

Karen Wooden

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2013 18:43
To: Planning and Development Shared Mailbox
Cc: Havant Auto-Reply
Subject: APP/13/00064 lodge road

WE have been part of the joint pre application consultation with nearby residents coordinated by Mr R Tait at no 28.

WE are in agreement with all the points he has raised and wish to object to the proposal based upon the issues

contained in his letter dated 26 March 2013 ..

Liz and John Bowles

20 Lodge Road

Reference: PLAN18535E

Planning proposals online comment form

Name*

Mr Robert Hogg

Address*

22,Lodge Road
Old Bedhampton
Havant

Post Code*

Po9 3ll

Your telephone number

Your email address

Planning application ref. no. eg
05/1234/00

app/13/00064

Application site address

28,Lodge Road
Old Bedhampton
Havant

Applicant's name

Why you think permission should
or should not be given

I have been part of the joint pre application consultation with nearby residents coordinated by Mr R Tate at number 24, Lodge Road. I am in agreement with all the points he has raised and wish to object to the proposal based upon the issues contained in his letter dated 26th March 2013.

Reference: PLAN18536E

Planning proposals online comment form

Name*

Ronald Tate

Address*

24 Lodge Road
Havant

Post Code*

PO9 3LL

Your telephone number

Your email address

Planning application ref. no. eg
05/1234/00

13/00064

Application site address

28 Lodge Road
Havant
PO9 3LL

Applicant's name

G Maklin

Why you think permission should
or should not be given

24 Lodge Road, Havant, Hampshire. PO9 3LL.
[REDACTED]

FAO Mrs Heather Lealan Planning Service Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX. 26th March 2013.

Dear Mrs Lealan,

Development at 28 Lodge Road, Bedhampton, PO9 3LL.

You will know from my letters dated 25th October 2012, 4th January 2013 and 4th February addressed to and telephone conversations with Mr Greg Emerson that I act for my wife and residents at numbers 20, 22, 26, 25 and 27 who have been in pre-application discussions with this developer. With these letters I have sent copies of the correspondence and associated drawings.

You will know from this that, notwithstanding the narrowness of the frontage to 28, which is the smallest in the road, we accept, in principle, that the existing house might be demolished and that a bungalow might be sited to the rear of the site. This is provided that conditions prevent further development of the bungalow that might detrimentally impact upon the amenity of number 26.

We are aware that the present house has structural problems that have resulted in an insurance claim. The developer has suggested that the quantity of development proposed is the only viable solution. We question this.

We have not seen any viability assessment nor is there one with the application. If the development case is based upon this premise, we would expect an 'open-book' analysis for scrutiny. This would reveal the insurance settlement based upon a structural report and QS assessment. If the property is under insured, the value of the existing house will simply fall to a point where this meets the value of the insurance settlement. We appreciate that the executors have a duty to try to maximise the value of the estate but an over development of the property is not a basis for sound town planning.

Turning to the application itself, the comments below are not arranged in order of significance. They simply work through the issues that arise.

The application form has errors in Question 6. There is a proposed alteration to the vehicle access. It is being widened across the whole frontage. A new pedestrian access is also being created at the rear.

The materials indicate tarmac for the driveways. This raises concerns over permeability and surface water run off for such a combined extensive area. There have been recent flooding incidents in neighbouring properties even with block paviers in use.

The six existing car spaces referred to are mostly in tandem and consequently, even if they were all used, their traffic generation impact would be significantly different from that with the proposed combined 8-bedroomed three dwelling development. Not only will the development triple the existing traffic generation from the residents of the three dwellings but also from the visitors and deliveries to them. The highways officer, Tracey Ford, has noted that the one garage proposed for plot 2 is too small and this effectively means that, contrary to the plans, there is no visitor space within the site.

The bungalow no longer has a garage proposed. This will reduce the potential for visitor parking here since it will now be needed for turning space. Parking and manoeuvring for plot 1 is immediately in front of buildings 1 and 2, which detrimentally affects the amenities of both dwellings and the visual appearance of the frontage to the development. No other houses in the road have this type of configuration. This arrangement is out of character with the area.

Whilst the number of spaces may technically still meet the required standard, the arrangement of them represents a very poor standard of development. Any development that does not provide garaging is out of character with the road where every property has at least one garage. Some have two.

