



Flat 42 Ward Court
65 Sea Front
Hayling Island
Hampshire
PO11 0AL.

15th August 2019

Dear Sirs

**Re: The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order
2015
Ward Court, 65 Sea Front, Hayling Island
Your Reference: APP/19/00722**

Thank you for your letter dated 6th August 2019 regarding the above planning application. I write to set out my objections below.

Visual Impact

The building in its current form is a large unattractive building. The building with an extra layer on it would be an even larger more overbearing unattractive building and would reduce the light to properties opposite. The development appears very dense and crammed in. If there were going to be penthouses then fewer units and spread out more would be more attractive and more in keeping with the existing streetscene, particularly as there is a listed building next door.

The extra parking spaces would turn the block into a mass of concrete which would make the building most unattractive to live in. A large part of the existing garden space is taken up by the swimming pool. There is not enough parking for existing residents as the existing carspaces and garages are not big enough for many modern vehicles but to remove what little garden there is to accommodate 12 extra spaces is totally unacceptable, another indication that the proposal represents overdevelopment of the site.

Loss of Garden and Loss of Privacy As A Result Of Carparking Proposals

My flat is on the first floor and I currently can see four parking places from my lounge window but they are not obtrusive as they are at a distance, lower than the ground floor of the block and partially obscured by flowers and shrubbery. The applicant's original proposal was to take the unadopted road to the south of the block and use that for parking for the penthouses. We have been informed that as ownership of the unadopted road could not be proved the road could not form part of the planning application so I see that it is now proposed to turn our lovely gardens into a concrete carpark. I object strongly to this as the view of the gardens and the sea beyond is an important part of my enjoyment of my flat.

Also in high winds there is a vortex formed in the space between the southern wings of the building which almost creates a whirlwind at times and may not be the best place to park cars. In addition, water running off the building, particularly from the proposed semi-

circular balconies would have nowhere to go which could result in the existing lower carparking spaces being flooded. The adjacent unadopted road the other side of the perimeter wall is always full of enormous puddles throughout the winter.

I also think the 2 carparking spaces proposed either side of the entrance to the block are an extremely bad idea. Some months ago the refuse lorry demolished the wall on the eastern side of the entrance and a bicycle. The applicants have rebuilt the wall.. I saw the refuse lorry reversing into the entrance the other day and it is an extremely tight fit. The entrance needs to be made wider,, not narrower. It would save on Norse's insurance premiums, and the first time it was only a bicycle that got demolished. With this proposal, next time it will be a car.

Overlooking

I am not currently overlooked but would be affected by cars coming and going if the proposed parking spaces were approved. The downstairs flats would be far more adversely affected as they would have cars parked alongside their windows. The proposed parking spaces would also create disturbance in the form of headlights at night, noise and car fumes.

Overshadowing and Loss Of Daylight

I live in one of the back flats which means that although my lounge and kitchen windows face south they only get sunlight 2-3 hours a day because of the wings of the building either side. The design appears to include semi-circular structures jutting out at roof level to accommodate balconies for penthouses which would decrease the sunlight my flat receives even more. I can also foresee having a waterfall cascading in front of my flat in bad weather due to water running or blowing off this structure.

The flat on the south-western corner is itself a penthouse, in that it is a double sized flat – the only one in the block and its unique status would be downgraded by this application.. This flat has a large skylight in the hall and skylights in the bathroom and cloakroom which are the only sources of light in those rooms. The proposal to simply build around those skylights does not seem satisfactory and would surely take away light from the flat. Maintenance of the skylights is the landlord's responsibility and I don't see how this could be done if there was a penthouse built around them.

Design and Materials

There is not a great deal of information about the materials used but when I raised my concerns about the alumina cement in the building I was told that the penthouses would be very light fibreglass structures. That does not appear to be the case from the information given. I understand it is really an issue for Building Control but the Council's Land Charges Department furnished me with a letter written in 1990 (attached) about the alumina cement in the building when I purchased my flat which recommended that any building no more than four storeys high should be all right but anything higher should be checked. Ward Court is five storeys high so it seems to be to be tempting fate to build another storey on top. The applicant claims to have confirmation that the building can withstand the weight of the penthouses but we have not been shown a formal report to back this up and we do not know if it is the particular design contained in this application that was being referred to.

