

Kieren Schneider
17 Billett Avenue
Waterlooville, Hants
PO7 7SZ
02/05/2024

Havant Borough Council
Planning Services
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant, Hants
PO9 2AX

Dear Mrs. L Wells:

As the owner of number 17 Billett Avenue, I have the following objections regarding the proposed amendments to The Grove Plot 1, Billett Avenue.

My objections listed in my letters 23/07/2023 & 23/01/2024 remain, along with all previous observations. These letters are summarised below:

1. Previous work between the developer and planning resulted in the property designs for all four plots being modified to reduce the roof height, this is evident in drawing 16A_071020. Plot 1 ridge height was reduced from 48.92 to 48.34, a reduction in 580mm. This I believe was a condition to the planning approval. The latest designs however have increased the ridge height beyond the original design from 48.34 to 49.06, an increase of 720mm. This cannot be acceptable based on the precedence and would provide dispute for the previous applications. This increase will have significant impact to the houses on Billett Avenue and Round way. I recommend the planning officer visit some of the houses on Round Way and see the impact of the development and the effect house height will have on their;
 - a. Loss of light/overshadowing
 - b. Loss of privacy
 - c. Noise and disturbance resulting from use
 - d. **Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions)**
 - e. Visual amenity

This will also affect many houses on Billett Avenue and the Grove to varying degrees. Note: The original application was for four units only varying slightly in design, similar in size, massing and car parking. Permission was only granted after the height of the all units were reduced by 0.4m on average, following concerns by the planning officers, see [Delegated Report 26/3/2021, section 7.2 (iii)].

2. The amended proposal is significantly different from the home approval previously given in APP/18/00109. The approximate GIA of plots 2, 3 & 4 is 240m² each, while the new proposal for plot 1 has a GIA of approximately 371m². This grossly changes the design, appearance and significantly affects visual amenity. We believe this is contrary to Havant Borough Councils core strategy **CS16.1 & CS16.2**.

3. The houses at the end of Billet Avenue are large, however so are the plots, this provides a feeling of space, light and visual amenity. To quantify this, the two adjacent properties on Billett Avenue, No.17 & No.15 have a plot area to ground floor area ratio of between 8.8 to 9.8. The new plot 1 development is significantly different and is estimated at 5.5, meaning the plot has 60% to 78% less outside space to the property's footprint. This would provide housing that is disproportionate to the rest of Billett Avenue and therefore objection is made against the plans based on visual amenity and overshadowing. We believe this is contrary to Havant Borough Councils core strategy **CS16.1**.
4. While the property is stated as increasing to a 5 bedroom house, in effect it is actually a 7 double bedroom house, with 5 bathrooms and a downstairs WC to support such a use. Given that the house could be used in this format, it is stated that there is insufficient parking to support this and therefore objection is raised against the increase in size on these grounds. We believe this is contrary to Havant Borough Councils core strategy **CS19.9** (Emergency services access) & development management policy **DM13**. This calculation of number of bedrooms is made in accordance with Havant Borough Council Parking Supplementary Planning Document, where it states. "Within a two-storey property, bedrooms include all those rooms at first floor or above (assuming a conventional layout) where the size of room can accommodate a single sized bed and a small amount of furniture (for example approximately 5 square meters in area)". To that end, 6 bedroom plus the annex bedroom defined on the ground floor is 7 bedrooms. It is stated in the design statement that the current proposal meets Havant SPD, however this is not the case. The guidance is given for standard layout properties, being used in the standard format. When the dataset provided in Appendix A is used for this properties layout and multigenerational use it is clear more parking is required to meet the statistical evidence. Based upon the data $0.35 \text{ (cars per room)} \times 14 \text{ (rooms)} = 4.9 \text{ cars}$. This is based upon the same calculation philosophy and characterisation of a room as in the guidance. Where a 4 bed house has 8 rooms, (4 bedrooms, 1 kitchen, 1 lounge, 1 master bathroom, 1 dinning). Therefore, we believe this is contrary to Havant Borough Councils **SPD**.
5. The new amended design proposed includes multiple Juliette Balconies and a large central balcony to the rear of the property. This is not in keeping with Billet Avenue, where there is no precedence for balcony use. In conjunction with this there are serious privacy concerns, with direct line of sight into No.17's, No.95, No.97, No.99 & No.101 kitchen, lounge, bathroom and gardens. Objection is raised based on loss of privacy on both Billett Avenue and Roundway. This coupled with the felling of trees across the site has created clear line of sight to multiple properties kitchen, living room, bathrooms and bedrooms. This is compounded by the difference in GL not advised on the planning applications.
6. The new amended proposal is a significant deviation in visual style to the other properties within the Grove. All colonial in design, providing visual amenity across the development. The new proposal for plot 1 however deviates from this style with significantly larger central front windows, loss of garage, increase in footprint and increase in roof height. Objection is raised on the grounds of Design, appearance, and visual amenity. This is contrary to Havant Borough Councils core strategy **CS16.1(c) & CS16.1(e)**. Note CS16 has previously been identified as a constraint under the original planning application APP/18/00109.
7. I object to the statement within the flooding assessment, it is not acceptable for overflow from the plot onto No.17 and subsequently No.19. As suggested a retaining wall should be

