

17 Wellesley Close
Waterlooville
Hants
26 June 2024

Planning Services
Civic Offices
HAVANT
PO9 2AX
F.A.O. Ms A Miszewska

Dear Ms Miszewska,

PLANNING APPLICATION APP/24/00246
UNIT 1, VICTORIA ROAD WATERLOOVILLE PO77ET

References (All associated with the Planning Application)

- A. EXISTING ELEVATIONS 1A VICTORIA ROAD -19166949;
- B. PROPOSED ELEVATIONS -11916948;
- C. TRANSPORT STATEMENT-1926794;
- D. CONSULTEE RESPONSE HCC Reference 053502 dated 19 June 2024.

We have the following comments, objections and suggestions for change with regard to the Reference Planning Application:

1. Introduction.

- a) From Victorian times Victoria and Albert Roads were residential. The Victoria Road housing was demolished prior to 1980 and replaced with a vehicle repair business. Sometime before 2000 the wooden structure was destroyed by fire and replaced by the building which remains today. The Albert Road Properties were demolished to make way for the current car park.
- b) The activities on the current garage site have over the years been deleterious to the residential neighbours.
- c) The conversion back to residential is welcomed with significant caveats.

2. General comments.

- a) Although the principle of the reversion back to residential is supported, it is considered that the proposal has significant shortcomings with regard to the overall design and certain assumptions.
- b) Overall. It is considered that the proposed design is significantly oversized for this location.

3. Objections.

- a) Effect on daylight, privacy and outlook: With reference to submitted drawings (Reference A and B) the proposed building height of 4 floors at 13 metres

appears to be well over 2 times the height of the current building. Photograph 1 shows the view from 17 Wellesley Close. Note: there are no windows in the South elevation. The bottom of the picture is 3.5 meters above ground level. It can be seen that the proposed building would dominate the skyline. Because of the topography, the top 2 floors would totally overlook the sitting out areas of the private gardens, which are within 35 metres, and would block the daylight to the flats above, inter alia, Waterlooville Beds. It is considered that the proposed building should be at least 2 floors lower to be acceptable in this location.



Photograph 1: View of current building from 17 Wellesley Close.

- b) Development Plan Policy- Lack of parking provision: Reference C acknowledges that the paucity of parking spaces is contrary to HBC guidelines.
- c) Reliance on Bicycles and Buses: Although bicycle and bus use is to be applauded some assumptions in Reference C are questionable. Paragraph 3.21 states that it only takes 15 minutes to cycle the 3 miles plus to Bedhampton Railway station. Paragraph 3.16 Fig 5, taken from Google maps, shows the National Cycle Way 222. It is of particular note that, in actuality, this route is not continuous and requires dismounting to avoid dangerous interaction with motor transport. Reference D does not support this rail service for residents. Reference C also fails to mention that Bedhampton is only for slow trains and that there are no direct bus services. A significant bone of contention previously raised by Councillors and the travelling public with the Stagecoach bus company is the fact that the regular number 39 bus to Havant

Bus Station takes on average 45 minutes to travel a mind numbingly tortuous route to cover what could be achieved in 15 minutes. The 37 Bus is faster but it only runs once an hour. Stagecoach have chosen to ignore suggestions that a half hourly express service between Waterlooville and Havant would be welcomed. Bearing in mind that Havant has the Borough Council offices, the main line train services for SWR and Southern, and the main leisure centre. The 1st Bus routes 7 and 8 into Portsmouth are significantly superior.

4. Observations:

- a) Errors in Reference D: Paragraph 3.10 states: “On both sides of the carriageway along Rockville Drive from the Forest End Roundabout there are 2m wide footpaths. The northern footway terminates at the Rockville Drive roundabout, with pedestrians required to cross onto the southern footway to continue their journeys. To facilitate this movement, a pedestrian refuge island complete with tactile paving is provided, enabling a safe and continuous road in the area for all non-motorised site users”. It is considered that photograph 1 at the Reference is misleading as it shows the clear view looking North East while ignoring the view to the South West as shown in Photographs 2 and 3 below. Photograph 4 is the view to the South West taken from the pedestrian refuge island. Notwithstanding the overgrown bush along the footpath, the curvature of the road causes a constrained line of sight toward the blind bend these photographs clearly illustrate the point that it may not be as safe as Reference D suggests.



Photograph 2: Rockville Drive - View to the South West from the Northern tactile pavement.



Photograph 3: Rockville Drive - View to the South West from the Northern tactile pavement.



Photograph 2: Rockville Drive - View from the pedestrian refuge island showing the blind bend.

- b) Environmental issues (Net Zero): Local Plan (Core Strategy) CS14 promotes the efficient use of resources through the use of renewable energy, efficient building design and sustainable construction. The Outline Planning Application makes no mention of the energy source for heating and hot water it is understood that it would be all electric. As stated above, It is considered that the design is at least 2 storeys too high to be acceptable. If it was lower with a pitched roof it would be ideal for mounting solar panels as the roof would face South without any shading.
- c) Design shortcomings: It would appear that to maximise a return on investment a number of features have been factored in: The apartment layouts show very little storage space and there is no provision for basement storage which is commonplace in Germany. The provision of bicycle storage inside apartments is considered to be bizarre. Bicycles would have to be manoeuvred through communal areas, in and out of lifts and in and out of tight spaces in apartments all without causing damage. It would also appear that the bicycles parked in the apartments could impede the movement of anybody with restricted mobility.

5. Recommendations:

- a) It is acknowledged that the sewer alignment precludes any East-West expansion of the footprint which would have allowed a lower building with similar capacity. This has forced a design of unacceptable enormity.
- b) It is considered that a row of terraced houses would be suitable. They could be built to high environmental standards complete with installed microgeneration equipment.
- c) Of note: In the 1980s Albert Road consisted of a row of terraced houses, like those remaining on Stakes Hill Road. Albert Road was demolished to make way for the car park.

6. Summary:

- a) The reversion of the site back to residential is supported;
- b) The proposed building height is at least 2 storeys too high and would dominate the skyline and cause an invasion of privacy to a totally unacceptable extent;
- c) 7 car parking spaces is well below the recommended level;
- d) Some of the assertions made in the Transport Statement (Reference D) are considered to be questionable and skewed in favour of the proposal;
- e) There is no attempt made to provide any micro generation system (solar panels) on what could be a large roof structure;
- f) A number of aspects of the design do not stand up to scrutiny.

Yours sincerely,

RA and AJ Edwards