Cladding

After the horrors of Grenfell and hearing about tenants who have to pay a fortune to remove cladding that no longer meets fire safety requirements I would object to any form of cladding.

Human Rights Act 1998

Article 8 (The Right To Respect For Family Life) and Protocol 1 Article 1 (the Protection of Property and the Right To Enjoy Property Peacefully) are engaged. I spend a lot of time looking out from my lounge and balcony on our pleasant gardens and I submit that my right to continue having and pleasant outlook and having some garden space to walk in should be respected and protected. Similarly I would suggest that the rights of flatowners who purchased a top floor flat because they did not wish to have anyone living above them and the right of the owner of the double top floor flat on the south western corner not to have the skylights in her flat interfered with should also be respected and protected.

With regard to the works themselves, whilst I am given to believe that objections to the nuisance caused are not regarded as relevant objections as they can be alleviated by conditions, here we are not talking about a new development of a separate site. This proposal involves turning a block containing 54 households into a building site for 12 to 18 months with residents, particularly on the top floor being subjected to constant noise all day and every day. Residents would be denied the use of their garages/parking spaces and would be forced to park a considerable distance from their homes.

There are currently 34 garages and 23 parking places within the block. To the west of the entrance are 11 more spaces which are owned by the block making a total of 34 parking spaces altogether. (I note incidentally that the planning application claims there are 37 existing spaces. This is incorrect. Also the application claims that there will be 18 new car parking spaces but I can only see 10 on the proposed plan. The plan shows 3 new spaces either side of the entrance but there are already two in existence each side and my total of 34 existing spaces includes these). To the east of the entrance there are 5 spaces which are public parking spaces. There is room for approximately 9 cars on the unadopted road on the west side of the block. We are told that there will be times when we cannot access our garages and parking facilities. So potentially, up to 50 vehicles could be displaced though not all spaces and garages are used due to their inadequate width as mentioned above.

There are double yellow lines all along Sea Front, along Stamford Avenue, which is the nearest junction opposite the east of the block, and along Staunton Avenue which is the nearest junction to the west of the block. As a result parking in side roads adjacent to those roads is already in heavy demand. By 5.45pm each day the parking spaces at the front of the block and in the unadopted road at the side are always full. There may be 2 or 3 spaces available in Norfolk Crescent but otherwise residents would be forced to park their vehicles several minutes walk away from their homes.

Article 14 (prohibition against discrimination) is also engaged. There are flatowners in their 80s and 90s in the block who are frightened and tearful at what will happen if this application is granted. The project would involve the lifts being out of action for unspecified periods of time. Thus granting this application would discriminate against elderly and

disabled residents as they would be more adversely affected by the non-operation of the lifts and inability to use their parking facilities. The applicant has no plans to rehouse the top floor residents so one flatowner in particular who cannot negotiate the stairs and who lives on the top floor would be trapped in her flat and forced to endure constant and intolerable noise. How can this be alleviated by planning conditions and how can this be justified in the public interest?

The answer, I would suggest, is that it cannot, and therefore this application should be refused.

Yours faithfully



Hannah C. Newbury

Planning Services
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX.

WARD COURT, 65 SEA FRONT, HAYLING ISLAND

You will be aware that the Department of the Environment have asked Local Authorities to advise owners of buildings in which High Alumina Cement Concrete has been used that this had happened with a view to the owners considering what measures they then wish to take. You may also be aware that a report of the Subcommittee P of the Building Regulations Advisory Committee have reported to the Department with recommendations on the matter and their report has been accepted and we forward a copy of Page 8 of the recommendation so accepted.

