
Site Address:	Land r/o 3 Queens Road, Waterlooville, PO7 7SB		
Proposal:	Construction of 1No. 2 bed detached chalet style dwelling.		
Application No:	APP/14/01229	Expiry Date:	26/01/2015
Applicant:	Mr Cook	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr Olafsson	Case Officer:	Daphney Haywood
	Martin Ralph Architects		
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

Queens Road is a primarily residential area characterised by mainly detached dwellings. No 3 queens Road comprises a detached dwelling sited on the south side of the Road in a relatively large plot backing onto mature woodland which is covered by a TPO. The road is characterised by frontage development, although there is some backland development on the opposite side of the road.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Construction of 1No. two/three bed detached chalet style dwelling to the rear of the existing dwelling. The proposed dwelling would have a gross floor area of 133 sq m and be sited on a plot of 638 sq m. A plot of 773 sq m would be retained for the existing dwelling. The proposed dwelling would be sited approx 11m from the existing dwelling, 8.5m from the boundary with the wooded area and 15m from the boundary with properties fronting London Road. A new access drive is proposed to the side of the existing house and adjoining the boundary with No 1A Queens Road and properties fronting London Road. Two parking spaces and turning would be provided on site. As the proposed dwelling would be 43m from the adopted highway it is proposed to provide a sprinkler system.

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)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

DM23	(Sites for Brent Geese and Waders)
------	------------------------------------

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control, (Fire Access Consultation)- consultation with HFRS recommended, high level of glazing may require thermal calculations.

Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service (HFRS) would strongly recommend that consideration be given to include the installation of Automatic Water Suppression Systems (AWSS) as part of a total fire protection package. Access for Firefighting Access and facilities for Fire Service Appliances and Firefighters should be in accordance with Approved Document B5 of the current Building Regulations. Hampshire Act 1983 Section 12 – Access for Fire Service Access to the proposed site should be in accordance with Hampshire Act 1983 Sect, 12 (Access to buildings within the site will be dealt with as part of the building regulations application at a later stage). Access roads to the site should be in accordance with Approved Document B5 of the current Building Regulations.

Arboriculturalist

The AIA submitted is comprehensive in its report and demonstrates that the trees on site and adjacent to the plot will not be damaged by construction. Both the construction of the dwelling and the access into the site maybe built without detriment to the trees.

However, I have concerns regarding the useable garden space for this dwelling and the potential pressure to prune the TPO trees located along the boundary in the adjacent woodland. The trees in the area form an important copse and are large in size and number, this would impact significantly on the garden area of the proposed dwelling - physical presence/bulk and light loss.

In this instance I can not support this application and raise objection based on the potential pressure to prune/remove TPO trees.

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps No comments received

Waste Services Manager No comments received

Forestry Commission No comments received

County Ecologist

Adjacent SINCE, Ancient woodland, Priority habitat and within 50m of protected species

Development Engineer - Highways

The Highway Authority has no objection to this application provide a planning condition is imposed requiring a dropped kerb vehicular access to be provided and that turning on site is provided to enable a car to exit the development in a forward gear. I would suggest that to conform to the HBC car parking standards two car parking should be provided and retained on site.

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: 8

Number of site notices: At least one site notice exists - check the number.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Summary:

- If this building goes ahead we would be overlooked, and feel it would be an intrusion, at present there are trees between us and 2 Queens Road, they would obviously be felled and there would be nothing to shield us from the new building, we would also have traffic noise and fumes from the property.
- I do not object to this development as such, but this will aggravate a present traffic and safety issue in Queens Road and some modifications will be required. This portion of Queens Road is used for parking by the numerous residents of 221 London Road, by the staff of Queenswood surgery (223 London Road) and by their many patients) both those for the walk in clinic and those with appointments). This makes for heavy congestion at times and difficulties for pedestrians crossing the road. Should this application receive approval, then there must be changes to the parking control. Perhaps something simple like restricting parking to one side of the road only from the junction with London Road until just past the entrances to No. 3 itself. There must also be very strict controls during the construction period. Should contractors arrive first, then there will be no room for patients (many elderly and infirm) to park near the surgery. Should the staff and patients arrive first then it will be absolutely impossible for deliveries to be made to this site. Perhaps the improved parking restrictions mentioned above should be implemented first and then (as a condition of planning approval) a restriction made that all contractors vehicles be parked on the building site only.
- I believe that this development is over development as this end of Queens Rd is becoming increasingly busy partly due to the popularity of Queenswood surgery where Queens Rd is used for parking.
- The construction material is of loose aggregate which will significantly increase the noise to the boundary of our property - This ideally needs to be a paved surface of some sort.
- The comments on overlooking in the development pack are clearly not correct as can be clearly seen from the artistic impressions within the application.
- Of advantage to us would be the removal of the enormous hedge that puts us in complete shade early on even on mid-summers day.
- With building work going on there would be noise, traffic movements and general disruption,

Comment:

see section 7

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) Impact on TPOed trees.
- (v) Ecology
- (vi) Highways

(vii) CIL and contributions.

