

Comments for Planning Application APP/16/00418

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/16/00418

Address: Land rear of and including The Coal Yard, 178A West Street, Havant, PO9 1LR

Proposal: Outline application for construction of 9 dwellings with access from West Street following demolition of 178a West Street.

Case Officer: Heather Lealan

Customer Details

Name: Mr Gary Offen

Address: 178 West Street Havant

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Although the proposal mentions 2 storey buildings only, I understand that this could change at the next stage of planning. A genuine 2 storey development done sensitively with rooms in the roof, (like the new houses next to the old school house on Bedhampton Road opposite Bedhampton garage) could be acceptable with some slight repositioning/design changes.

However, anything taller than the surrounding trees would significantly change the outlook for all the surrounding properties.

Given the above, I strongly object particularly to the Design/appearance/location of House no. 1/2 and the impact this would have on the rear outlook of properties 178-170 West St. House/plot no.1/2 is very close to the rear of 178-170 West St. No other houses have a building proposed directly at the end of their gardens.

At present these houses 178-170 West St have a pleasant tree filled outlook across garden land towards period conservation area properties beyond. Under the current proposals we would be looking at a large brick wall/large rectangle of roof on the side of a substantial house. (More so if the houses end up more than 2 storeys high).

This is made worse by the current design of House no.1 where the proposed house is considerably wider than the other properties and the orientation of the roof is at a right angle to the other houses. Any side windows would overlook our houses/ gardens. The current design and position of House no.1 could have a severe detrimental impact on our outlook, privacy, daylight and the potential for the rear of 178-170 West St to be overlooked.

Our outlook would be better preserved by a) omitting House 1. or 1+2 b) moving the development north slightly to create a buffer of trees c) making this House a similar size/design/roof orientation to the others.

Drainage/flooding- I can also confirm, as mentioned by a resident in Staunton Rd, that there was indeed a severe problem with the waste water drains on this site approx. 5 years ago leading to

my garden being flooded with sewerage. Southern water did some major work to fix the problem. It is essential that these drains are not disturbed. I also wonder if the drains are sufficient to cope with additional housing? If not, other residents may also find themselves flooded with sewerage. I believe that the drains concerned ran under the proposed plot no. 1/2-another reason to leave these plots as a green space.

Access to and from the site-I am concerned about pedestrian access to the site which doesn't seem to be very clear on the plans. In particular I am concerned about residents using the path directly next to my house as a short cut. At present this is little used except occasionally for a few older gentlemen working on their allotments. The path is very narrow and passes directly past my living/dining room window and kitchen window, and under my daughter's bedroom window. It provides the only access to my front door and from there to my garden. I object to any use of this path by residents/visitors which would represent a considerable decrease in my privacy and potential increase in noise (people coming back from the pub at night etc.) As this path is no longer needed for access is there any way it could be blocked off at the estate end?

There is also the issue of wheelie bins currently stored by the residents of 170-176 West St. behind the car wash office building. Would these be stored in residents' front/ back gardens (if they still have rear access)? A good alternative site might perhaps be under the large apple tree on the western perimeter opposite plot 1. I would object to these being sited next to my wall/fence for obvious reasons of noise, smells etc. or any siting which potentially blocks the entrance to my house/garden.

The Access road runs right by my house which could increase noise, fumes and smells particularly at night and will certainly do so when construction work is under way and heavy plant is rumbling past. As my house is likely to be most affected by this I would hope that the council would do everything possible to help minimise the disruption caused by this eg work to be carried out 9-5 Mon-Fri only

The plan also seems to show rumble strips on the entrance road (which I would object to on noise grounds) I would obviously prefer the road/footpath to be as far away from my house as practicable with some landscaping/bushes as a buffer. Is this possible?

Re. the road junction with West St I would object to any siting which reduced parking on West St. It is hard enough for residents to park outside their houses as it is.

There is also the possibility of cars unable to get on to West St queuing up beside my house when traffic is backed up from the level crossing increasing noise, fumes etc. which I would object to. Perhaps one of those yellow grids would help? Conservation of trees/loss of open space-The site currently contains lots of lovely old trees/hedges which should be kept where poss. eg old apple tree.