

Appeal by James Tate

re.

**Site at 16 Latchmore Forest Grove ,
Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 8XG**

Grounds of Appeal

presented by

Robert Tutton BSc(Hons), MRTPI.

Mr Robert Tutton

Qualifications: Bachelor of Science (Honours) Degree in Town and Country Planning awarded by the University of Aston in Birmingham.
Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute since 1976.

Experience: Has worked in the town and country planning field for fifty years, of which nine were spent with Portsmouth City Council (1965-74) and fifteen with Fareham Borough Council (1974-89) in several senior positions, including Chief Forward Planning Officer and Chief Development Control Officer. Has been a Town Planning Consultant in private practice since July 1989 and a Director of Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd since January 2008

Is familiar with the provisions of adopted planning policies for the Waterloooville area and has visited the appeal site and its environs on several occasions since being instructed by James Tate in March 2015.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
Section 78

APPEAL by **James Tate** against the decision of **Havant Borough Council** to refuse the grant of planning permission for the demolition of a side extension at No.16 Latchmore Forest Grove, Waterloooville in Hampshire PO8 8XG and the erection of a detached two-bedroomed bungalow with associated landscaping on land to the rear, utilising the existing access.

Havant Borough Council's reference: APP/14/01166

**Statement of the Case presented in
favour of the appeal by James Tate.**

1.0 THE APPEAL SITE

1.1 No.16 stands on the north side of Latchmore Forest Grove in the northwest sector of Havant Borough Council administrative area, to the northwest of the Cowplain District Centre and 175 metres to the west of its junction with London Road (A3). The range of services and facilities offered within the District Centre includes a Lidl general store (that opens 0800-2100 hours Monday-Saturday and 1000-1600 hours on Sunday) and a Cooperative Food store (with post office counter) that is open for trade from 0700 hours until 2300 hours every day, a 'Tuckers Pharmacy' and three hot-food takeaways. London Road is a principal north-south public transport corridor that forms part of the routes followed by two 'First' bus services – the No.8 is available between 0551 and 2321 hours and 61 buses a day are available to take passengers north to Clanfield or south to Portsmouth; the No.37 is available between 0554 and 1930 hours and 15 buses a day are available to take passengers north to Petersfield via Horndean and Clanfield or southwest to Havant via Waterloooville and South Downs College. Residents of this locality enjoy safe and convenient access by foot or public transport to a range of facilities, so there are real alternatives here to use of the private car; this is an accessible, sustainable location.

1.2 Latchmore Forest Grove ('the Grove') is straight with street-lights on both sides and a bound footpath on its north side that lies behind a grassed verge; the footpath and verge together are 3.6 metres wide. The Grove is characterised by a varied mix of detached bungalows and two-storey houses. To the east of the appeal site, No 14B is a detached two-storey house that is finished in red brick at ground level with grey-painted render at first-floor, beneath a gabled roof of brown concrete interlocking tiles. No.16 is a detached chalet-bungalow with a single-storey front lounge projection; it is finished in grey render with a gabled roof of dark grey concrete interlocking tiles. The gap between Nos.14B and 16 is 5.1 metres wide between their front corners and 4.1 metres wide at their rear corners. The land falls to the north and away from Latchmore Forest Grove by approximately 1-1.5 metres and falls away again towards the pairs of semi-detached two-storey houses that face north to Morley Crescent.

1.3 When planning application APP/14/01166 was submitted in November 2014, a flat-roofed 'store' stood at the southeast corner of No.16; it has since been demolished, to make way for the achievement of a new driveway four metres wide between Nos.14B and 16. Vertical-board fences two metres in height stand on either side of the new driveway and afford access to a rectangular area that is 18-20 metres wide and 19 metres deep (ie 361 square metres in area) that was previously used and licenced as a pet-shop; two semi-derelict buildings associated with that former use stand by the northeast and northwest corners of the site.

2.0 RELEVANT DECISIONS

2.1 Attention is drawn to the decision by Inspector Hitchings in June 2004 to grant planning permission 01/51181/001 for the erection of a two-storey detached house on land to the east of No.16 Latchmore Forest Grove (Appendix 1). At para.1 of the 'Procedural Matters', Inspector Hitchings referred to drawing no.0356-201A that had been received by Havant Borough Council in 12th November 2003; it therefore enjoys the status of an 'approved plan' and its content is material consideration in the determination of this appeal. It shows the areas of hardstanding required for the forecourt parking of vehicles to serve the existing and proposed dwellings.

