Appellant's Final Statement For:

Site Address: 10 Romill Close, West End, Southampton, SO18 3NE

Applicant: Mr B Natt

PINS Reference: APP/W1715/W/17/3179274

Date: 12th October 2017



Nigel Locke Planning Consultant, 55-57 Sea Lane, Rustington, West Sussex, BN16 2RQ. T: 07470 512090; E: planningappeals@gmail.com; W: www.nigellockeplanning.vpweb.co.uk

Appellant's Final Statement in Response to the Council's Statement

2.1(1) as discussed in our original appeal the land provided for property 10 Romill Close would be adequate and more than that which has already been accepted for No. 1 Romill Close application C/15/76607, which is also within the same conservation area. The properties approved in this application were also not inkeeping with the character of this road. However the proposed development is in keeping with the surrounding properties of Upmill Close as the development would not be seen from Romill Close as confirmed by the council in the questionnaire section 1.2a.

2.1(2) Again mentioning the undesirable backland development, which has already been approved for application c/15/76607. There is also a need for property within the area of West End as mentioned in our initial appeal. Adverse effect on the amenity enjoyed by Romill Close has also been mentioned but once again planning permission granted for both applications c/15/76607 and c/13/73461 were both approved in the same road and conservation area, both of which would have a larger adverse effect on the road amenities however were both still given permits.

The side access mentioned has already been addressed in our

statement by the providing of additional parking space for No. 10 and we have also confirmed that the space to the side of No. 10 is already used as an access point for the garage. This was also accepted and approved by Hampshire County Council Highway Department as having adequate parking once the turntable had been remove from the initial application.

2.1(3) Again commenting on pressures to the roads amenity in the form of Southern Water. This again would be the same reasoning used in the previous section with the previous two applications being passed and having a greater impact (The time frame for Marina's development to have been built has expired and therefore are not currently being built. Three less houses now to be added to Romill Close)

3.3 Not in keeping with surrounding properties. Due to property location and visibility from Romill Close it would not be seen as part of the road anyway. However inkeeping with properties to rear and development at No. 1.

Reasons for Refusal

Reason 1.

9.1 Mentions design of the property, which we have addressed with it being in keeping with the closest neighbouring properties

in Upmill Close. And to the design of the development approved for No. 1 Romill Close.

Unlike the applications, which would be seen directly from Romill Close sites Marina and No. 1, which have both been previously approved, neither in keeping with the cottage appearance.

9.2 - No cause of harm to the environment. No TPO as confirmed via the questionnaire from the council.

9.3 – In keeping from closest properties in Upmill Close not Romill Close, to which the site cannot be seen.

9.4 - Again the development cannot be seen from Romill Close therefor would not be unattractive for the road.

9.6 - "long garden of Romill Close would be affected" this has already been changed and approved by the acceptance of backland development for two properties both with smaller gardens in application C/15/76607.

9.8. There is no uniform pattern after the acceptance of two very different property styles in both accepted applications from Marina and No. 1 Romill Close.

9.9 - The street scene of Romill Close will remain unaffected as

the property is set back and unseen from Romill Close. As the Inspector will see on a site visit

9.12-9.15 - They are describing No. 1's mentioned development as being materially different however I fail to see this as both the concepts and principlesremain the same. If anything the impact would be far greater from the approved development at number one.

9.14 In particular mentions the plot being large enough so support the new development of number one however as previously advised in our initial appeal the garden of both of these new properties are small than both those provided at No. 10 and the new development to the rear of No. 10, if it was to go ahead.

Reason 2

9.16-9.21 - This mentions the space for number 10 if the development is accepted and how it is not traditional for properties of Romill Close, however the garden space of both No. 10 and the new development are I believe larger than the gardens of the approved application C/15/76607 and the previous now expired application for Marina, Romill Close.

9.22- 9.23 - As already addressed in the initial appeal, the side

way of No. 10 is already used as an access point to the garage of this property. Although different circumstance when the property is inhabited by a third party and this has already been been deemed acceptable by the highway department on initial application.

Reason 3

9.29 - 9.29 - The appellant will enter into a Unilateral Undertaking.

Comments on the appellantsground of appeal

10.3-10.4 - As previously addressed the garden space is not in keeping with current garden spaces in Romill Close however it is in keeping (if not greater) than the size of the gardens of the properties for thedevelopment approved for 1 Romill Close. As the rest of the street is do have larger rear gardens this should have been an issue for the previously approved application and also for the application for Marina Romill Close. The new garden space although not the same size as the other gardens in Romill Close (except for the development at No. 1) is still deemed legallyadequate for the properties size within planning guidelines.

10.6 - The property cannot be viewed from Romill Close due to

the angle there for this point is irrelevant to the street scene of Romill Close. The east site is mentioned however I believe this to be Upmill Close. This is not a valid reason for the street scene of Romill Close as it would be a view from Upmill Close and if this is the case then the backland development at No. 1 would have the same effect.

10.7 - Commenting on the development not beingbackland development however it is not compared to the development approved at No. 1 as this seems to be one of the council's main reasons for refusal then it is surprising that the development at number one has been approved.

10.9 - Building line is not continued from Romill Close as development will not been seen from Romill Close

10.11 - Already addressed as in keeping with neighbouring properties of Upmill Close as the development of No. 1 has.

10.18 - Mentions no gain as lacks in housing mix, however this contradicts the council's complaint that the property is of a different design and size to surround properties.

10.20 - Again mentions appearance of the area however the site is to maintain its appearance with influence of both surrounding properties and the development approved at No. 1 Romill Close.

This would then be in keeping with the design and evolving of Romill Close mirroring that of the back yard development of number 1

10.32-10.33 - This is commenting on developments in conservation areas should only "enhance or better reveal their significance" if this is indeed the case again referring to the developments approved within the same conservation area for both Marina and No. 1 to which the developments design are of a similar design to the proposed development for the rear of No. 10 Romill Close and neither were in keeping with the street scene of Romill Close

Conclusion

11.1 - Contesting the development as not being in keeping with the area and being within a conservation area as No. 1 Romill Close has already had an approved back land development to a similar design. Previously Marina was approved to be demolished and replaced with 4 properties of modern design. Neither developments approved by the council in the same conservation area would be in keeping with Romill Close's street scene.

11.2 - This has been addressed expressing that the amenity space will still be larger than the space already approved for the properties for the development of No. 1 Romill Close.

11.3 - Regarding the extra amenity pressure for the water services in Romill Close. The development at No. 1 Romill Close is to add a further two properties to road was granted after and while the planning permission was still live for the development at Marina, which would add a further 3 properties (Marina to be demolished and replaced with 4 houses) meaning 5 new properties in Romill Close in total. Bearing in mind that planning permission has now expired for Marina Romill Close there is now the pressure of a further 3 houses (previously approved) on the water services for the road not being built. Therefore the introduction of a single property in place of three should not have as large an impact as the council insist.

Appendix

7-8. - Both of these points mention tree protection however as the questionnaire part 3; section 16, the council have answered no to the question of "is this site subject to any tree protection order" and we have submitted a sufficient tree reporton the initial application. The council's Head of Trees has raised no objection.