

Comments by Planning Officer in a pickup  
on proposed 2-bed bungalow

From: Pickup, Tina <Tina.Pickup@havant.gov.uk>

Sent: 01 May 2020 16:35

To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: APP/20/00146 - 17A - 17B Avondale Road

Appendix 1 - Support by LPA for  
1-bed bungalow

Admkt.

Dear Mr Holman,

Having had long discussions about this application with my team leader, I can now update you on the various issues, as follows:

Parking – I have clarified matters with the County Highway Engineer and I am expecting him to withdraw his request for a parking survey. I am of the opinion that sufficient on-site parking to serve the proposed development is provided, in accordance with our adopted Parking SPD. Whilst it is acknowledged that the provision of the dropped kerb would result in the loss on one on street parking space, on an unclassified road with no parking restrictions, this would be something that is potentially permitted development.

However, please note the request to demonstrate suitable pedestrian visibility splays of 1.5m x 1.5m – if you could show this on the plans please.

Drainage – Again I have had discussions with our own drainage engineer following the third party representations and consulted response from the Lead Local Flood Authority raising the flooding experienced on site. It seems that the LLFA have identified an 'ordinary watercourse' as likely to be an underground pipe that runs, possibly as shown on their map, and could cross the site or nearby, that is probably blocked and causing the flooding reported. Because most residents wouldn't even know the pipe is there, the letter to residents from the LLFA in February was advising them of their maintenance responsibilities and asking neighbours to co-operate with each other to try and locate the route and access points of the pipe run. The route shown on the plan is only an estimate and they need residents co-operation to accurately find the pipe on site.

The only way to resolve the flooding issue is for someone to do a trial hole to locate the pipe, build a manhole on it, and then do the maintenance required to get it flowing again. As the responsibility lies with all the land owners through which the pipe flows, then ideally this would be a joint venture with contributions from all the people along the route. Such work would also need LLFA consent.

I am assuming this has not happened locally to date. So, since this pipe could cross the application site, and if it did, then any foundations could damage it, I think that the applicant needs to at least dig trial holes across the site to establish whether it crosses their site or not.

With respect to the proposed infiltration drainage, because the soils in the area are mixed and may not be suitable, then a BRE test would need to be done prior to commencement. This could be a pre-commencement condition (in the event of permission) or you may wish to check this at this stage, combined with the above works.

Merits of Case – however, notwithstanding the technical issues above, we also have some concerns over the principle of the proposal. As you are aware from the planning history and appeal, and pre-application enquiry, this was always going to be a marginal case. Currently I am particularly concerned at the re-allocation of site area compared to the pre-application enquiry, with a substantial amount of amenity space remaining for the host dwelling. The garden depth available for 17A is reduced to only about 6.5m which is significantly below our recommended minimum of 10m and is also out of character with the surrounding area. I think it is symptomatic of the site not being quite big enough to accommodate the proposal and it therefore being an overdevelopment.

As indicated in the pre-app response, if the proposal were reduced to a one bedroom unit, then the application dwelling footprint would be reduced, so too would the need for one of the parking spaces. This would enable the site area to be reduced and thus restoring a larger amenity area for the host dwelling.

So, I am afraid, that as currently submitted I am not in a position to support the proposal which I consider to be an overdevelopment of the site and out of character with the surrounding pattern of development, contrary to policy CS16. You