

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Development Management Committee (uo to 25 Feb 2021) held on 21 January 2021

Present

Councillor Satchwell (Chairman)

Councillors Mrs Shimbart (Vice-Chairman), Crellin, Diamond, Keast, Lowe and Patel (Standing Deputy)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor(s): Lloyd and Patrick

22 Apologies for Absence

Councillor Lloyd stepped down from the meeting to make a deputation as a ward member.

23 Site Viewing Working Party Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 12 January 2021 were received.

24 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interests.

25 APP/20/00696 - 162 Stakes Hill Road, Waterlooville, PO7 7BS

(The site was viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party)

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).

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation of the Head of Planning to grant permission.

The Committee received the supplementary information, circulated prior to the meeting:

- (1) written deputation submitted by Mr Briston;
- (2) written deputation by Mr Longmore;
- (3) written deputation by Ms Snowden;

- (4) written deputation by Fielding Architects;
- (5) written deputation by Cllr Patrick; and
- (6) written deputation by Councillor Lloyd

In addition to the written deputations listed above, the Committee received the following verbal deputations:

- a) Mr Freeland, who, on behalf of the applicant, drew the members attention to the following issues raised in his written deputation supporting the application:
 - 1 the proposal was an appropriate form of development for the area;
 - 2 the proposal was in a highly sustainable location and made an efficient use of developed land in the urban area;
 - 3 development would help the Council meet its housing supply target;
 - 4 the proposal provided ample facilities for future occupiers of the development;
 - 5 no objections had been received from the Council's Traffic Management Team or the Highway Authority;
 - 6 the existing highway issues caused by children being dropped off at nearby schools fell outside the scope of the scheme; and
 - 7 the applicant was willing to address the conditions set by the Council
- b) Councillor Patrick, who, drew the members attention to the following issues raised in her written deputation objecting to the application:
 - 1 the proposal would result in the loss garden space;
 - 2 the proposal would be out of keeping with the area;
 - 3 the development of the site, in the manner proposed, would not provide adequate provision of car parking and would therefore encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway, which would exacerbate the existing traffic problems associated with the dropping off and collection of pupils attending the nearby schools to the detriment of highway safety.

Councillor Patrick recommended the Committee to refuse the application for the following standard reasons:

R26

R28

R30

R164

R165

- c) Councillor Lloyd, who, drew the members attention to the following issues raised in her written deputation objecting to the application:
- 1 the proposed development would constitute an undesirable over-intensive use of site. which would have an adverse effect on the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties;
 - 2 the proposal was not in keeping with the style of the surrounding residential dwellings;
 - 3 the additional traffic likely to be generated by this proposal would exacerbate the existing traffic problems currently experienced in Durham Gardens, which would add to the hazards of road users of this highway and would have an adverse effect on the amenities of occupiers of Durham Gardens;
 - 4 the additional use of the access road by traffic likely to be generated by the proposal would be likely to cause undue interference with the safety and convenience of users of the adjoining footpath;
 - 5 the proposed parking provision was inadequate to meet the demand for parking spaces likely to be generated by the occupiers and visitors of the proposed 8 bedrooms, and thereby likely to encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway which would add to the hazards already experienced by users of Durham Gardens and be detrimental to the amenities of the residents of this road; and
 - 6 the significant trees surrounding and within the site could be damaged by this development.

The officers commented on the deputations as follows:

- (i) the report covered all the issues raised in the written and verbal deputations;
- (ii) neither the Highway Authority nor the Council's Traffic Management Team had raised objections;

- (iii) the parking provision complied with the Council adopted standards;
- (iv) the Council's Arboriculturalist and ecologist had not objected to the proposal; and
- (v) it was considered that the proposal was in keeping with the area and would not have a significant impact on the amenity.

In response to questions raised by Members of the Committee, the officers:

- (a) advised that:
 - (i) the distance between the boundary fence and the nearby public house was 1 metre; and
 - (ii) the distance between the development and the nearby public house was 5 metres;
- (b) outlined the mitigation measures proposed to reduce the impact of the operation of the nearby public house on the proposal;
- (c) outlined the conditions proposed to protect the amenities of existing residents during the construction of the proposal;
- (d) clarified the purpose of the noise assessment submitted to support the application;
- (e) advised that the size of amenity area to the right of the extension was 24 square metres;
- (f) advised that the parking provision complied with the Council's adopted standards and was therefore a material consideration;
- (g) advised that the Highways Authority, after consideration of the proposed parking provision and highway safety, raised no objection to the proposal subject to the proposed visibility splays;
- (h) advised that applicant was not obligated to resolve the existing traffic problems;
- (i) advised on the separation distances between the proposal and existing dwellings; and
- (j) advised that as the current extension had a dormer window there was currently a degree of overlooking.

The Committee discussed the application in detail together with the views raised by deputees.

During the debate, the Committee considered whether:

- (A) the development represented an overdevelopment of the site due to its bulk, size, scale, lack of amenity and urbanising effect;
- (B) the noise likely to be generated by the nearby public house would have an adverse impact on the occupiers of the development;
- (C) the number of parking spaces proposed would encourage parking on the highway to the detriment of highway users and the nearby residents;
- (D) the traffic likely to be generated by this proposal would exacerbate the existing traffic problems experienced in this area; and
- (F) the proposed development would be an incongruous feature within the streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area.

The Committee acknowledged that, in view of the comments received from the Highway Authority and the fact that the proposed parking provision complied with the Council's adopted standards, it would be difficult to justify a refusal on highway grounds and inadequate parking spaces.

With regard to amenity space, the Committee acknowledged that as the existing Local Plan had no space standards for communal developments, it would difficult to justify refusal solely on these grounds.

On balance the Committee considered that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site due to its scale, bulk a, lack of amenity space and urbanising effect on the area and as such would be out of keeping with the area.

The Officers recommended that if the Committee was minded to refuse this application, it should also refuse on the grounds that a legal agreement had not be entered into to secure appropriate mitigation measures in respect to water quality.

Therefore, it was

RESOLVED that application APP/20/00696 be refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed development would be an overdevelopment of the site by reason of its scale, bulk, lack of amenity space and urbanisation by the built form, which would be an incongruous feature out of keeping with the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2 In the absence of a suitable agreement to secure appropriate mitigation measures in respect to water quality, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on the Solent European Sites as specified in the Habitats Regulations Assessment that has been undertaken in relation to this planning application. The development would be likely to result in detriment to water quality and as such, it is contrary to policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, emerging Policies E16 and EX1 of the Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

(the votes were recorded as follows:

For: Councillors Satchwell, Crellin, Lowe, Keast, Patel, Howard, and Mrs Shimbart

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0)

The meeting commenced at 5.02 pm and concluded at 6.50 pm

.....

Chairman