

Comments for Planning Application APP/23/00685

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/23/00685

Address: Land between, 26-32 Padnell Road, Waterlooville

Proposal: 2No. new dwellings with associated car parking and bin/cycle storage.

Case Officer: Leanne Richardson

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Further Comments

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Ms L Richardson

Planning Development

Havant Borough Council

Public Service Plaza

Civic Centre Road

Havant

Hants

PO9 2AX

16th October 2023

Dear Ms Richardson

I wish to submit the following considerations and objections in the matter of the following Planning Application.

=====

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015

Site: Land between 26-32 Padnell Road, Waterlooville, Hants.

Proposed Development: Erection of 2No. new dwellings with associated parking and bin/cycle storage.

Planning Application Number: APP/23/00685

Applicant's Name: D & K Contracting Services Limited DeSuoza

=====

This is the latest in a series of unacceptable proposals put forward by this applicant for this site. This application has been crafted in such a way to appear as though previous objections and reasons for refusal have been fully addressed but I submit that matters for concern and reasons for refusal continue to exist.

1. Type of Development

This Application puts forward a modified version of a structure previously seen in an application submitted in February 2022 that was refused. While aesthetically similar in appearance from the street view, the ground floor interior of this version has been modified to add a 'study' (potentially Bedroom No4). To achieve this and in keeping with a familiar modus operandi, the developer seeks to push the envelope by adding a sizable single-storey extension to the rear that extends way beyond the building line of adjacent dwellings, thereby rekindling objections to the obtrusive nature of the proposal. Side windows have also been added to each dwelling where previously there were none. Whilst similar to the property on the western flank of the development site it differs greatly to the property on the eastern flank both in height and design.

The application fudges where the eastern boundary of Plot 1 will run. In previous unsuccessful applications the hatched area marked 'Surface Water Easement' was clearly intended as an access route for vehicles. The present application may show the Easement Area coloured to blend with adjacent grass and Grasscrete areas but it should not be assumed it will form part of Plot 1 and that separate vehicular access remains its intended use. The entrance to the communal carpark forewarns this showing a vehicle driving on the hatched area.

2. Parking

The proposed parking provision is the same as previous unsuccessful applications and is by way of a communal car parking area to be used by the occupants of both dwellings and surfaced in 'Grasscrete Blocks'. The pressing question is why?

Why is the applicant proposing a communal parking area when a separate entrance and driveway for each dwelling is easily possible? Is it for the purpose of aligning with the Surface Water Easement area to create vehicular access? Private entrances to proposed dwellings would be in keeping with all other properties in Padnell Road. A carpark would not. The proposed surface is an unsightly low-budget solution which would give the appearance of a municipal overflow or office carpark. A surface of this nature is more suited to an area for temporary parking at a sports field and requires constant maintenance or will quickly fall into a state of neglect - a task which will prove difficult to manage if vehicles are constantly parked on it. Who will own the parking area? Who will own the Easement Area to the side of Plot 1? Who would be responsible for the upkeep of such a scheme?

Any chance of future improvement would be impeded by the parking area's communal status. In no time at all this could end up as an eyesore which would detract from the general appearance of the locality and negatively impact on adjacent properties.

The proposed communal parking is totally out of keeping with the area and shows a lack of empathy for the locality and its residents. A design such as this has no place in Padnell Road and should be rejected.

3. Surface Water Easement Area

The area referred to as 'Surface Water Easement' hides in plain sight the true intention of this corridor. In previous unsuccessful applications this area was intended for vehicular access to dwellings to the rear of the development site. While dwellings at the rear may no longer appear in the current application the route for vehicular access remains. This explains the need for communal car parking and how things conveniently align.

Whether or not the area marked 'Surface Water Easement' area will be the property of owner of Plot 1 or the developer (if indeed these are to be different people) it is clear to see that the hatched area on the drawing titled 'Proposed Plans' will provide vehicular access to the rear of the two new dwellings and the south side of the development site.

4. Vehicular Access

The drawing entitled 'Proposed Plans' illustrates six cars neatly parked facing the western boundary. Interestingly, the area is set away from the boundary fence of No26 which has no adjacent habitable dwelling, yet the carpark extends tight to the boundary with No32 immediately next to a bedroom, dining room and window. Given it is impossible to enforce where vehicles will park on a surface where parking bays are impossible to define it is highly likely that occupants of the two proposed dwellings would have their own interpretation of how and where vehicles should be parked. Therefore, a realistic likelihood exists that vehicles will be parked directly under the side window of No32 which will look out across this unsightly carpark. Proximity to and noise from the combined vehicular movements of both new dwellings will be concentrated next to No32 at the point of entry/exit creating a constant source of nuisance. In the event that a tall vehicle were to park in proximity to the side window of No32 a severe loss of outlook and light would be suffered.

If a vehicular access route were to be created in-between Plot 1 and No32 to the rear of the site the potential for further construction would exist that may be beyond the control of the Planning Authority and be to the detriment of neighbouring properties.

Such development might include but is not limited to vehicular hard standing, storage and workshop space and garage accommodation for one or both of the proposed dwellings, even a storage yard. Any such construction would severely impact on the views from adjacent dwellings, affect light and peaceful enjoyment of their gardens. Vehicular movement at the boundary with

No32 would cause disturbance.

The Planning Authority should reject any scheme that facilitates vehicular access or the parking of vehicles to the side of Plot 1 or to the rear of the proposed dwellings.

5. Position of proposed development

This applicant has a history of trying to develop this site with schemes that are unsympathetic to the area and local residents. The two unsuccessful proposals put forward previously by this developer ignored a 'Building Line' that has been prevalent for many years which has determined the size, shape and design permitted for extensions to neighbouring buildings. This latest application continues to ignore what has been an issue in the past.

The proposed construction loosely conforms to the building line at the front of No28. However, the position of the structure is set back considerably from the line at the front of No32.

The applicant perseveres with attempts to squeeze as much as possible into this development. Although it might be argued that the last 4 metres of the proposed dwelling is single story this does not make this part of the structure invisible.

A single storey extension projecting such a distance beyond the rear of No26 and No32 will have a severe impact on outlook and light for both dwellings and will be easily visible from the ground floor lounge of No32 .

Adjacent householders have had a Building Line govern their ability to extend for many years. It is unthinkable that an out of town developer might now be allowed to ignore the rules simply to make a profit.

The Planning Department is asked to refuse this design accordingly.

6. In conclusion

The street view of the proposed semi-detached dwelling does not present a major issue, but the depth of the structure is unacceptable.

The concept of a communal carpark is out of keeping with the area. To remain in keeping with the area and adjacent properties each dwelling should have a private entrance and driveway.

The use of the area stated 'Surface Water Easement' clearly facilitates vehicular access to the rear of the development site which will cause disturbance and nuisance which must be prevented. Vehicular access to this area must not be allowed whether directly from the street or via the garden of Plot 1.

For the reasons stated it is requested that this Planning Application be refused.