

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 29 March 2007

Winchester City
Council
Planning Department
Development Control

TEAM MANAGER
SIGN OFF SHEET

Committee Decision

Case No:	07/00299/FUL	Valid Date	30 January 2007
W No:	15642/10	Recommendation Date	14 March 2007
Case Officer:	Mr Robert Ainslie	8 Week Date	27 March 2007
		Committee date	29 March 2007
Recommendation:	Application Refused	Decision:	Committee Decision

Proposal:	Erection of 3 no detached dwellings comprising 1 no three, 1 no four and 1 no five bedroom dwellings with garaging and associated landscaping and work to existing trees
------------------	--

Site:	St Eloi South Drive Littleton Winchester Hampshire
--------------	--

Open Space Y/N	Legal Agreement	S.O.S	Objections	EIA Development	Monitoring Code	Previous Developed Land
Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y

DELEGATED ITEM SIGN OFF		
		REFUSE for the reason(s) listed
	Signature	Date
CASE OFFICER		
TEAM MANAGER		

AMENDED PLANS DATE:-

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 29 March 2007

Item No: 15
Case No: 07/00299/FUL / W15642/10
Proposal Description: Erection of 3 no detached dwellings comprising 1 no three, 1 no four and 1 no five bedroom dwellings with garaging and associated landscaping and work to existing trees
Address: St Eloi South Drive Littleton Winchester Hampshire
Parish/Ward: Littleton And Harestock
Applicants Name: Urbanscape Developments Ltd
Case Officer: Mr Robert Ainslie
Date Valid: 30 January 2007
Site Factors: Tree Preservation Order
Recommendation: Application Refused

General Comments

This application is reported to Committee because of the number of letters of support received

A similar scheme, together with an alternative scheme for five dwellings were submitted in 2006 and subsequently withdrawn following concerns in relation to the scheme for 5 dwellings. Both schemes have now been resubmitted with an amended access and the submission of an ecological report.

An application for an alternative scheme for five dwellings has been submitted and is being considered separately at this committee (W15642/09).

Site Description

The application site is 0.2ha in size. This area excludes the land under the band of trees along the western boundary of the site and the land to the south of the site which is to be retained as a meadow.

The application site forms part of the residential curtilage of a former property on the site known as St Eloi. The land rises slowly at first to the south but then climbs steadily towards the southern boundary and beyond to the meadow area. A group of protected trees lie along the western boundary and provide a strong visual screen from views to the west. A number of predominantly smaller trees and vegetation lie to the east of the site and offer sporadic screening from properties along this boundary.

South Drive is characterised by predominantly 2 storey dwellings in spacious plots with spaces between dwellings. Notable exceptions to this are the two properties to the immediate east of the site. A number of detached properties are located to the east of the application site. Woodmancote is located particularly close to the boundary and is partially orientated towards the rear of the application site. This neighbouring property has first floor windows facing across towards the rear of the application site.

South Lodge lies to the immediate west of the application site. Whilst there are views towards this direction they are limited, given the group of trees along the boundary.

Proposal

The proposals are for three detached dwellings with one facing directly onto South Drive, and two located at a higher level towards the southern end of the site. A vehicular access is proposed along the eastern boundary of the site. The properties would be approximately 10-15m away from properties to the east. The density of the development would equate to 15dph.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 29 March 2007

The proposals include parking spaces for some properties and garaging for others. The access to the development is from South Drive.

The materials for the scheme have not been confirmed yet, however this could be adequately conditioned, if members were minded to approve.

Relevant Planning History

- W15642** One detached four bedroom dwelling with integral double garage - Application Refused - 14/09/1998
- W15642/01** Two detached four bedroom houses, storage building and four bay garage/carport - Application Refused - 05/03/1999
- W15642/02** Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 no four bedroom dwellings with associated garages and new access - Application Refused - 22/06/1999
- W15642/03** Detached four bedroom dwelling with integral double garage - Application Refused - 01/07/1999
- W15642/04** Two detached four bedroom houses, storage building and two bay garage/carport - Application Refused - 06/07/1999
- W15642/05** Demolish existing dwelling, construct 2 no. three bedroom semi-detached, 1 no. double carport, 3 no. two bedroom terraced and 1 no. block consisting 2 no. three bedroom and 2 no. two bedroom dwellings, associated car parking, access road and alteration to access. - Application Refused - 03/09/2003
- W15642/06** Construction of 3 No. detached four bedroom dwellings - Application Refused - 08/06/2005
- W15642/07** Residential redevelopment comprising; 2 no. four bedroom detached and 3 no. two bedroom terraced dwellings with associated parking and landscaping - Application Withdrawn - 04/01/2007
- W15642/08** Residential redevelopment comprising; 1 no. three bedroom, 1 no. four bedroom and 1 no. five bedroom detached dwellings with associated parking and landscaping - Application Withdrawn - 04/01/2007
- W15642/09** Erection of five dwellings comprising; 2 no four bedroom and 3 no two bedroom dwellings with garaging and parking and associated landscaping and work to existing trees – Currently under consideration.

