

From: Michael Knappett [<mailto:michael@jezeph.co.uk>]
Sent: 26 February 2015 14:07
To: Richard Nash
Subject: 71 Stakes Hill Road, Waterlooville PO7 7BH - APP/15/00017

Dear Mr Nash

I am now in a position to respond to you addressing some of the comments made by G.W. and J.E Heathcote, the owners of No. 75 Stakes Hill Road, in their letter dated 6th January 2015 on the planning application.

1. Incorrect Information on Application Form – Land Ownership

Some of the land within the ownership of the owners of No. 75 Stakes Hill Road is also highway land. Verisona Solicitors (Waterlooville) have advised the applicant that No.75 does in fact own the sub soil but HCC control the highway and as such the applicant would have legal right to use it. The objectors' letter also flagged-up the fact that part of the frontage hedgerow to be removed was previously shown within the ownership of No.75. This has now been rectified by the submission of amended plans showing the widened access moved further to the north. The owners of No. 75 Stakes Hill Road have now also been served Notice as requested by the Council.

2. Highway Safety

The proposal to widen the existing access will not result in any highway safety issues. Vehicles entering the site (in a forward gear) will clearly see any vehicles reversing out of the access to No.75 and so will wait until such time as they have finished reversing. The proposed development would be accessed by vehicles entering and leaving in a forward gear and as such poses no adverse highway issues. The latter being a requirement of the Council's Development Engineer.

The Council's Development Engineer was consulted at the pre-application stage and again on the planning application and he had no highway concerns.

3. Natural Features – Existing Ground Water Well

The alignment of the new foul water drainage runs can be installed to avoid the location of the ground water well. The well is also shown indicatively on the amended site layout plan.

4. Privacy and Outlook

There would be no overlooking from the roof light windows within the western side elevation of the proposed dwelling. The first floor windows within the proposed two-storey dwelling would be approximately 20m away from the conservatory which has been plotted on the amended site layout plan. This is not a main habitable room. The proposed dwelling would also be provided with a rear garden of 12.2m in length, at the end of which is a tall hedgerow of 2m - 2.5m height. Beyond this there is an outbuilding within the garden area to No.75. Given the distances involved, the design would minimise the overlooking of any window at No.75.

5. Conservation and Historic Issues

The Council's Conservation Consultant was satisfied with the scale and location of the proposed dwelling. English Heritage did not wish to comment on the application.

Design and Layout

It is common for submitted plans not to include annotated dimensions. All of the plans were provided to scale and the Council's Conservation Consultant acknowledges that the proposed dwelling will be cut into the existing bank on site. The proposed development would be set back substantially from the road and would clearly not be as apparent in the street scene as No. 75.

The Planning Statement omitted to mention the previous application for a single dwelling at the site because this does not appear on the Council's website when typing in 71 Stakes Hill Road or Land adjacent to 71 Stakes Hill Road. It does appear, however, when the reference number is typed in but you would have to know the reference number in advance to order to find the planning application.

The development as proposed is for a single detached dwelling in the urban area and the proposal seeks to make a more efficient use of urban land. Planning policy supports the proposed development. There is no requirement whatsoever for the application to prove an exceptional need for development on this site.

I would describe the proposed development as more akin to infill than as backland development, especially as the proposed dwelling would be closer to the Stakes Hill Road than the host dwelling at No. 71. The proposed dwelling would not be built to the rear of either adjoining dwelling.

The proposal would constitute a 'windfall' development and would contribute towards the Council's housing land supply. Paragraph 48 (not 58) of the NPPF advises LPAs not to include residential gardens in their future predictions for windfall supply, but this is not what the application is asking the LPA to do.

With regard to the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, this was considered prior to submission but not referred to. The proposed development would address the Council's separation requirements outlined in paragraph 5.05, although one could argue this would not quite be a back-to-back situation. The proposed dwelling has been well designed and would also appear subservient and smaller in size, massing and scale to No.71.

I would be grateful if you could take onboard the above points prior to writing your committee report.

Regards

Michael Knappett

Bryan Jezeph Consultancy Ltd; Registered in England and Wales No.306 5949; Registered Office:
The Gallery, 3 South Street, Titchfield, Hampshire PO14 4DL.

Tel. 01329 842668 Fax. 01329 844726 Web. www.jezeph.co.uk

This message is intended for the specified recipient only. If you are not the specified recipient, please delete this message immediately and disregard its contents.