

Additional Planning Information

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
21 January 2021

I am now able to enclose, for consideration by the Development Management Committee on 21 January 2021, the following additional planning information that was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda No	Item	
2	Site Viewing Working Party Minutes	1 - 4
	To receive the minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 12 January 2021.	
5(1)	APP/20/00696 - 162 Stakes Hill Road, Waterlooville, PO7 7BS	5 - 14
	Proposal: Sub-division of existing house to form 1No. 2bed and 2No. 1bed apartments and erection of a two storey side extension to form 2No. 2bed apartments with provision of car and cycle parking and bin storage. (Revised).	

[Additional Information](#)

Site Briefing held on 3rd December 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 12 January 2021

Present

Councillor: Satchwell (Chairman)

Councillors: Crellin, Howard, Keast, Lloyd, Mrs Shimbart (Vice-Chairman),
Patel (Standing Deputy) and Patrick (Standing Deputy)

Officers: Steve Weaver, Development Manager
Lesley Wells, Principal Planning Officer
Cynthia Haveron, Democratic Services Officer
Julia Mansi, Development & Building Control Manager
Jacqui Northway, Democratic Services Officer

18 Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

19 Declarations of Interests

Councillor Patrick declared that she had been involved in the provision of CIL funding for street lighting in Frazer Road.

20 APP/20/01019 - Hooks Lane Ground Clubhouse, Fraser Road, Havant

Proposal: Conversion of existing Multi-games play area (MUGA) into a car park, by way of, creating a connection through the existing car park serving the rugby club, and associated footpath and lighting alterations

The briefing was held at the request of the Head of Planning.

The Working Party received a written report, which identified the following key considerations:

- (i) Principle of development;
- (ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area;
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity;
- (iv) Trees; and
- (v) Ecology

The members received a presentation from the officers outlining the report and familiarising the members with the site, the subject of the application.

In response to factual questions raised by members of the Working Party, the officers advised:

- (a) that tree to be replaced was in a poor condition; the location of the replacement tree would be determined under the provisions of recommended condition 3;
- (b) that the MUGA to be removed was in a poor condition;
- (c) that Sports England had raised no objection to the removal of the MUGA;
- (d) that when the Council granted permission for the artificial pitch it was recognised that the MUGA would be removed to make way for additional car parking spaces;
- (e) that the charging policy of the proposed and existing car park was not a material planning consideration;
- (f) that the lighting proposals related to the proposed development and not the wider lighting scheme for the area;
- (g) that the Ecologist had concluded that the area had minimal ecological value.
- (h) that as the development involved going from hard surfacing to hard surfacing it was considered that there would be little ecological impact. The lighting would not involve floodlights so there would be little impact on bats in the vicinity;
- (i) that details of landscaping of the boundary with the school would be determined under recommended condition 3; and
- (j) of the range of activities that could be played in a MUGA.

RESOLVED that, based on the site inspection and information available at the time, the following additional information be provided to the Development Management Committee:

- a details of the use of the artificial pitch and its value to the wider community;
- b clarification on whether a soft landscaping plan for the boundary with the school was available;
- c clarification on whether Environmental Health had concerns about the level of exhaust fumes likely to be generated by the use of the proposed car park;

- d clarification on impact on bats
- e details on the operating hours and activities of the rugby club;
- f clarification on any restrictions on the use of the existing car park;
- g clarification on whether it was proposed to restrict the times vehicles could park in the proposed car park and the value of the car park to the wider community, and has there been a study on its use and can this be accessed;
- g clarification on how the construction of the car park will be funded; and
- h a revised slide showing that only one tree would be removed and replaced under this development.

The meeting commenced at 4.00 pm and concluded at 5.14 pm

.....
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Submission to the meeting of the Development Management Committee on 10 December 2020

Agenda Item 6: -

APP/20/00696 | Sub-division of existing house to form 1No. 2bed and 2No. 1bed apartments and erection of a two storey side extension to form 2No. 2bed apartments with provision of car and cycle parking and bin storage. (Revised). | 162 Stakes Hill Road, Waterlooville, PO7 7BS

04/12/2020

I urge the members of the Development Management Committee to vote to reject this planning application. It is an overdevelopment of this small site, which also has an awkwardly positioned and potentially dangerous access.

There is no private outside amenity space for residents, and the communal garden is too small for five households. The only access to it is from the car park, by squeezing between parked vehicles. It will be inaccessible for wheelchair users.

The plans show that the vehicle access is to be widened by extending it northwards. The result is that vehicles will exit the site at an angle, reducing the drivers' visibility to the north along the footpath/cycleway.

The car park is small, and is unlikely to have enough parking spaces for all of the residents and their visitors. Manoeuvring will be difficult from some of the parking spaces. Drivers will find it easier to reverse out onto the stub in the road, which will become the default turning area. The prospect of vehicles reversing across the shared footpath/cycleway is a particular concern.