Consultations

Engineers: Drainage:

Applicant proposes to use treatment works for the dwellings with a drainage field within the curtilage of each. This is acceptable provided that compliance with building regulation is ensured and that the Environment Agency issue the necessary consents.

If approval is granted, a condition should be included that no dwelling be commenced until a drainage strategy for each dwelling be submitted to and approved by the LPA showing each dwelling can be drained in compliance with building regulations.

Engineers: Highways:

Proposal is acceptable in highway terms subject to conditions. Given history of the adjacent development, the access arrangements are acceptable.

Landscape:

No objection if tree cover is retained, undamaged and maintained.

Trees

Concerns appear to have been taken into account. Happier with relationship with just one house as opposed to the three on the other application. Less of an impact on the trees. Satisfied that these important trees can be protected.

Environment Agency:

No objection subject to conditions

Natural England

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 29 March 2007

Comments awaited

Southern Water:

Environment Agency should be consulted regarding the use of a private wastewater treatment works or septic tank drainage which disposes of effluent to sub-soil irrigation. Owner of premises will need to empty and maintain works or septic tank to ensure its long term effectiveness Council's technical staff should be asked to comment on adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from proposed development. Southern Water can provide a water supply to site

Representations:

Littleton & Harestock Parish Council

No objection but following comments made:-

- Area is prone to flooding. Agreed drainage system would have to be installed to cope with a rise in the water table. Run-off will exacerbate the flooding problem.
- Concern that lack of amenity space to Plot 5 will result in land outside policy boundary being used in the future.
- Plot 5 appears dominant to surrounding properties due to height and size and may overlook properties to north and east.
- Concern at increase in traffic in South Drive and impact extra developments are having on a single track road.

9 letters received objecting to the application for the following reasons:

- Limited visibility for drivers exiting the site. Lack of parking, resulting in parking on South Drive. Unacceptable increase in traffic. Lack of amenity space would mean children would play in South Drive.
- Plot 3 would overlook residents of Woodmancote and Lapwhyng. Loss of light to Woodmancote.
- Overdevelopment of the site. Cramped. Little by way of amenity space. Loss of rural feel of area. Plot 3 would be too high and create an eyesore. Mass of Plot 3 across width of plot would dominate and overshadow neighbouring properties. At odds with Littleton Village Design Statement.
- Insufficient area for dispersal of foul water.
- Permission granted for two dwellings which was more acceptable.
- Spoiling haven for wildlife.
- Noise impact of additional traffic along gravel drive.
- Potential for increased flooding.
- Previous letter from Planning Office on previous application stated backland development would be out of keeping with character of locality and detrimental to amenity.

Reasons not material to planning and therefore not addressed in this report

- Concerns about accuracy of boundary detail along eastern boundary and ownership of land.
- Disruption caused by construction vehicles.

4 letters of concern received

- Two buildings on site is most in keeping with the area, best for drainage, traffic and also for neighbour amenity.
- Three dwellings seems most in keeping but both schemes will have a significant effect on drainage and traffic increase.
- Volume of traffic
- Flooding. Pressure on natural drainage.
- Expectation for appropriate conditions to be imposed.
- This proposal is a reasonable alternative to application for five dwellings.
- Lack of public transport and local amenities.
- Concern about potential use of land to South of site as additional garden area.
- Impact on the trees.
- Area is a haven for wildlife.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 29 March 2007

- Whilst concerns remain, does seem to be a more reasonable alternative.
5 letters of support received.
- In keeping with other detached houses in South Drive and retains character of the road and village. Will enhance South Drive.
- Sympathetic landscaping to minimise impact on surrounding houses.
- In line with latest government guidelines for housing.
- Applicant has ensured that adjacent properties are not overlooked. Would not result in overlooking towards South Lodge.
- Fair compromise between most of residents to keep development to a minimum. Would wish that desires of residents would take priority over slavish devotion to what are guidelines, not rules.

