the loss of this example in its entirety, and for this reason fails to respond to, draw inspiration from or respect its local context in that it does not respond positively to existing features close to the site.

(iii) Impact on neighbouring amenity

The adjoining dwelling to the north-west (50 Southfield Walk) does not have any existing windows facing the site. As the proposed dwelling would be sited almost entirely 'gable-to-gable' with the end of the terrace there would be no significant overbearing effect on number 50. The proposal would be likely to result in additional and oblique overlooking to the rear garden of this property but, given the existing context, it is considered this would not be to the extent that associated reasons for refusal would be sustainable. The geographical relationship with other nearby dwellings is such that the proposal should not have any material impact on their amenities.

(iv) Parking and other matters

The submitted application form and drawing suggest that 2 on-site parking spaces could be provided in support of the proposal – 1 external space and 1 within an attached garage. There is no space available on site to realistically make any additional provision. Policy DM13 requires residential proposals to comply with the standards contained in the Residential Parking and Cycling Provision SPD. The garage as shown does not meet the minimum width or length recommended by the SPD and there is some doubt as to whether the proposed external parking space could be properly accommodate, particularly given the Highway Authority requirement that a 1.8 metre wide strip be retained around the site. In any case the standards require 3 allocated spaces for a 4 bedroom dwelling in this location.

No justification is provided for this shortfall, which is considered likely to result in amenity problems and a reduced quality of life for occupiers of the development and pressure on existing limited nearby on-street parking spaces, potentially causing neighbourhood tensions. It is of relevance that the site is not within a highly accessible location where some discretion might be exercised on parking standards.

The submitted drawing does not indicate any provision for cycle or bin storage, but this could be comfortably accommodated within the site. As the proposal is in outline, it is not subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy at this stage – this would be

dealt with at the detailed or reserved matters application stage. The outline proposal is subject to a financial contribution in respect of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Project, and an appropriate Deed and Payment have been provided.

8 Conclusion

The construction of a dwelling on the site would be acceptable in principle and, in the manner proposed, should not have impact the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

However, development of the site in the manner proposed would not respond to, draw inspiration from or respect its local context as it would not use the characteristics of the locality to help inform its design in terms of massing and plot width, and would not respond positively to existing features close to the site. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Furthermore, development of the site in the manner proposed would not provide adequate provision of car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's adopted standards and would therefore have a detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of the building and the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

The planning application should therefore be refused.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE OUTLINE CONSENT** for application APP/15/00510, for the following reasons:

- 1 Due to its excessive width in comparison to adjoining dwellings and the associated bulk and reduction of gap punctuating built development, development of the site in the manner proposed would not respond to, draw inspiration from or respect its local context as it would not use the characteristics of the locality to help inform its design in terms of massing and plot width, and would not respond positively to existing features close to the site, and would therefore have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the locality. 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 Development of the site in the manner proposed would not provide adequate provision of car parking in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's adopted standards and would therefore have a detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of the building and the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.