

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Access Officer

The development site is relatively flat and parking is provided on site. The Design and Access Statement states that the dwelling would have a flush threshold. Part M of the Building Regulations will need to be complied with.

Building Control

No comments

Waste Services Manager

No comments received

Development Engineer

I have no objection to the application providing two spaces and cycle facilities are provided for the existing and proposed building, and the provision of a vehicular access to the new parking area.

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

The rear access to the existing property is via the parking area for the proposed property. This situation is not ideal it makes the security of the proposed property dependant upon the residents of the existing property. The rear accesses should be redesigned to provide a discrete access for each dwelling. This will make residents responsible for the security of their own property.

The application does not show whether the existing property is to be modified to allow for a front door within the bay window. It appears that this access will give direct access to the front room of the dwelling. Such an access is not ideal I would recommend that access is into a hallway.

Public Spaces Development Manager

No open space implications with this application.

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: 48

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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 on the Character and Appearance of the Area
- (iii) Impact on Neighbouring Residents
- (iv) Developer Contributions

(i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The site is located within the built up area where new residential development is considered acceptable in principle subject to site specific development control criteria.

(ii) Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

- 7.3 The site is located in a prominent corner location. The dwelling proposed would be wider than the dwelling to which it is attached and would result in the two storey element being set between 1.8m and 2.8m off the pavement. Whilst it is recognised that other extensions or new dwellings have been built in the area, they are either not on a corner plot, have a narrower design or have large set backs from the highway. It is considered that the proposed dwelling would be contrary to the established pattern of development in the locality.

- 7.4 The design of the proposed house would be overly dominant in this location. Furthermore the design of the building would not address the Soberton Road frontage in an acceptable manner. The fenestration and overly large porch combined with extensive blank brickwork would result in an unattractive built form.

- 7.5 The agent has provided examples of other development in the locality including an appeal decision, however, having examined the examples provided they are not considered directly comparable to the current proposal. The appeal decision (143 Blendworth Crescent) related to a site with a significant set back from the adjacent highway with open space between, reducing the prominence and impact of the development. The planning permission at 20 Blendworth Crescent was in a less prominent location and of a reduced scale.

(iii) Impact on Neighbouring Residents

- 7.6 The principal impacts in terms of neighbours are considered to be to the attached existing house (No.1) and to No.2 Soberton Road. Properties to the west (1-39 Soberton Road) and to the south (16-20 Blendworth Crescent) are set off and any impacts are considered to be limited and acceptable.

- 7.7 No.1 has a small rear flat roofed extension with ground floor window set off the boundary beyond this. A small side window and porch would be lost as a result of the development. Whilst there would be some impact in terms of afternoon light to the rear of the property resulting from the rear projection of the proposed two storey house, on balance this is not considered to warrant a refusal of planning permission on the basis of this element.

- 7.8 The property to the north No.2 Soberton Road is set well off with a glazed door and window facing the application site. Whilst there would be an element of additional overlooking, this would be limited and acceptable.

(iv) Developer Contributions

- 7.9 The development would require a CIL contribution, the applicant has not submitted the

CIL form, however the liability has been estimated at 115sqm x £80 = £9200. An informative is recommended to be added to the decision notice in relation to the requirement for CIL.

- 7.10 The Council has recently published, for consultation, the Local Plan (Allocations Plan) publication. Within the plan is draft policy DM24 which seeks to mitigate impacts of new residential development on designated habitats (SPAs). This augments the existing policy CS11 of the Core Strategy. Currently, further work is needed to ascertain a fair and proportionate approach to mitigation, including the impact of small residential developments and although provisions are not currently in place for measures to be undertaken or contributions to be made for development of the scale proposed here, this is likely to change in the future as further work is undertaken and the emerging policy acquires greater weight.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 In conclusion, whilst the provision of a dwelling on the site is considered acceptable in principle, the current proposal would be out of character with the area and overly dominant on this prominent corner plot. The design also fails to properly address the Soberton Road frontage. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/13/01108

(A) for the following Reason:

- 1 The proposed dwelling would by reason of its size, design and prominent siting be harmful to the existing character and appearance of the area conflicting with the established pattern of development. Furthermore the detailed design of the building including fenestration, overly dominant porch and blank brick work areas would fail to adequately address the Soberton Road frontage which would detract from the appearance of the building in the street scene. The proposals therefore conflict with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.