(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.

(ii) Impact upon the streetscene and character of the area

The proposed dwelling would be sited to the rear of the existing development and would not be prominent in the street scene. Whilst the proposed access will be visible, to the west it will be partially screened by the existing tree and frontage planting, and to the east it is proposed to provide a landscape strip varying in width from 1.2 to 1.5m. This will soften the impact of the drive, and given the existence of a similar form of development on the opposite side of the road, the visual impact is considered acceptable.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The main impact relates to the existing dwellings at No 3 and No 7 Queens Road and the dwellings which lie to the east. In respect to the existing dwelling at No 3, the property will retain a garden varying in depth from 10m to 14, and whilst this is relatively modest for the size of the existing house, it is considered adequate for the dwelling and comparable to the size of the existing plot for 1A Queens Road.

In respect to the impact on 1A Queens Road, the proposed access would be sited adjacent the boundary to this property. In order to minimise the impact of the drive it is proposed to provide landscaping adjacent the boundary fence and the width of this has been increased from minimum 0.5m to minimum 1.2m. As the access would serve a single dwelling this is considered acceptable. Reference has been made in the representations to the use of gravel being noisy, should permission be granted it would be possible to condition this matter for further consideration and a quieter surface.

In respect to properties fronting London Road, the proposed dwelling would be a minimum of 15 m from the boundary and window to window distances at 36m satisfy the 20m minimum standard, and this is considered acceptable. Regarding 7 Queens Road, the proposed dwelling would be set off the boundary, sited on lower ground and does not have any first floor windows facing this boundary, and the proposal is not considered to resulting detriment.

(iv) Impact on TPOed trees.

The proposed dwelling would be approx. 8.5m from the woodland to the south. These trees which are covered by a Preservation Order are significant trees of substantial height. The Council's Arboriculturalist has advised that whilst the trees on site and adjacent to the plot will not be damaged by construction there are concerns regarding the useable garden space for this dwelling and the potential pressure to prune the TPO trees located along the boundary in the adjacent woodland. The trees in the area form an important copse and are large in size and number, this would impact significantly on the garden area of the proposed dwelling from their physical presence and bulk and associated light loss, resulting in potential pressure to prune/remove TPO trees.

The proposed garden would lie to the side and front of the dwelling, and whilst of an adequate size (8.5m minimum by approx 30m), given the close relationship to mature trees, there is considerable potential for pressure for works to the trees because of the relationship with the proposed garden and the dwelling itself.

(v) Ecology

Protected species - bats have been identified in the adjoining woodland. The application is not supported by an assessment in respect to this matter. The absence of such information would therefore be a secondary reason for refusal.

(vi) Highways

Local residents have raised concern regarding traffic congestion and conflict with parking for the surgery both during construction and once any development were built. The development provides for on site parking in accordance with adopted standards, however, should permission be granted it would be necessary to seek a construction management plan to cover the construction stage.

(vii) CIL and contributions.

The CIL rates to be applied to development are set out in the Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which was adopted by the council on the 20th February 2013. This followed two public consultation exercises and an Examination into the Charging Schedule by an independent Examiner. The Examiners Report concluded that the Havant Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule provided an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the borough. The levy is charged at £80 per square metre on new floorspace (measured as gross internal area). The application includes a self build exemption form and therefore the proposal is exempt subject to satisfying the requirements for self build..

This development would increase the number of dwellings within the 5.6km zone identified as significant in potentially increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. Natural England's advice in regard all new housing development within this zone is that it is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA. The measures of mitigation adopted by the LPA at the end of June this year requires a payment of £172 per dwelling to the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project, and this payment has been received.

8 Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed development could achieve an acceptable relationship with the neighbouring dwellings and would not result in an adverse impact on the street scene or the character of the area, however, owing to the relationship with the adjoining woodland there would be a significant impact on the garden area for the proposed dwelling which would lead to considerable potential pressure for works to the trees which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. Additionally the impact on protected species has not been assessed.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/14/01229 for the following reasons:

- 1 The layout and siting of the proposed development would result in trees important in the local landscape and subject to a Tree Preservation Order being located such as to have an excessive and over-bearing impact on amenities otherwise enjoyed by occupiers of the development, thereby putting at undue risk the long term conservation of the trees. It is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- 2 It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected species known to be present in the immediately adjoining woodland. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS11 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.