erected to prevent flow across the boundary. No.17 & No.19 are part of a Tree preservation area, a majority of these trees are on a significant gradient. Flooding of this area is likely to destabilise a number of trees due to ground saturation. As these are mature trees of significant size, should they fall, they would cause damage to surrounding properties. We believe this is contrary to Havant Borough Councils core strategy **CS13.3**.

8. What is missing from the previous flooding statement is a comprehensive review of surface flood water coming from the Avenue and main London Road. Since most of the road is privately owned there is no mains drainage. Because of this and the slope of the road, surface water under heavy rain runs directly down to the houses at the base of the avenue, including plot 1. Flooding has already occurred in this area during the culvert modification, where the civils team had significantly underestimated the streams flow and despite being warned did not provide sufficient pumps or large enough bore pipes to manage the flow. This resulted in site flooding and flood damages to properties on Highfield Avenue. In addition to the flow from Billet Avenue, an additional phenomenon adds to surface water flow. London road slopes from Queens enclosure to Billett Avenue. Due to the array of trees along the border of Queens enclosure, when it rains significant debris is dropped onto London Road and covers the road drains. Large volumes of water then flow down London Road and a moderate portion enters Billett Avenue and adds to the already large surface water flow. Calculations provided have estimated Billett Avenues surface water flow in [1]. This assessment includes factors for global warming but takes no account of the additional water from London Rd or the adopted part of Billett Avenue. This needs to be rectified as part of the development of plot 1 by including drainage at the top of the road and then piped back to the culvert. By utilizing this undeveloped site, existing infrastructure can remain unaffected. Due to the reports conducted so far not incorporating all water flow and under estimating what is physically seen at the site, objection is raised on the basis of increased flood risk. We also believe as it stands, without the suggested surface waterflow back to the culvert, this is contrary to Havant Borough Councils core strategy **CS15**. Please note that houses at the base of Billett Avenue are protected by surface water drainage that is piped back to the culvert. This is after the fork between the Grove & lower Billett Avenue. This system prevents significant flow, however there are no effective surface drainage infrastructure solutions in place for plot 1.
9. It is worth noting that the original application APP/18/00109, included additional road side parking down the Grove in the form of laybys, this would provide flexibility in car movement and prevent vehicles having to reverse all the way up the Grove. However, presumably due to costs these have not been provided, along with the retaining wall against No.15s boundary. This is less of a problem where the existing properties have flexible parking and garages available. However, this is problematic with plot 1's reduction in parking space and garage.
10. A recent Environment Agency survey highlighted significant damage to the old culvert situated on plot 1. The survey shown longitudinal pipe cracking, reducing the culverts structural performance. It is critical any required structural repairs are fully implemented prior to any construction work occurring on plot 1.
11. The gap between the new property design and Plot 2 has reduced to ~500mm (based on previous position submitted). This will impact plot 2 in terms of;
 - a. Loss of light/overshadowing
 - b. Layout and density of building**
 - c. Noise and disturbance resulting from use
 - d. Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions)**

e. Visual amenity

In summary valid objections are raised in accordance with the following material planning considerations:

- **Adequacy of parking/loading/turning**
- **Conflict with planning policies**
- Design, appearance and materials
- **Loss of light/overshadowing**
- Loss of privacy
- **Layout and density of building**
- Noise and disturbance resulting from use
- **Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions)**
- Proposals/policies in the development plan
- **Road access**
- Traffic generation
- Visual amenity

