
Site Address: 28 Lodge Road, Havant, PO9 3LL
Proposal: Demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of 2No. semi-detached 3 bed houses and 1No. 2 bed bungalow with associated parking and garages.
Application No: APP/13/00064 Expiry Date: 15/04/2013
Applicant: Derek Warwick Developments Team: Team 1
Agent: Mr J Kamm Case Officer: Heather Lealan
Ward: Bedhampton DMC Lead Member

Reason for Committee Consideration:

Density:

HDS Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located to the end of the cul-de-sac that is Lodge Road. The cul-de-sac consists of a mix of two storey detached and semi detached properties. The semi-detached properties dominate the road and are of a particular architectural style with a central ridge with hipped ends and the roof extended to ground floor level to either end of the pair of dwellings.
- 1.2 There is a footpath which runs adjacent to the western boundary of the site providing a link between Lodge Road and Bedhampton Hill.
- 1.3 There is a detached dwelling located towards the front of the plot in similar line to the general building line of the cul-de-sac as it curves around at the end of the road. The massing of the existing house gives the appearance of a pair of semi detached houses from the wider streetscene due to the width of the front elevation. This site currently has a vehicular access from the road and parking on a driveway and garage for at least three cars.
- 1.4 The rear garden is of a good size, at a depth of 35m and the boundaries are treated with a 2m (approx) Close Boarded Fence and mature vegetation.
- 1.5 The properties to the southern end of the cul-de-sac have rear gardens of between 10 and 20m in depth and the properties that surround the turning circle to the northern end of lodge road are generally more generous in size, between 20 and 30m in depth.

2 Planning History

No relevant planning history on Acolaid

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of 2No. semi-detached 3 bed houses and 1No. 2 bed bungalow with associated parking and garages.
- 3.2 The proposed two storey semi-detached properties are sited towards the front of the site. Vehicular parking for Plot 1 is provided on hardstanding to the front of the

dwelling and for Plot 2 within a single garage to the rear of this plot. One visitor car parking space is provided adjacent to the proposed single garage. Plot 1 has a garden depth tapering from 14m to 5m, and Plot 2 an average garden depth of 14m.

- 3.3 The proposed single storey dwelling located to the rear of the plot is accessed via a driveway which is proposed to run adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site, two parking spaces are provided to the front of this dwelling. This dwelling has a rear garden of an average 12-13m in depth.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

The National Planning Policy Framework, March 2013

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
DM12	(Mitigating the Impacts of Travel)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Arboriculturalist

No objection so long as AIA is conditioned to be submitted prior to commencement

Building Control

No objection

Development Engineer

The garage proposed for plot 2 is only 5m x 2.7m external and therefore does not meet the borough standard and is not therefore counted as a garage or a parking space but a store. To meet the requirement for a garage it needs to be 6m x 3m internal. If the garage cannot meet the requirement it might be better to remove it and provide the parking as this would only require to be 4.8m x 2.4m unless it is bounded by a solid boundary wall / fence.

Each dwelling requires 2 parking spaces to meet the standards this is only achieved if the visitor space is counted or if the garage is removed/altered. I see from their letters that they refer to elderly residents not using more than 1 vehicle, however this does not count on this development as they have not requested an age restriction on the development.

Details of the driveway material need to be conditioned as no migrating material is required within 5m of the adopted highway.

Waste Services Manager

No comments

Crime Prevention

As part of the development the garage which forms part of the boundary treatment is to be demolished. To prevent access into the rear garden at this point an appropriate boundary treatment should be installed. The boundary treatment should be of robust construction (perhaps closed boarded fence) and of a similar height to the adjacent boundary treatments.

I note that the pedestrian access into the existing footpath is stopped. Should this be reopened as part of the development the gate should be fitted with a key operated lock that can be operated from either side of the gate.

Acquisitive crimes such as burglary and theft are often facilitated by easy access into the rear garden. To provide for the security of the properties I recommend that the gates giving access into the rear gardens are fitted with a key operated lock that can be operated from either side of the gate.

The proposed bungalow is to the rear of the development with very little natural surveillance; which increases the vulnerability to crime. To mitigate this to some extent I recommend that the external doors are certificated to PAS24 standard or better and the windows are certificated to PAS24:2012 standard or better.

An appropriate level of lighting will be required along the private drive way.

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: 13

Number of site notices: One

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 9 received, 7 against the proposal and 2 in support of the proposal. One letter of support is from the occupier of 28 Lodge Road, (who it is understood to be a tenant). However, a further letter of support was received from Dr Foley who is one of the site owners and the comments of both of these letters have been summarised below;

Summary (with Officer comments in italics)

Objection:

(a) No viability assessment has been submitted with the application in regard to the requirement to develop the site for three houses. *The application will be considered on planning merits*

(b) Increase in vehicular activity to the site will impact on highway safety and the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent residential dwellings

(c) The materials indicate tarmac for the driveways. This raises concerns over permeability and surface water run off for such a combined extensive area. *The*

nature of the hardsurfacing can be conditioned notwithstanding the submitted plans

(d) Layout of tandem parking spaces and dimensions are not acceptable

(e) Parking and manoeuvring for plot 1 is immediately in front of buildings 1 and 2, which detrimentally affects the amenities of both dwellings and the visual appearance of the frontage to the development. No other houses in the road have this type of configuration. This arrangement is out of character with the area.