This is a poor scheme, with too many compromises. It has been designed to generate the maximum profit for the developer, with little regard for the residents and neighbours, or for the safety of passing cyclists and pedestrians.

Yours faithfully,

P Briston

11 Durham Gardens

This page is intentionally left blank

Deputation by Mr Longmore

I am one of the oldest people and the longest living person that has lived in Durham Gardens. I came here in 1982 after living and working in Borneo for many years.

This road was just a lovely quiet place to see with trees down both sides of the road. The houses with Portland stone fronts and front gardens of neatly cut grass and flowers and not many cars it was a dream of a place to live.

The house at 162 Stakes Hill Road had a large rear garden that backed into Durham Gardens and had a fresh water well that could supply drinking water to anyone if we ever had a short fall of water. There were also 6 bee hives and if you wanted any honey you could just go to the owner of the house and buy some.

Then 162 Stakes Hill Road was sold I think to the now owner that had no intention of living in it but to turn it into a house building site.

First part of the rear garden went and so did the bee hives and two large 4 bedroom houses were built which left some of the rear garden but not for long. Next came two more 3 bedroom houses even though the people of Durham Gardens tried to stop it even though it had a fresh water well which is now covered over.

The next thing the owner of 162 Stakes Hill Road tried to do was have the Copper Beech tree cut down in the year 2006 so they could come out of the front of the house into Durham Gardens. This tree and another tree had been in the front garden of 162 Stakes Hill Road for ever and had PTOs on them so that was stopped. That did not stop the owner from still trying to build in the front garden.

March this year the owner of 162 Stakes Hill Road tried to get a 2 ½ story block of flats built in the front garden where if it had been built 16 people could have lived in it. Where were all the cars going to go as there is no room on that propriety? That was stopped.

Once again the owners of 162 Stakes Hill Road are trying again. This time September 2020 they requested there block of flats to fit alongside the old house which together with the old house could hold 16 people. With parking for 7 cars, so where will the remainder park in Durham Gardens where there is not enough space for cars that are parked in the road now.

Durham Gardens is a small road already full of cars, vans and some lorries. We are the only road without yellow lines unlike the two roads either side of us. People from the pub the dentist and all the people that take their children to and from school every day park in this road. Every day we have people that do not live in our road parking on the green verges in front of our drives and just making our lives a misery.

Now I hear you may let the owner of 162 Stakes Hill Road build again in their front garden with no consideration of the people of Durham Gardens and all the people and children that walk on the pavement that pass the entrance to 162 Stakes Hill Road every day.

Do you not think the owners of 162 Stakes Hill Road have made enough money on the houses that they have had built in the rear garden of the large house already?

I hope that when some child or older person is hit by a car coming out of 162 Stakes Hill Road you feel guilty for what you are about to do.

Dear Sirs,

As per your letter inviting a written deputation in respect to the meeting on the 10th December 2020, please see below my statement as below:

As a Durham Gardens resident, I am strongly opposed to the development of the aforementioned. Having lived here now for 3 years, during school hours and beyond, the street is inundated with traffic from drop offs and pick ups as well as the walking children and parents using the road entrance to cross. This becomes particularly busy at school times.

Due to this, the traffic on the street as well as cars going in and out of the street (from Stakes Hill Road onto Durham Gardens and back) is crowded and dangerous. It is one of the few roads with no yellow lines and on a number of occasions, I have encountered near misses when it comes to school children and parents nearly being hit by vehicles. The road is currently unpleasant to live on during these times, having myself being blocked into my own drive.

Adding additional housing directly on the corner which is currently extremely dangerous would simply add to the issue and it would be irresponsible and dangerous to allow this development to go ahead without putting double yellow lines on both Stakes Hill Road and Durham Gardens. It would be a violation of public safety.

Adding to this, the ingress and egress of the development would be directly onto the road which currently hosts a blind corner for traffic coming out and into Durham Gardens and therefore adding an additional way onto the road again would be highly dangerous. This development has been turned down numerous times before and for good reason the last time in respect to a rejection by the Highways Agency which in itself should give you a good perspective on how dangerous this would be.

On top of this please see below additional points and my key points which I believe should stand against the development:

1. The design and look of the building would not compliment or align with the current surroundings
2. As the building would be 2-storey, this would result in a loss of space and would be of detriment to the street view and visuals
3. The proposed development is of bulk and with a residential property directly opposite, would impede on the view
4. The proposed development would be an ugly addition
5. The proposed development does not have satisfactory proposed parking or access and egress and therefore would be dangerous to road users and pedestrians

Please note, I welcome positive change within the area, however I see no positives at all to this development proceeding on the plot suggested.

I hope my concerns will be considered within the decision made.

Regards,
Michelle Snowden

This page is intentionally left blank

Application APP/20/0069 – 162 Stakes Hill Road – Waterlooville PO7 7BS

Written Deputation for the Development Management Committee 21st January 2021

1.0 Introduction

This submission is in support of the proposed sub-division of the existing property and its extension to provide a total of 5 apartments together with associated vehicle and cycle parking, communal amenity space, refuse and recycling storage.

