
Site Address: 28 Lodge Road, Havant, PO9 3LL
Proposal: Demolition of existing house and erection of a replacement 4 bed house with detached garage and a 2 bed bungalow.
Application No: APP/13/00841 Expiry Date: 28/10/2013
Applicant: Derek Warwick Developments Team: Team 1
Agent: Owen Davies Architects Case Officer: Heather Lealan
Ward: Bedhampton

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

APP/13/00064 - Demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of 2No. semi-detached 3 bed houses and 1No. 2 bed bungalow with associated parking and garages - Refused 22/5/13 following Development Management Committee consideration for the following reasons;

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 2011.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Demolition of existing house and erection of a replacement 4 bed house with detached garage and a 2 bed bungalow.
- 3.2 The proposed two storey detached property is sited towards the front of the site. Vehicular parking for the house is provided within a garage and on hardstanding to the western side of the dwelling.
- 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 2012

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS9	(Housing)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
Residential Car and Cycle Provision Supplementary Planning Document

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

Environment Agency - No bespoke comments

Building Control

Access route must comply with fire standards access and bins to be moved to collection point of day of collection.

Development Engineer

I recommend approval subject to the following conditions.

- Two car parking spaces plus cycle facilities are provide for each property.
- The first 5 metres of the drive must be constructed in a none transferable material.

Waste Services Manager

No comments

Open Spaces

No open space implications

Crime Prevention

Acquisitive crime such as burglary and theft is often facilitated by easy access into the rear garden. To provide for the security of the dwellings pedestrian rear access gates should be 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: 18

Number of site notices: One

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 9 received, 5 against the proposal, (3 identifying their address as 28 Lodge Road) and 4 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, two letters of support were received from J Foley and R Foley who are understood to be two of the site owners and the comments of these letters have been summarised below;

Summary (with Officer comments in italics where the matters raised are not assessed in the planning considerations section of this report)

Objection:

(a) The proposal constitutes overdevelopment of the site and the form of tandem

development is out of keeping with the streetscene; it would be the first of such development within Lodge Road

(b) A large mature pine tree was cut down prior to the submission of the previously refused application - *This tree was not the subject of a TPO and as such its removal did not require consent*

(c) Overbearing - the view from No 10 Brookside Road will be onto a brick elevation of the proposed bungalow and the gradient of the land, being lower in Brookside Road, will exacerbate this detrimental impact.

(d) Concerns about drainage down to Brookside Road. *This would be a matter for building control consideration*

e) Detrimental impact on the quiet enjoyment of the occupiers of No.10 Brookside Road due to cars associated with rear dwelling

f) Noise from demolition and construction *This is not generally a valid planning reason to refuse development*

g) The design and appearance and the privacy and outlook and the removal of trees which has already happened is not a good thing

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

(i) The materials indicate tarmac for the driveways. This raises concerns over permeability and surface water run off for such a combined extensive area, the inclusion of a speed hump within the entrance would be beneficial. *The nature of the hardsurfacing can be conditioned notwithstanding the submitted plans*

(j) Layout of tandem parking spaces and dimensions are not acceptable. Space should be incorporated on site for deliveries and visitors.

(k) 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*

(l) 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. *See (k) above*

(m) The traffic and parking in this road is already a problem and this development would significantly worsen the problem during construction and post development - *Construction traffic would not generally be a planning reason for refusal and the highway engineer finds the onsite parking and turning adequate*

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

(o) Error within question 6 of the application form - accesses are being altered

(p) The bungalow has no garage proposed and this is out of keeping with the road where every property has at least one garage.

(q) The D&A statement is incorrect in its assessment of the streetscene and house design..

Support:

(s) Principle of tandem development within the site is supported if the comments raised in Mr Tate's representation letter of the 26th September are addressed.

(t) Support is given for the bungalow to the rear provided permitted development rights are removed.

(u) The current dwelling is not viable to repair - *No evidence has been submitted to this regard and regardless the merits of the scheme submitted must be considered*

(v) Careful attention has been paid to ensuring that in addition to high quality design , the new design of the front house is more imposing in line with residents comments to the previous scheme and more aesthetically pleasing than the existing dwelling and would enhance this end of the road

(w) The proposed bungalow will not affect the street view

(x) There has been no suggestion of dissent about the presence of the bungalow to the rear. *Neighbour objections have been received which include concerns about the detrimental impacts of the bungalow to the rear of the site*

(y) There is adequate parking, turning and access within the boundary of the development - *Noted*

(z) The development and particularly the bungalow location will assist us with the boundary management of our adjoining properties (No.15 Bedhampton Hill)- *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 effect on streetscene.
- (iii) Effect on existing residential properties.
- (iv) Consideration of residential amenity of any future occupants
- (v) Highways implications
- (vi) Impact on trees
- (vii) CIL Liability

(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 detached building to the front of the plot would accord with the prevailing housing style as it mimics some architectural details. This conclusion is due to the variance in design of the dwellings within the streetscene and the appearance of the existing dwelling within the site which is detached and is of a bland and uninspiring design which does not accord architecturally with any of the other properties within the street.

- 7.4 It is further proposed to develop the rear of the site from residential garden to a second 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. It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme would constitute a discordant form of development, 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 residential properties

- 7.5 The proposed drive which would serve for access to the parking provision for the bungalow 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 dwellings to the east of the site; to some degree No.10 but more so to No.12 Brookside Road. 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.
- 7.6 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.
- 7.7 It is not considered that the siting of the proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers to the west or 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

- 7.8 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 side elevation and entire length of rear garden of the proposed house to the front of the site, will have a detrimental impact on the quiet enjoyment of this dwelling by future occupants in terms of the resulting vehicular movement around the dwelling.

(v) Highways implications

- 7.9 The Development Engineer has raised no objection to the scheme on highway safety grounds so long as any approval is subject to it being conditioned that two car parking spaces plus cycle facilities are provided for each property and that the first 5 metres of the drive must be constructed in a non transferable material.

(vi) Impact on trees

- 7.10 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.

(vii) CIL Liability

- 7.10 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).
- 7.11 It is considered that there is a CIL liability for this site. A credit can be given for the existing floorspace of the dwelling within the site and therefore only the additional floorspace is CIL liable. The agent has completed the CIL planning form and confirmed that the net additional gross internal floor space will be 91.5m and as such this will require a CIL payment of £7,320. The applicant has been advised of this sum accordingly.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the proposed tandem development within this plot would amount to an inappropriate form of development 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 These environmental and social impacts are such that the development is not considered to be a sustainable form of development as defined by the NPPF.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/13/00841 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposal would result in 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 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 proposed house to the front of the plot 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 and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.