

Comments for Planning Application APP/19/00911

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/19/00911

Address: 1A St James Road, Emsworth, PO10 7DN

Proposal: Demolition of existing bungalow. Erection of 3No. 3bed dwellings with parking and cycle storage.

Case Officer: David Eaves

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:10 October 2019

Subject - Planning Application - APP/19/00911

Demolition of existing bungalow. Erection of 3No. 3 bed dwellings with parking and cycle storage.
1A St James Road, Emsworth. PO10 7DN.

For the attention of Mr. David Eaves, Case Officer.

Dear Mr. Eaves,

I am writing to you in connection with the above planning application, which has been assigned to you as Case Officer. I have examined the application documentation currently submitted and under consideration, and I wish to object strongly to the proposed development before you on the following grounds -

1. The existing and proposed north elevations of the application drawings do not represent a true accurate record of the side elevation of our property. In particular, the existing north facing side windows serving our kitchen, dining and family rooms have been positioned further along to the west of our extension than is in reality. These windows are much closer to our side access door and chimney stacks. As a result, the end of the flank wall to the proposed dwelling annotated Unit 1 nearest our property, would end mid-point across our primary kitchen window having a detrimental impact on our outlook. Furthermore, with the ground level falling away from the rear elevation/s of the proposed properties would further exacerbate their impact on us.

In addition, the proposed raised decking area platform and level indicated at the rear of the proposed properties, would provide occupants with a direct view into our kitchen/dining and family rooms through our windows considerably impacting on our privacy.

2. The size of the rear gardens are dis-proportionate and too small for the size of the dwellings proposed. The length of garden including the decking area to Unit 1, amounts to a mere 7.5m.

This falls considerably short of the stated 10m requirement outlined in the Borough Design Guide SPD which supplements Policy CS16. In addition, Unit 3 is contrived, it has an irregularly small shaped garden, approximately half the size of gardens to Units 1 and 2; plus a strip of garden to the north which would be in the shade most of the day and be of little benefit.

It is observed that the rear boundary to all three properties is indicated running at a slight angle, when in fact this is not the case and should be running at 90 degrees to the southern boundary, thereby reducing the garden lengths further.

In addition, it should be noted that the red outline representing the application site cuts through the two outbuildings of neighbouring properties to the west of unit 3 along its northern edge. Also, the application drawings fail to position the Oak and Birch trees to the north west of Unit 3 nor provide any detail of the potential impact the proposed development may have on these trees nor whether they are to be retained or removed.

3. The rear 'Juliette' balconies and raised decking platforms would overlook a large portion of our rear garden which incidentally wraps itself around the complete length of rear boundary to the proposed three dwellings. The rear gabled elevations and 'Juliette' balconies would be some 7.5m to 8m from our rear boundary creating a loss of privacy and an unacceptable overbearingness detriment to the enjoyment of our garden area.

4. The drawings and information submitted indicate the boundary fencing is to be replaced with new. The current boundary fencing to the side and rear of the development site and ourselves is relatively new and therefore, I wish for the existing boundary fence treatments to remain as existing between our property and the application site.

5. It is also noted Unit 1 is located extremely close to the southern boundary, and I wish to raise concerns about how access is to be achieved for construction purposes and for future maintenance of the gutter, roof and external wall along this boundary.

6. I'm aware the application site falls within a Flood Risk Zone 1 area, and would like to note an excessive amount of vegetation and a number of trees have been recently cleared from the site which may affect the application site surface water drainage and soil stability. Coupled with the ground falling towards our garden, raises my concerns further about the possible impact this may

have on our portion of garden and our outbuildings to the rear of the application site.

7. The gross internal floor area for each unit fails to comply with the Technical Housing Standards 'Nationally Described Space Standards' document. The proposed first floor layouts indicate 2 double bedrooms and a single bedroom. The Space Standards require a 2 storey 3 bedroom 5 person house to achieve a minimum gross internal floor area of 84m² plus 2.5m² of built-in storage area. The Design and Access Statement states an Internal Area for each unit of 80.5m² falling short of the set area requirement. Furthermore, the internal layout arrangement fails to note any internal built-in storage area/s.

8. The requirements set out within the Secured by Design 2010 noted within the Design and Access Statement has been superseded by the Secured by Design 2019 guidance.

9. In addition to my comments and observations above, I conclude the design of the dwellings in their current form to be bland and out of keeping with the surrounding area. The contrived layout, bulk and massing of the design would erode the openness aspect of the street scene to this corner section of St James Road.

10. On balance and in summary, the proposed development would be too over-bearing on our property leading to a loss of privacy and outlook, lacks clarity with some important information either missing or mis-represented, fails to comply with a number of set standards and policies, and in my opinion is an unnecessary over-development of the site.