- 1.1 Some 29 objections have been submitted against the proposal and although there is significant repetition the main areas of concern appear to be the design of the building, the scale of development and highway matters.
- 1.2 The applicant and his agents have worked closely with the case officer in a positive and proactive manner as required by the NPPF.

2.0 Building Form

Given that the proposed development includes an extension to an existing property we have adopted the architectural form and external materials of the host building. To us this is an appropriate design response and has been endorsed by your officers. The Design and Access Statement which accompanied the application deals with these matters in greater detail.

3.0 Scale of Development

We submit that the scale of development is modest, appropriate for the site and not at variance with the existing grain of development in the immediate area. Officers consider the proposal to be an efficient use of previous developed land within the urban area and provides a useful addition of small dwellings to the Borough's housing stock. The scale of development is not considered to make an adverse impact on the surrounding area, particularly as the development provides the necessary parking, amenity space and space for recycling/refuse storage.

4.0 Highways – Landscaping – Ecology and other Matters

In processing the application the case officer consulted with 9 other specialists colleagues. It is important to note that none of the consultees raised fundamental objections to the proposal. It is accepted that any consent would be conditioned to reflect the comments made by the consultees and we have been advised of the proposed conditions during the preparation of the officer's report.

4.1. Highways - One matter raised by both objectors and during the Council's site visit was the question of on street parking in the vicinity of the site. This is an existing issue which seems to relate specifically to the drop off and pick up of children to and from the nearby schools. A Transport Statement was submitted as part of the application, justifying the approach to parking access and modified sight lines at the existing entrance to the site. Importantly both the Borough's own Traffic Management Team and the County Highway Authority raised no objections to the proposed development.

4.2 Landscaping - The site contains two significant trees and an Arboriculture Report formed part of the application. The recommendations of the report were accepted by the Council's arboriculture

officer and any consent will contain a condition ensuring compliance with the recommendations. Further conditions will require the submission of hard and soft landscaping details for approval. The scheme will include the retention of all suitable existing soft landscape including trees and hedgerows and the supply of additional planting to enhance the environment.

4.3 Ecology – In order to maintain and improve the ecology of the site both Bat boxes and nesting boxes for birds will be included within the scheme.

4.4 Noise – A detailed noise report accompanied the application and proved the development was acceptable in noise terms. This submission was accepted by the Council's Environmental Health Officers.

4.5 Infrastructure – There have been no adverse responses from utility companies with regard to the local services infrastructure being able to support the proposed development. Again any consent will contain a condition requiring submission of information relating foundation design.

5.0 Conclusion

The rigorous analysis of this application by your officers has proved the proposed development is acceptable on all levels. We therefore respectfully request that the committee accept the officer's recommendation to approve, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

END

BBF-Fielding Ltd

14th January 2021

I am Cllr Diana Patrick and I am one of the Councillors representing Stakes Ward. Thank you for letting me give this deputation this afternoon.

I am here today to speak for the residents of Durham Gardens.

This application has been put forward several times and initially refused permission by the officers, and then on redesign and reapplication has been Red Carded by myself.

This is a chalet bungalow that has already been extended in the past and had its rear garden sold off in order to build four houses, in its rear garden, Nos 36/38 being the closest. The bungalow is very much in keeping with the properties that run along the front of Durham Gardens parallel to Stakes Hill Road, and that continue in style along Stakes Hill Road. However, the current proposal is to extend the original house further and to add a 2 story extension to the side. This proposal would be totally out of keeping with the area.

The residents of Durham Gardens already have to endure the traffic that parks along its entire length every morning and afternoon, whilst parents drop off and pick up their children from the three schools along Stakes Hill Road. There is no further room for any more vehicles, and the parking on site will not be adequate for 7 apartments. I have experienced the chaos myself as my two granddaughters both go to St Peters School. There is a pedestrian crossing right by the entrance to Durham Gardens, which is almost opposite the entrance to the school and that comes shortly after the large roundabout at the junction with Frenstaple Road with fast approaching traffic which blocks the road and causes large tailbacks. This is a problem already and a severe safety issue for the children.

I therefore ask you to refuse planning permission based on the following:-

R26. The proposal would result in development at a 2- storey height across (virtually) the whole width of the plot, resulting in a loss of space about the building to the detriment of the visual amenities and special characteristics of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 who forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1

R28. The proposed development would result in an excessive building bulk adjacent to an existing property, detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupier of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1

R30. The proposed development by reason of its bulk, height, and prominent position would be an incongruous feature within the street scene to the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1

R164 Any development on this site without adequate provision for rear loading and parking facilities would be likely to interfere with the free flow of traffic on Durham Gardens to the danger of road users. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16, CS19, CS20, and DM13/DM14 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1 and Planning Policy Guidance 13

In the interest of all the residents of Durham Gardens and surrounding area, and in the regard of o the congestion and safety issues already evident I ask you to refuse this application.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank