

From: Ben Kirk

Sent: 26 April 2016 07:28

To: David Eaves

Subject: APP/16/00312 | Change of use of room above garage to create 1No. 1 bedroom flat. | 9 Nightingale Park, Havant, PO9 2SE

APP/16/00312 | Change of use of room above garage to create 1No. 1 bedroom flat. | 9 Nightingale Park, Havant, PO9 2SE

David

I note that there have been a couple of objections from residents to the above proposal. I just wanted to take the opportunity to respond to a couple of the points made.

The letter received from Mr and Mrs Hutchings states that they have seen no evidence of domestic goods being stored in the property. I must challenge this point. When the original application was made it was noted that the client wished to store his own pre-war MG cars in the garage and the room above was for additional storage for equipment in connection with this and other domestic goods. When I visited some weeks ago to prepare the current application the building was still used for storage of the same and I am sure that you will note this on your site visit.

The objection letter goes on to note the applicants connection with the motor trade. Whilst this is true I must stress that this has no bearing on the application and the number of cars that would be on site. The applicant has a suitable commercial property in Chichester for his commercial motor trade activities and so this has no bearing on the application.

The objection also raises concerns over the number of parking spaces however both the response from Highways and the traffic team are satisfied that adequate parking can be accommodated on site and a suitable worded condition can be applied to any consent. I would also draw your attention to the fact that an application has been made to SSE street lighting to relocate the lamp post that is in the middle of the driveway, this is a clear sign that the applicant has firm intentions to address the parking to ensure suitable provision on site and not in the road is made.

The building is capable of conversion. It is correct that the building was not built as a dwelling and so some works will be required, it was never the intention to create a dwelling here but the applicants situation has changed in recent times. Nonetheless the building can be made capable of complying with the current regulations.

With regards to the point made about condition 4 imposed on the previous consent to construct the room over. This condition is noted but this only precludes conversion to residential without planning consent. Hence the application now being made. It does not, as you know, preclude such an application being made and being assessed on its planning merits at the time.

Turning to the letter of representation from Mr and Mrs Hall. I note the point regarding the covenants but would point out that this is a legal matter and not a planning matter.

Issues regarding the parking are the same as noted above and these have similarly been addressed.

Finally with regards to overlooking. The approved room over allowed for two dormer windows, whilst the permission was for storage it was nonetheless a valid planning consideration to assess overlooking and neighbour amenity at the time. Given this was acceptable then I see no reason why

it would not be acceptable now. The only other fenestration proposed is the roof light to the rear and this is at high level so as not to create overlooking.

I would ask that you take these points in to account when making your assessment. If you have any comments or queries please let me know.

Regards

Ben Kirk