2.2 Planning permission 04/64661/003 was granted by Havant Borough Council in November 2004 for the '*Construction of detached 3 bedroomed house with associated parking and new access to Latchmore Forest Grove*', on land immediately adjoining the appeal site (Appendix 2). The permission has since been taken up and the permitted house is now No.14B Latchmore Forest Grove. The permitted layout shown on drawing no. 0356-211A shows the permitted house handed, with the kitchen/diner in the southwest quadrant of the ground floor and a lounge across the full width of the house, to its rear. The kitchen/diner is 4.7 metres long and 2.75 metres wide; the window of the 'diner' element is double-glazed and its cill lies 1.55 metres above the finished floor level. The windows serving the lounge face north to the garden. In similar vein, the primary outlook from the kitchen of No.16 Latchmore Forest Grove is north to the garden, while a double-glazed secondary window (cill height 1.6 metres above the floor) faces east to the access drive. A play-room three metres square in No.16 also has a window that faces east to the drive – its cill lies 1.2 metres above the floor. In view of Reason for Refusal 2 of the current appeal proposal (see para.3.3 below), attention is drawn to the requirement at Condition 5 for the provision of '2 parking spaces on the frontage'. In light of the 'access and parking' arrangement first permitted by Inspector Hitchings and since endorsed by the Borough Council itself, it is contended that the latter's recent contention – that the current appeal proposal would have '*an unsatisfactory layout with a poorly located access drive and extensive hardstanding*' – has no foundation.

3.0 PLANNING APPLICATION APP/14/01166

3.1 Receipt of planning application APP/14/01166 was validated by Havant Borough Council on 12th November 2014. Section 3 of the 1APP form submitted by James Tate's agent Martin Critchley Architect described the proposed development as being to '*Demolish side extension to No.16; erect 1 two-bedroom bungalow*'. Section 5 confirmed that the proposal had been prepared in the light of advice proffered by planning officer Daphne Haywood on 29th September 2014 in the context of application APP/14/00625. Section 9 recorded the intention to finish the bungalow walls in '*Brick and render*', with a roof of '*Concrete interlocking tiles*'.

3.2 Martin Critchley's drawing no.0356-211A shows two sheds at the north end of the appeal site, one of which immediately abuts both north and west boundaries. Two parking spaces are shown to serve No.14B Latchmore Forest Grove, with three spaces serving No.16; a 'Store' is shown projecting from the west elevation of No.16. Drawing No.0356-212° shows the 'Store' demolished, the two outbuildings demolished and a 'New Driveway' 4 metres wide laid between Nos.14B and 16 Latchmore Forest Grove. An L-shaped two-bedroomed dwelling is shown on the rectangular area beyond the 11-metre gardens of Nos.14B and 16 – it would stand a metre away from the west boundary, 3.955 metres from the north boundary, 7.3 metres from the east boundary and 6.7-6.86 metres from the 1.8m close-boarded fences that would respectively define the curtilage boundaries of Nos.16 and 14B. Drawing No.0356-325o shows the elevations, roof plan and internal layout of the proposed bungalow – 10 metres long at its north elevation and 8.5 metres wide, to face east to the garden; it would stand 2.2 metres in height to eave and 4.6 metres to the ridge of its hipped roof. It is noteworthy that the new bungalow would stand a metre away from the west boundary and almost 4 metres from the north boundary in the northwest corner where, hitherto, an outbuilding has stood immediately adjacent.

3.3 The application was determined by the Officers under their delegated powers, so no prior opportunity was afforded for James Tate or his agent to appreciate the matters on which the decision would turn or to present a deputation in favour of the proposal to the Development Management Committee (of Members). The decision notice issued on 7th January 2015 gave these four reasons for withholding consent:

“1. The proposal, owing to the cramped nature of the site and proximity of proposed development to the boundaries, would result in a detrimental impact on the quiet enjoyment of the properties surrounding the site and, in particular those at 14B and 16 Latchmore Forest Grove, by virtue of the close proximity of the access and resultant vehicular and pedestrian activity would be adversely impacted. 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 development proposed is considered to provide an unsatisfactory layout with a poorly located access drive and extensive hardsurfacing onto Latchmore Forest Grove, to the detriment of the amenities of the site and the character 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.”