(f) The turning area outside the site is sub standard. *This is outside of the application site and the development engineer raised no concern to this regard*

(g) Conflict that already exists at the end of the adjacent alleyway where emerging pedestrians and cyclists have no mutual sight line with any emerging vehicles from the property. *Development engineer raised no concerns*

(h) Appearance of bin store to the front of the dwelling is out of keeping with the general appearance of the streetscene

(i) The design of the semi-detached dwelling is not in keeping with the existing dwellings within the cul-de-sac - each pair is 14.6m wide and an overall width of 18.0m. The proposal is for a frontage of 11.7m and overall width of 14.1m. This will be thus 20% smaller than the existing stock and it results in a roof design that is pinched and mean with a short ridge that limits the massing and visual impact of the building. It does not reflect the "style and proportion" of the other semis.

(j) The location of the site at the head of the cul-de-sac facing down the road requires a building of some presence. Despite the narrow frontage to the site, the present house, although bland, demonstrates how this massing can be achieved. The proposal will be a retrograde step. The design does not "fit in well". It fails to provide an appropriate closing feature to contribute significantly to the required street scene.

(k) The buildings have not "been sited to accord with the Havant Borough Council's Design Guidance criteria with regard to garden size." Paragraph 5.13 of the Design Guide indicates a 10m rear/private amenity space. Plot 1 falls well short of this and this is even more critical given the presence of and exposure to the public footpath at the rear - *It is considered that the garden for plot 1 is acceptable, it's tapered nature allows for at least part of the garden to exceed the 10m minimum*

(l) The orientation and siting of the semis in relation to number 27 will have a significant detrimental visual intrusion and impact upon the outlook from the main living room and bedroom of this property.

(m) The proposals are over development of this restricted plot

(n) The traffic and parking in this road is already a problem and this development would significantly worsen the problem both temporarily with builders - *This would not be a planning reason for refusal*

(o) The proposed development will create overspill parking and this will have a knock on effect down the length of the road.

Support:

(p) This is a considerate and sympathetic development proposal and I commend to

the planning officers and to the members of the planning committee. I hope that the development will be permitted - *Officer not in agreement for the reasons set out within the planning considerations, section 7 of this report.*

(q) The design has made use of the natural lie of the land together with existing trees and fences to ensure that there is no increase in the overlooking of adjacent houses and gardens - *Noted*

(r) There is subsidence and also serious structural issues inside and the cost to repair these problems to an acceptable standard is not feasible

(s) The house was always an ugly house and very different to other architecture in the road, and has aged to become an eye sore. The scheme design buildings that are sympathetic to the local architecture in terms of appearance and materials. - *Officer not in agreement that the scheme accords with the appearance of the streetscene for the reasons set out within the planning considerations, section 7 of this report.*

(t) The garden is much larger than other gardens in the locality (apart from no 13 Lodge Road) and lends itself to a single storey bungalow to the rear back, leaving each plot with a proportionate garden - *Officer not in agreement for the reasons set out within the planning considerations, section 7 of this report.*

(u) Attention has been given to making sure that there is no impact on neighbouring properties- *Officer not in agreement for the reasons set out within the planning considerations, section 7 of this report.*

(v) There is adequate parking, turning and access within the boundary of the development for 2 cars per house- *Noted*

(w) Great efforts have been made to design these houses in keeping with the local street view and the property at the back would not be visible from the street at all - *Noted*

(x) Attention has been given to making sure that the access and egress can be forwards - *Noted*

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) Effect on the character of the area and the streetscene.
- (iii) Effect on existing residential properties.
- (iv) Consideration of residential amenity of any future occupants
- (v) Effect on highway safety.
- (vi) Impact on trees

(i) Principle of development

7.2 With regard to the principle of the development, the site lies within the urban area where residential development is considered acceptable in principle subject to a

thorough assessment of other development control criteria.

(ii) Effect on the character of the area and effect on streetscene

- 7.3 The cul-de-sac consists of a mix of two storey detached and semi detached properties. The semi-detached properties dominate the road and are of a particular architectural style with a central ridge with hipped ends and an extended section to ground floor level of roof sections to either end of the pair of dwellings. It is considered that the proposed semi-detached building to the front of the plot would accord with this style albeit that the proposed dwelling would be more narrow in width than the existing development. This conclusion is due to the variance in design of the existing dwellings within the streetscene and the appearance of the existing dwelling which, whilst detached, gives the appearance of a semi-detached dwelling due to the width of the front elevation, and is of a bland and uninspiring design which does not accord architecturally with any of the other properties within the street.
- 7.4 However, the requirement for an access road to the proposed rear dwelling impacts on the setting of the frontage dwelling with additional impacts arising from the siting of both the parking for the dwellings to the front of the site and the provision of a bin store to the front of the site. This congested arrangement contrasts markedly with the mature garden character of the other properties in the road. It is considered to give a rise to a cramped layout, resulting in an overdevelopment of the plot detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene.
- 7.5 It is further proposed to develop the rear of the site from residential garden to a third dwelling in the form of a single storey 2 bed property. The character of the cul-de-sac is one of established residential development of mixed type with a highway frontage and gardens of a moderate size. The proposed development, being a tandem development would be out of character with the traditional frontage style of housing in the locality, whilst the size of the rear garden is larger than most of the dwellings within Lodge Road, it is not considered to be of sufficient size to accommodate the level of development in the manner proposed. It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme would constitute a discordant form of development and would be cramped, out of character and detrimental to the amenities of the area. As such the proposal does not respect the environmental quality of the area, and hence is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy and the Borough Design Guide, which is a Supplementary Planning Document to the Core Strategy.