Relevant Planning Policy:

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review:

UB3, T6, H7, R2, E6, E8

Winchester District Local Plan Review

DP1, DP3, DP4, DP5, CE10, H3, H7, RT4, T2, T4

National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements:

PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS 3 Housing

PPS 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

PPG 13 Transport

PPG 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

PPG 25 Development and flood risk

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Littleton Village Design Statement

Achieving A Better Mix in Housing

Other Planning guidance

Guide to the Open Space Funding System

Movement, Access, Streets and Spaces

Parking Standards 2002

Technical Paper: Open Space Provision and Funding

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The application site falls mainly within the built up settlement of Littleton. Littleton is designated as a defined settlement where the principle of residential development is broadly acceptable subject to particular site constraints. The designation of this settlement was considered as part of the Local Plan process, where the inspector concluded that the settlement was appropriate and sustainable as a location for residential development (Para 6.10.3). The southern part of the site (as outlined in red on the location plan) falls in countryside outside the built up settlement. However the submitted documentation indicates that this land will be retained as a meadow. Conditions could be imposed to ensure retention as such.

The proposals result in a density of 15dph. This would be well below the guidelines set out in Policy DP3, H7 and also PPS3. It is therefore considered that the proposals fail to accord with Policies DP3 or H7 of the Local Plan in this respect and the guidance laid out in PPS3. The alternative scheme for five dwellings would still appear in keeping with the character of the area and demonstrates that a more efficient use of the land could be achieved without compromising the character of the area.

The proposals provide 3 detached properties being 1no three bedroom dwelling, 1no four bedroom dwelling and 1no five bedroom dwelling. The proposals make no provision for small 1 or 2 bedroom properties and therefore fail to comply with Policy H7 in this respect.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 29 March 2007

Whilst the developer has expressed a willingness to meet the requirements in terms of a contribution towards public open space provision, this has not been secured and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy R2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and Policy RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006.

Design/layout

The proposal differs from the alternative scheme for five dwellings in that the terrace of three smaller properties is replaced by a single detached dwelling. The 2 detached properties to the rear of the site remain the same as that proposed on the alternative scheme.

It is considered, in purely design terms, that the proposals would appear in keeping with the neighbouring residential properties. The two dwellings to the rear set one behind the other are in character with the layout of properties to the immediate east and elsewhere within Littleton.

Impact on character of area and neighbouring property

It is considered that the design of the dwelling at the front of the site would not detract from the character which currently exists within South Drive, that being of detached residential dwellings with spaces between them. It is considered that the dwelling would not appear out of place with the character of the area.

The two dwellings to the rear would appear somewhat prominent given the rise in levels. However this would not be so apparent given the proposed built form to the front of the site. The impact would not be significantly greater than the existing built form to the east of the site.

The amenity space to each of these properties is considered to be acceptable.

The design of Plot 3 has involved careful consideration in relation to the positioning of windows at first floor level to prevent overlooking to the property to the east, which is set at a lower level. Any windows which face towards this property are secondary or high level and could be conditioned to be obscurely glazed.

Windows within Plot 2 face towards the side of the property to the east, however it is considered that, given the distance between the properties (12m) and the existing boundary treatment, that a refusal on this ground could not be sustained.

No windows in Plot1 face towards South Lodge to the west and this dwelling would not result in overlooking towards the west.

One first floor windows within the Plot 1 would face towards the neighbouring property to the east. Given the distance and orientation between the proposed windows (20m), it is not considered that a refusal on this ground could be sustained.

Landscape/Trees

The landscaping for the proposed development is considered to be acceptable and the important band of trees along the western boundary would be retained as part of the development.

Highways/Parking

The parking is being provided to adopted standards and no objection has been raised by the highways engineer.

The visibility splays are considered to be acceptable and meet the same standards as those on the neighbouring development to the east.

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA 29 March 2007

Other Matters

An ecological study has been submitted as part of this application in relation to wildlife within the site and is currently being considered by Natural England. Members will be updated on the response from Natural England at Committee.

The issue of drainage and potential flooding has been considered by both the Environment Agency and the Drainage Engineer. The development is considered to be acceptable in this respect subject to conditions.

The issue of potential noise by virtue of the gravel access could be considered in more detail as part of the submission of details in compliance with any landscaping conditions.

Recommendation

Application Refused for the following reasons

Reasons

1 The proposed development is contrary to the housing and design policies of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) (H7) the adopted Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 (H7), SPG Better Housing Mix and Planning Policy Statement Note 3 Housing in that, it has not been demonstrated that additional units cannot be accommodated on the site or within the proposed development footprint or that a better mix of dwelling types and sizes could be achieved therefore the proposal fails to achieve a better mix of dwelling types and sizes and fails to address national and local housing needs, making efficient use of the land available.

2 The proposal is contrary to Policy R2 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review) and Policy RT4 of the Winchester District Local Plan in that it fails to make adequate provision for public recreational open space to the required standard.

Informatives:

The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, T6, H5, H7, R2, E6, E8

Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006: DP1, DP3, DP4, DP5, CE7, H3, H7, RT4, T2, T4,