“3. The proposal would provide inadequate separation between existing and proposed windows, resulting in loss of privacy to the existing dwellings in Latchmore Forest Grove. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.”

“4. The proposal, without the completion of the appropriate binding arrangements to secure a contribution towards the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project, is contrary to the Council's Policy on mitigating the impacts of development which, in accordance with approved Policy DM24 of the Local Plan seeks to mitigate the impact of new residential development on the Solent Special Protection Area (SPA).”

3.4 The Officers' Delegated Report which led to the decision has since become available for scrutiny (Appendix 3) and these matters are considered noteworthy:

A. "The proposed bungalow would have a gross floor area of 60 sq m and externally measure approx 10m by 6.9, extending to 8.5m and a height to ridge of 4.665m. It would be sited 3.9m from the rear boundary with properties in Morley Crescent, a minimum of 1m from the boundary with 16A Latchmore Forest Grove and approx. 7.3m from the boundary with 14B Latchmore Forest Grove...The current proposal seeks to address the reasons for refusal of application APP/14/00625 and the main changes relate to the access now shown as a minimum of 4m wide, the existing dwellings provided with rear garden depths of 11m, hedge planting shown along the boundary of No.14B (outside the application site but within the blue edging), the proposed dwelling as single storey with a ridge height of 4.665m (reduced from 4.81m) and moved out from rear boundary (now shown as 3.95m compared to 1.6m of the refused scheme...Additionally the bungalow is now shown a minimum of 1m from the boundary with No.16A Latchmore Forest Grove, compared to a minimum of 1.68m." (Paras.3.2 and 3.3)

B. The 'Policy Considerations' were identified as being 'National Planning Policy Framework'(unspecified elements), four policies of the Core Strategy (CS11, CS16, CS21 and DM13) and the Havant Borough Design Guide. (Para.4).

C. 'Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations' were undertaken with nine bodies – the Public Spaces Development Manager, the Arboriculturalist, the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre, the Waste Services Manager, the Development Engineer (Highways), Engineering/Drainage, HFRs, Crime Prevention (Minor Apps) and Southern Water; none raised objection to the proposal. (Para 5).

D. Three representations were received as a result of 'Community Involvement'.

E. "The application site is located within a defined urban area for development plan purposes...The construction of a new dwelling on the site is therefore considered appropriate in principle, subject to consideration of detailed development control criteria, which includes the provisions of the Borough Design Guide SPD as well as Core Strategy policies which promote high quality designs which respect the amenity of the locality and local residents" (Para 7.2))

F. "The proposed access would be sited up to the boundary with both Nos.16 and 14B Latchmore Forest Grove...The drive would be only 4m in width and directly abut the adjacent buildings and their gardens, resulting in motor vehicles and pedestrian activity in close proximity with associated noise and nuisance, to the detriment of the occupiers of the adjacent properties." (Para. 7.3)

G. "The proposed dwelling would be sited approx 3.9m from the boundary with properties to the north, 1m from the western boundary and 7m from the property to the east and whilst the existing out buildings will help screen and reduce the impacts, the proximity to boundaries and limited space around the dwelling would result in nuisance to neighbouring properties from the activities and noise associated with a dwelling." (Para.7.4)

H. "In respect to loss of privacy and overlooking, the previous scheme allowed for a 20m separation between main windows of properties in Latchmore Forest Grove in accordance with the Borough Design Guide...The current scheme shows a reduced separation of 18 to 19m, which is below the 20m guide...The shortfall is small and the

proposed development is only single storey but, because of the difference in levels there is an associated loss of amenity from loss of privacy to the existing dwellings in Latchmore Forest Grove.” (Para.7.5)

3.5 On 3rd March, James Tate paid Havant Borough Council £200.60 to settle its requirement for a contribution to the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project. The Borough Council was invited to confirm that, with the contribution settled, Reason for Refusal may be treated as withdrawn. On 17th June, Daphney Haywood of Havant Borough Council wrote *“I confirm that, as the SDMP contribution has been paid, that refusal reason 4 of planning permission APP/14/0116 is no longer applicable”*.