(iii) Effect on existing properties

- 7.6 The proposed drive which would serve both for access to the parking provision for Plot No.2 and access to plot No.3 would run along the shared boundary with No.26 Lodge Road. The driveway would run past practically the entire length of the curtilage of the dwelling of No.26 and would result in a large area of hardstanding being adjacent to the rear garden area of both this dwelling and the dwelling to the east of the site, No.12 Brookside Close. No.12 is a dwelling with a very short rear garden and therefore it is considered that the use of the proposed drive and expansive area of hardstanding for parking and manoeuvring would result in noise nuisance to the detriment of the amenities of the adjacent residential properties to the south and east of the site.
- 7.7 In relation to the impact of the proposed rear dwelling itself on the amenities of neighbouring properties, it is proposed to be single storey, and sufficient distance from rear elevations and is not considered to result in unacceptable loss of privacy or

outlook. However, it would introduce a new hub of activity into what is currently a quiet residential garden area and this would add to the impact of its inappropriate backland position.

- 7.8 It is not considered that the siting of the proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers to the west of north of the site. The closest dwelling to the west, No.27, is well screened by mature vegetation from the application site and is separated from the site boundary by the public footpath which runs adjacent to both site boundaries.

(iv) Consideration of residential amenity of any future occupants

- 7.9 Having regard to the recommended garden sizes set out in the Borough Design Guide, it is considered that the division of the plot would leave acceptable garden sizes for each of the new dwellings albeit that they would be of an irregular form. Due to the positioning of the proposed dwellings within the plot it is not considered that they will have an overbearing impact on the amenities of the future occupiers of the proposed dwellings. However, it is considered that the proposed driveway and parking provision, which runs along the frontage of both plots 1 and 2 and to the side of plot 2, will have a detrimental impact on the quiet enjoyment of these dwellings by future occupants in terms of the resulting vehicular movement around the dwellings.

(vi) Highways implications

- 7.10 The Development Engineer has expressed that the parking provision does not meet the borough standard and no objection was raised to the turning provision proposed on site. However, a visitor space has been shown which demonstrates sufficient parking space is available for all of the proposed plots and as such the scheme can meet the required standards of parking provision for the number of bedrooms proposed. A contribution of £5,778 is required towards the HCC Transport Policy. The applicant has been made aware of the required contribution however, as the scheme is not considered acceptable a Section 106 Agreement has not been entered into. The applicant has been made aware that an appeal version of the agreement can be sent out if they decide to pursue this route.

(vi) Impact on trees

- 7.11 There are no trees worthy of statutory protection on the site, the trees which would be required for screening are shown as being retained. The Council's Tree Officer raised no objection in regard to the potential impact to the trees off or on site so long as the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement are conditioned.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the proposed tandem development within this plot would amount to overdevelopment to the detriment of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings, through the introduction of an additional hub of activity within the rear garden and the provision of a driveway with a large amount of hardstanding and associated vehicle activity.
- 8.2 It is further considered that development in the manner proposed would not be acceptable in terms of the impact on the amenities of the area as it would not accord with the existing character of the locality.

- 8.3 A contribution of £5,778 is required towards the HCC Transport Policy and the scheme is not considered acceptable because a Section 106 Agreement to this regard has not been entered into by the applicants.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/13/00064 for the following reasons.

Appendices:

- A: Location Plan
- B: Block Plan
- C: Proposed Elevations for Semi-Detached Houses
- D: Proposed Floor Plans for Semi-Detached Houses
- E: Proposed Elevations and Floor Plan Detached Bungalow
- F: Streetscene Elevation

- 1 The proposal would result in overdevelopment of the plot and an undesirable form of tandem development which would be out of keeping with the character of the locality and detrimental to the amenities of the area.
It is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.
- 2 The proposed driveway and associated hardstanding by reason of their proximity and relationship with Nos. 26 Lodge Road and 12 Brookside Road and the future occupiers of Plot 1 and Plot 2 would adversely affect the quiet enjoyment of the occupiers of those properties contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.
- 3 The proposal, without completion of the appropriate binding arrangements to secure a contribution towards the Hampshire County Council Transport Policy, is contrary to the Council's Policy on contributions towards transport infrastructure which seeks to ensure that the provision is made from new development towards improvements to the transport infrastructure. It is therefore contrary to policies CS21 and DM12 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Appendices:...