The position of a Local Authority over the matter of High Alumina Cement Concrete is difficult because until 1975 there had not been restrictions on the use of this material as such, nor had it been necessary for a person applying for permission to erect a building to inform the Council that they intended use of the material. Accordingly the Council have no first hand or formally acquired information as to whether HAC has been used in existing buildings but they can take up indications from matters mentioned incidentally in formal applications made to them. They have inspected their records as to buildings in the Borough generally and have found some indications in their building regulations deposited documents that it might well have been intended to use HAC in the construction of Ward Court. Moreover they were subsequently contacted by a resident, who instituted a private investigation by his own consulting engineer, and while this is a document undertaken not by the Council and not for any purpose of the Council, We gather that this has tended to confirm that HAC was used here.

You will appreciate that the Council are acting here to fulfil governmental requests as to the dissemination of information in what is felt to be the public interest but neither they nor their officers could accept liability for any inaccuracy in the information which they are endeavouring to convey.

The above information is given on the distinct understanding that Havant Borough Council and Hampshire County Council do not warrant the accuracy of any of the replies and on the basis that neither of the two Councils nor any officer, servant or agent of the two Councils is legally responsible, either in contract or in tort, for any inaccuracies, errors or omissions herein contained whether arising from inadvertence or negligence or from any other cause whatsoever. So also is any other information given separately (eg by subsequent letter, or orally).

RECOMMENDATIONS

15 EXEMPTIONS FROM APPRAISAL

We recommend that, in buildings consisting solely of houses, maisonettes and flats, floors and roofs of standard factory-produced joists up to 10in in depth, which is the maximum size used in such construction, may be considered safe and exempt from appraisal provided:

- a the buildings do not consist of more than 4 storeys.
- b in the case of roofs of HACC construction:
 - i they are of joist and block or composite construction;
 - ii they are not used for access, except for maintenance;
 - iii the spans do not exceed 6.5 metres clear in the case of an X7 or less joist roof and 8.5 metres clear in the case of an X9 or X10 joist roof.
- c there is no persistent leakage or sustained heavy condensation

16 CRITERIA FOR APPRAISAL OF BUILDINGS

16.1 We recommend that all buildings not exempt under para. 15 should be appraised by a suitably qualified engineer. In the absence of actual data on concrete strength the criteria tabulated below may be used. Any such appraisal should include a visual inspection of the structure.

Criteria for appraisal of floors or roofs with HACC beams in non-composite construction

	Type of Beam	Concrete strength fcu (N/mm ²)	Maximum Strain	Beam Performance factor	Partial Materials (γ _m) Concrete	Safety Steel	Factors Loading Dead Floor	(γ _f) load Roof	Live load
1.	Standard factory-produced X-joists up to 10in in depth manufactured on a long-term production line with consistent dimensional and quality control and used in joist and hollow block construction	21	0.002	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.4*	1.4*	1.6
2.	Standard factory-produced X-joists up to 10ins in depth manufactured on a long-term production line with consistent dimensional and quality control and used as isolated beams or purlins	21	0.002	1.3	1.5†	1.0	1.4*	1.4*	1.6
3.	Other standard factory-produced joists manufactured on a long-term production line with consistent dimensional and quality control used as isolated beams and purlins	21	0.002	Not applicable	1.5†	1.0	1.4*	1.4*	1.6
4.	Other factory-produced beams up to 10ins in depth manufactured on a long-term production line with consistent dimensional and quality control used as isolated beams and purlins	Provided same as used. If not they	the quality in item 3	of control and the same should be	production is the figures can be assessed.	1.0	1.4*	1.4*	1.6

The dead load factor for floors may be reduced to 1.2 and that for roofs to 1.3 if the actual dead load is assessed.

† Except where it has been verified that the top surface had not been trowelled smooth, in which case the partial safety factor for concrete may be 1.0.

Partial Materials (γ _m) Concrete	Safety Steel	Factors Loading Dead Floor	(γ _f) load Roof	Live load
--	--------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------

Partial safety factors				
Materials (γ _m)		Loading (γ _f)		
Concrete	Steel	Dead load		Live
		Floor	Roof	