4.0 PLANNING POLICY

4.1 Section 38 of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 requires an application or appeal to be determined in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; an element of flexibility is provided which enables decisions to be made which may disagree with the development plan. The statutory development plan for the Waterlooville area comprises the **Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy)** 2011 and the **Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations)** 2014. The **Havant Borough Design Guide** is a supplementary planning document.

4.2 Paragraph 8.01 of the **Havant Borough Core Strategy** (Appendix 4) tells one that although *‘The overall character of the borough is largely urbanised...The priority for locating new development is in the existing urban areas, where there are existing facilities to use and new development would have least impact on the range of highly protected biodiversity’* (Appendix 4). This northwest corner of Havant Borough is notably devoid of *any* special designations. The appeal site lies within the ‘red edge’ that defines the urban area, so Policy CS17 applies - it promotes the ‘Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas’. The Spatial Distribution Map (Figure 8.1) confirms that Latchmore Forest Grove lies within the ‘Waterlooville’ sector where new development is intended to be *concentrated*, to realise the adopted strategy; it is particularly noteworthy that, of the five areas of the Borough where new residential development should be delivered by 2026, Waterlooville is proposed to take the most (2,126). With regard to the ‘Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas’, Policy CS17 tells one how the adopted strategy should be delivered – it generates a presumption *in favour* of development that makes effective use of land that satisfies three criteria:

“Development will be permitted that makes the most effective use of land in the Borough by granting planning permission that:

1. Concentrates new housing, employment, retail, leisure and other development within the five urban areas of Havant, Leigh Park, Waterlooville, Emsworth and Hayling Island, as shown on the Proposals Map
2. Prioritises development on previously developed land, including redundant, derelict or underused land and buildings within the urban area.
3. Broadly distributes the new housing and employment development in the five areas of the borough, as indicated on the Spatial Distribution Map (Key Diagram)..”

4.3 The Core Strategy has a 'Glossary' but it does not carry a definition of 'concentrate', in order that readers may appreciate the Borough Council's intention to '*...concentrate new housing in the urban area of Waterloooville.*' As No.16 Latchmore Forest Grove stands on 0.076 hectare of land and thereby represents a net residential density of just 13.2 dwellings per hectare, there can be little doubt that this accessible, sustainable unused land is a prime example of where new housing *should* be concentrated, to play its part in delivery of the adopted strategy. As Policy CS17 was, however, **not** one of those given weight by the Officers in their consideration of planning application APP/14/01166 (see item B at para.3.4 above), it is evident that the Officers failed to give attention to a relevant provision of the development plan.

4.4 With the contribution towards Solent Disturbance Mitigation settled, the determination of this appeal largely turns on Havant Borough Council's contentions that the proposed bungalow would contravene the purposes of Core Policy CS16 because the '*...cramped nature of the site and proximity of proposed development to the boundaries would result in a detrimental impact on the quiet enjoyment of the properties surrounding the site and, in particular those at 14B and 16 Latchmore Forest Grove, by virtue of the close proximity of the access and resultant vehicular and pedestrian activity would be adversely impacted (Reason 1); the proposal is '...considered to provide an unsatisfactory layout with a poorly located access drive and extensive hardsurfacing onto Latchmore Forest Grove, to the detriment of the amenities of the site and the character of the area'(Reason 2); and '...inadequate separation would be achieved between existing and proposed windows, resulting in loss of privacy to the existing dwellings in Latchmore Forest Grove'.*

4.5 Core Strategy Policy CS16 is a 'coarse-grained' omnibus policy that sets criteria that are intended to apply to all forms of development proposals across the whole borough during the fifteen-year period to 2026. It sets down seven requirements for the achievement of 'High Quality', but only these five sub-tests of criterion 1 are directly germane to the determination of this appeal:

"Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

1. Responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context and:
 - a. Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site;
 - b. Integrates with existing local landscape features, promotes wildlife and biodiversity and/or applies characteristics of the local area into the design of a scheme wherever possible to create variety and interest;
 - c. Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development, including heights, massing, existing building lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;
 - d. Is well connected to and integrates with the immediate local area and the wider area by linking to existing pedestrian and cycle routes and encouraging people to use public transport where possible; and
 - e. The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking....