We also have the following observations & suggestions:

1. Billett Avenue has just had the road fully repaired, at great cost to the residents as it's a private road. The developments of plots 2 to 4 contributed significantly to the roads decline, unfortunately the condition became near unusable and therefore immediate action was required. It has been the residents of Billett Avenue and The Grove that have had to foot this significant cost. In fairness to all members of Billett Avenue and the Grove, it would be appreciated (once a suitable planning resolution is reached) if a condition is added that any damage from construction to the road is repaired, such that the road is returned to its current state.
2. Construction on the Groove plots 2, 3 & 4 is complete. The construction caused moderate disruption down the road, with the road blocked many times with construction vehicles. On multiple occasions existing residents were unable to leave for work. There has also been damage to grass verges and damage to a car due to reduced access. Because of this it is imperative that a construction plan is submitted and approved that clearly shows where heavy vehicles will park, unload and turn and also where the associated trades persons vehicles will park. It is not acceptable to park on the avenue and restrict access for existing residences, particularly as we have many elderly residents and much of the road is effectively a single carriage way.
3. The Environment Agency will require access to the Culvert Manholes, previous plans highlighted this access requirement. The culvert will require annual access to review and potentially maintain, this access should be reestablished on the plans. Provision in emergency flooding should also be made in that the access previously defined should not be used for permanent vehicle parking.
4. Plans should also be updated to show the sewer line, the previous construction team onsite collapsed the sewer line, which required multiple HGV to extract the sewage for 36hours continuously while repairs were made. This may have been avoided if the plans were suitably detailed.
5. While adequate screening has been included for 15 Billett Avenue, sufficient screening should be deployed to maintain the avenues aesthetics for all properties. It is suggested that the councils representative visit some of the properties along Round Way. With the proposed balconies both houses will have full unimpeded view into all rooms, bearing in mind that these existing houses are designed with the rear of the house to be private with large patio

doors and open conservatories. While housing in this location is a necessity, everyone's privacy must be respected. In addition to this, all skylights should be removed from the property if there is a habitable third floor. The side skylights provide full visibility into 17 Billets Avenues Kitchen, bathroom, garden, along with visibility into number 15 and properties along Round Way.

6. Reviewing the planning development for the other Grove properties, it shows that the approved design is already at the limit of acceptable property for the site. Roof height has already been fully constrained for plots 2 to 4, this, should be maintained for plot 1.
7. It is suggested that nutrient calculations are updated to reflect two generations under one home, in this instance it could be 1 x 5 bedroom house + 1 x 2 bedroom house, to provide a fair charge commensurate with the actual demand.
8. The North arrow on SD-2236-01 F is significantly misaligned from its actual position, this is less evident as proper plans in relation to site and site boundaries have not been provided.
9. The AMS/AIA are incorrect for the Yew tree root protection area, this is due to the trees not being located within plot 1 boundary. You will note on the recent planning applications for number 17 that this tree has just recently been accessed by a professional with access to the site. This has shown an RPA of 8.09m. Because of this the drawings previously provided require updating to reflect the correct RPA. When updated, this will show a moderate inclusion into the RPA. The AMS will need updating to use appropriate construction techniques within the foundation's inclusion into the RPA. The total inclusion area should also be re-calculated and confirmed to meet code requirements. As per number 17s planning, it is expected that a level of site surveillance will be required to ensure the construction limits any damage to the tree. Any detriment in relation to the combined RPA of both developments should be reviewed against the protected tree, noting No.17s planning has already been approved.
10. In respect of drawing SD-22-36-99, the text for line "average height of neighbouring properties" is not correct for adjacent properties. This line would be significantly lower if including plot two and number 17.
11. This submission is near identical to the previous unsuccessful submissions, the only real difference is the omission of site and other relevant details. One can only think this is an alternative tack to gain approval of a previously unsuccessful attempt by unfair means.

Finally, we note that under Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 Statutory Instrument 2010/948 "makes it unlawful for any planning obligation to be taken into account as a reason to grant a planning permission if it does not meet the 3 tests set out in the Regulation". We believe this development does not meet the third test of "necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development".

Regards,

Kieren Schneider CEng

