

Deputation to Planning Committee – 172 THE DALE, Dale Lodge Widley

Hello Members,

For those of you who do not know me, I am Cllr Caren Diamond and have been a councillor for Havant borough for 13 years. I have lived in and around Widley and Purbrook all my life, so I have seen it evolve and develop over that time.

This planning application sees an opportunity by the developer who has bought Dale Lodge and refurbished it, to maximise that development by splitting the site and putting a three bedroomed house in the front garden.

CAR PARKING SPACE

The positioning of the space for two vehicles is planned to come off the turning space at the north, closed end of the lane. I would suggest this site is far too far away from the proposed dwelling. I cannot see future occupants carrying shopping or children from those spaces up to the house, especially in bad weather.

A sensible amendment would be if the proposed new dwelling had access across a corner of the drive to Dale Lodge, so vehicles attached to the new house could be parked conveniently alongside the house.

I would ask for a **condition** to make this possible, if you decide to approve this application.

ACCESS TO THE SITE

Access to the site is via a private lane. Four other residents also have access. Adding a further property with its vehicles, will likely be detrimental to the amenity of those users of the lane.

I would add to **R28** that: “the new dwelling would be detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding properties and excessive need to use the single-track lane”

BIN STORAGE

Originally, the bin storage was shown near the house, which is usually where people want them, for easy access when binning their rubbish.

It is now shown to be next to the site of a pedestrian access gate into Widley Gardens.

I would ask for a **condition** that on collection days, the bins should be put on the pavement outside the address of the property, which is on the corner of The Dale, accessed via the private lane.

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS GATE INTO WIDLEY GARDENS

The residents of Widley Gardens are fearful about this access point being part of the application. The planning officer says that it is “required” by the plan, for the convenience of the future occupants.

I ask, why should the residents of Widley Gardens have to lose their amenity of the security of living in a cul-de-sac, for the convenience of a future occupier of a house?

We all know this could lead to parking from the proposed house even though they would have their own parking spaces accessed via the private lane.

Members, I ask you to consider this and if you are minded to approve, please request **a condition** that the pedestrian gate be removed in perpetuity, and replaced by a fence or wall, clearly showing that Widley Gardens ends, at the closed end of the cul-de-sac, and the property or properties which have access to the private lane are only accessed by that private lane.

The fact that it will be difficult to accommodate further vehicles on site, automatically shows that the “proposed development would be likely to encourage the parking of vehicles on the public highway in The Thicket, The Dale and, given the addition of a footpath to the proposed new house, in the hammer head turn in Widley Gardens.

This would impede turning for residents of Widley Gardens and hamper access for delivery, emergency, waste collection and street cleaning vehicles in this cul-de-sac.

If you decide to approve this Plan, I would also ask for a **condition** that during the build process, all materials and trades people, access the site via the private lane.

TREES

A summary of Appendices 2 and 3 from the arborist’s report states that apart from three, all trees and hedges are in a good state.

Please note that tree T8, a sycamore, is due to be felled on the applicant’s plan, and in its place a cherry tree is planned to be planted. However, T8 is categorised as being in good order according to the arborist’s assessment.

Tree T8 straddles the boundary between the plot and the neighbouring property at 22 Widley Gardens. The resident of 22 Widley Gardens has maintained the tree for 25 years. It is valued for the critical shade it gives their garden and house during the heat of summer.

It also provides significant habitat for wildlife, especially birds during extreme weather; far more habitat in fact, than a cherry tree would give. Therefore, the mature sycamore should remain, and I would ask for **a condition** to ensure that.

SEWER, STANDING WATER AND DRAINAGE

I would refer Members to an objector's letter relating to the connection of the proposed house to the sewage network, and problems associated with storm overflows from the drain in their garden.

I note Building Control comments:

'I can advise that there is no public sewer shown on the map of sewers within 3m of the proposed building.'

I am **unaware** if there has been an update regarding management of wastewater and rainwater.

A condition may be required if the drainage is not clearly dealt with in the application, and if Members are minded to approve.

I **recommend refusal** on the following grounds, taken from Havant Borough Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document:

Section 5.25 says – 'Development of back-land and infill sites should not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties. Many of these sites are situated amongst existing neighbours and can create an adverse impact'.

Clearly this proposed 'back-land' development would have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

Section 5.27 says - 'Due to the problems of overlooking, noise and traffic disturbance, loss of amenity, cramping and the adverse impact on local character, successful tandem schemes are difficult to deliver successfully', and

Section 5.29 says - 'Combined, rear (or in this case, front) gardens and their landscape provide an attractive street scene and backdrop to dwellings. This is part of the character of an area, which can be lost through back-land development. Therefore, in these instances, back-land development should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances'.

The 'exceptional circumstances' of this proposed 'back-land' development have not, as far as I can see, been identified.

Section 5.8 says - 'Back-land development should not have a negative effect on existing character and therefore should avoid development'. I refer R135 and R136.

Regarding parking for residents and their visitors I refer to **R165** and **R168** reworded to say: "The proposed access to the highway by more vehicles than is current, would likely cause safety issues, especially given the close proximity to the entrance to Purbrook Park school, and parking issues at drop off and pick up times".

Thank you for listening to me on behalf of the residents in my ward who will be affected by this proposal. END

Reasons for refusal are as follows using the following Model Reasons:

Numbers 28, 133, 135, 136, 165 and 168 all of which can be worded with specific reference to the proposal.

Conditions requested:

1. a condition that on collection days, the bins should be put on the pavement outside the address of the property, which is on the corner on The Dale, accessed via the private lane.
2. a condition to provide parking alongside the new building.
3. a condition that the pedestrian gate be removed in perpetuity, and replaced by a fence or wall, clearly showing that Widley Gardens ends, at the closed end of the cul-de-sac.
4. a condition that the mature sycamore tree in the north corner of the plot be retained.
5. a condition that during the build process, all materials and workers access the site via the private lane.
6. a condition may be required if the drainage is not clearly dealt with in the application.

1,139 words (including headings)