4.6 Planning permission was granted in 2004 for a three-bedroomed two-storey house (it is now 14B Latchmore Forest Grove) on a plot of 211.5 square metres (which represents a net residential density of 47.3 dwellings per hectare) with a private rear garden of 85.8 square metres; the appeal proposal is for a two-bedroomed bungalow on a plot of 361 square metres (which represents a net residential density of 27.7 dwellings per hectare) with a private rear garden of 139 square metres. The proposed plot is 70% bigger than that of the adjoining (recently-permitted house) and the new bungalow would enjoy the amenity of a private garden that is 62% bigger than its three-bedroomed neighbour. These simple calculations ably demonstrate that, regardless of whether one draws comparison by site area, density or garden size, neither the appeal site nor the bungalow standing upon it would be 'cramped'. Contrary to the charge laid down in Reason for Refusal 1, it is contended that the appeal proposal responds positively to the local character close to the site and satisfies criterion (a) of Policy CS16.

4.7 The '**Havant Borough Design Guide**' 2011 (Appendix 5) is intended to amplify the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CS16. At paragraph 5.25 of its Design Guide, Havant Borough Council acknowledges that 'Residential Backland and Infill Developments' have a role to play in delivering the Council's housing and development targets but warns that many such sites are situated amongst existing neighbours and can create an adverse impact. 'In order to maintain a reasonable relationship between new dwellings and neighbouring properties', paragraph 5.05 of the Design Guide states that '...the following minimum distances should apply:

- “* Where windows of the new development and an existing dwelling occur back-to-back there should be a minimum of 20 metres separation
- * Where a new dwelling or the development is more than two storeys in height an additional four metres per storey should be added to the separation distance eg a separation distance of 24 metres is required between the new three storey building and existing two storey building.
- * Where a dwelling faces a blank gable, 10 metres separation distance is required.
- * Garden length should normally allow 10 metres between the dwelling and the boundary.”

4.8 Figure 5.1 of the Design Guide illustrates the 'Back-to-back-distances' that the Borough Council seeks to achieve but it is particularly noteworthy that the illustration offers no guidance for a proposed bungalow. Dimensions on the submitted Site Plan show Nos. 14B and 16 Latchmore Forest Grove with rear gardens 11 metres in length, so the proposed bungalow would stand 17.86 metres and 17.7 metres respectively from the two-storey rear elevations of those dwellings. Contrary to the charge laid down in the Reason 3, such distances satisfy the requirements of the Design Guide and consequently Core Strategy Policy CS16. National policy is of no assistance in the consideration of this detailed matter.

4.9 With regard to 'Delivery Strategy', paragraph 6.03 of the Core Strategy promised that 'Regular monitoring of the SHLAA and housing delivery through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) will be undertaken to ensure the effective delivery of housing. To that end, Policy CS9 generates a presumption in favour of housing proposals which would assist the delivery of eight

‘Housing’ objectives; objectives 1, 4, 5, 6 and 8 are considered relevant to the consideration of this appeal:

“Planning permission will be granted for housing proposals that will:

1. Contribute to achieving a net total of 6,300 new dwellings between 2006 and 2026...
- 6 Achieve a suitable density of development for the location, taking into account accessibility to public transport and proximity to employment, shops and services in addition to respecting the surrounding landscape, character and built form.
- 7 Provide a mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures which help meet identified local housing need and contribute to the development of mixed and sustainable communities.
- 8 Provide accommodation for the ageing population in sustainable locations, taking account of the need to provide for a variety of care needs and flexibility to accommodate differing requirements of ageing care...
8. Ensure housing development is delivered in a phased manner with an appropriate proportion of previously developed land so as to avoid unnecessary development on greenfield urban extension sites.”

4.10 As Core Policy CS9 generates a presumption in favour of ‘Housing’ and a residential bungalow was proposed there can surely be no doubt that it was relevant to the consideration of planning application APP/14/01166 yet it was not even included within the ‘Policy Considerations’ (see item B at para.3.4 above), let alone accorded weight. Officers of Havant Borough Council failed to have regard to a relevant policy of the statutory development plan in their determination of the application. Had Policy CS9 been accorded due attention and weight, the Officers *should* have recognised that the proposed bungalow would contribute to the delivery of 6,300 new homes by 2006; would achieve a suitable density of development for the location, taking into account its accessibility to public transport and proximity to shops and services; would respect the surrounding landscape, character and built form; would contribute to the development of a mixed and sustainable community; could provide accommodation for the ageing population in this sustainable location; and would help relieve development pressure on greenfield sites.

4.11. On the matter of ‘Housing Mix for different tenure types’, paragraphs 1.21-1.23 of Havant Borough Council’s **‘Housing Supplementary Planning Document’** (2011) present findings of relevance to the determination of this appeal (Appendix 6). Taking account of statistical returns that derived from the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH), Hampshire Home Choice and HomesInHants, paragraph 1.21 of the SPD recorded that *‘...the greatest demand is for smaller households...Site location and design/layout of development are important in encouraging such individuals to make the decision to downsize...This would free up some larger units but may not meet all of the need’*. Paragraph 1.23 opined that *‘Generally the aim will always be to increase the amount and proportion of dwellings with two or more bedrooms for all housing tenures as this is the greatest housing need irrespective of tenure types...This will enable the council to meet the greatest housing need and provide the most flexible housing stock...There will therefore be a preference for a range of housing sizes and types with increased provision of two bedroom or more properties ie with three or more bed spaces, for all properties’*. A new two-bedroomed bungalow within a sector

of Waterville dominated by family dwellings would play a modest yet valued part in widening housing choice, in the manner called for by the Borough Council. It is evident, however, that the role to be played by the appeal proposal in meeting acknowledged local housing need formed no part of the Officers' consideration of the application; they failed to give attention to a material consideration in their determination of the application.

4.12 With regard to the 'Number and proportion of completions (gross) by dwelling size during 2013/14', Havant Borough Council's **Annual Monitoring Report** 2014 (Appendix 7) opined that *'It is considered important to monitor the changing size of dwellings, since there is trend in a reduction of household size...the figures in tables 5.6 and 5.7 show that 28% of completions in the borough during 2013/14 were one and two bedroom dwellings...This is a notable reduction compared to previous trends..'* One can only concur with the Borough Council's position that it is important to monitor dwelling size but market trend analysis serves no useful purpose unless it results in a change of direction when an imbalance has been identified. The Borough Council's Housing SPD identified a call in 2011 for more two-bedroomed dwellings and although its monitoring report of 2013/14 revealed that the supply of new small dwellings had fallen, it appears to have had no effect on the Officers' consideration of application APP/14/01166 in January 2015. James Tate's proposal should have been welcomed not spurned for the (modest yet valued) contribution that it afforded to redress the imbalance in housing supply that had been identified a month before.

4.13 The **National Planning Policy Framework** records (at paragraph 49) that *'Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development'* and paragraph 50 calls on local planning authorities *'To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities...plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)'*.

5.0 CONCLUSION and SUBMISSION

5.1 The appeal site is in a sustainable location within the established residential area of Waterloo, where the development plan proposes the *concentration* of housing development, as part of a strategy that is aimed at the delivery of 2,126 new homes by 2026. The 'Housing' SPD expressed a preference in 2011 for the provision of two-bedroomed dwellings to meet the greatest housing need but the most recent Annual Monitoring Report has drawn attention to the relative *decline* in the rate of providing such accommodation.

5.2 Double-glazed windows are in place in the side elevations of Nos.14B and 16 Latchmore Forest Grove and the provision of an access drive four metres wide would ensure that the quiet enjoyment of both properties would continue. The area of hardstanding at the Grove frontage is similar to that which was first approved by Inspector Hitchings in 2004 and has since been endorsed by Havant Borough Council. In light of the distances between dwellings, the natural change in levels and the siting/design of the proposal, it is submitted that adequate distances would be achieved. Contrary to the charges set down on the decision notice, it is submitted that the appeal proposal

would *satisfy* the requirements of Core Strategy Policies DM24, CS16 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.3 The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government is respectfully requested to allow this appeal and grant planning permission for development that accords with the policies of the adopted development plan and no other material considerations suggest otherwise.

6.0 APPENDICES

1. Inspector Hitchings' decision, June 2004.
2. Documents relating to application 04/64661/003.
3. Officers' Delegated Report re application APP/14/01166.
4. Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 (extract).
5. Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, December 2011 (extract)
6. 'Housing' Supplementary Planning Document, July 2011 (extract).
7. Annual Monitoring Report, December 2014 (extract)

.