Based upon the guidance in "Manual for Streets" the turning area outside the site is sub standard. It is not, as claimed in the Design and Access Statement (DAS), "a generous turning circle". Refuse vehicles and other regular delivery vehicles reverse along the road. HGVs have damaged gateposts at numbers 22 and 24 and depressed kerbs and pavements leading to flooding at 24. Visitors to the 6 other properties here rely upon parking along the two stretches of pavement within the turning area. Any additional visitor/delivery needs 'overspill' into the rest of the road. 3 additional dwellings will add 50% to this demand.

The highways officer has indicated in a telephone conversation that if you were minded to approve the proposal that she would seek a Section 106 Agreement to meet the cost of a Traffic Regulation Order should it be needed. This suggests that this issue could be serious. Yellow lines would not only be visually detrimental to the semi rural character of the road but it would also displace this street parking to other parts of the road thereby inconveniencing residents there. Again, this is the wrong starting point for the proposed development to be introduced into the road.

One minor issue related to traffic generation is the potential conflict that already exists at the end of the adjacent alleyway where emerging pedestrians and cyclists have no mutual sight line with any emerging vehicles from the property. Stripping back a section of hedging here could improve the situation but it will increase the likelihood of exposure and visual intrusion into the street scene of the dominant bin storage area.

Almost all of the existing properties do not store bins at the front of their dwellings.

The conversation with Ms Ford identified that, whatever proposal might ultimately be approved, there is a need for planning conditions to control the construction management. We agree and this should not only include restrictions on working hours but methods of material delivery and the parking of workers and tradesmen's vehicles.

The DAS confirms that the proposal is for "sustainable family housing". This is inconsistent with earlier suggestions from the developer that the housing was aimed at the elderly. Looking at Ms Ford's comments, this may still be the case but the developer's letter referred to by her is not on the web site. We agree with her that occupation cannot be controlled. Indeed, even if it could, the traffic generation from retired households in the road is significant and could result in more movements than working households.

The developer claims in the DAS that "there will be only a small increase in vehicular activity" but has failed to demonstrate this. There is no highway and transport assessment to accompany the application.

The content of Design Statement raises serious concerns about whether the architect has ever visited the site and appreciates the true nature of the context. It shows a distinct lack of local knowledge. It refers to a "generous turning circle" which is not true and "cycle path". The footpath has a cycle prohibition order on it. It then describes the road as having, "semi-detached Council/ex-Council housing of various styles." None of the properties have ever been council owned and all the semis are of a very similar style and character with only small changes in detailing e.g. replacement windows.

The Statement suggests that, "There is no one dominant style." Whilst this may be true of the nearby houses, shown in the photographs: this is not true of the road as a whole where the number of semis present predominates. This is significant because it is this element that the design attempts to replicate. However, it fails significantly.

Photograph 3 shows the expansive nature of the existing semis. A combined wide centre section is flanked by porches and is capped by a long ridge leading to suitably proportioned hipped ends. Set back at the sides is further ground floor widening under long sloping roofs. This gives a combined frontage of each pair that is 14.6m wide and an overall width of 18.0m. The proposal is for a frontage of 11.7m and overall width of 14.1m. This will be thus 20% smaller than the existing stock and it results in a roof design that is pinched and mean with a short ridge that limits the massing and visual impact of the building. It does not reflect the "style and proportion" of the other semis.

The location of the site at the head of the cul-de-sac facing down the road requires a building of some presence. Despite the narrow frontage to the site, the present house, although bland, demonstrates how this massing can be achieved. The proposal will be a retrograde step. The design does not "fit in well". It fails to provide an appropriate closing feature to contribute significantly to the required street scene.

The DAS is again wrong in that the buildings have not "been sited to accord with the Havant Borough Council's Design Guidance criteria with regard to garden size." Paragraph 5.13 of the Design Guide indicates a 10m rear/private amenity space. Plot 1 falls well short of this and this is even more critical given the presence of and exposure to the public footpath at the rear.

The orientation and siting of the semis in relation to number 27 will result in much more than "minimal overlooking of adjacent properties". The siting of Plot 1 on the western boundary of the site moves the development considerably closer to number 27 where it will have a significant detrimental visual intrusion and impact upon the outlook from the main living room and bedroom of this property.

The overall impression of the DAS is that, at best, it is incompetent and error strewn. At worst, it might be considered that it is unprofessional and

seeks to deceive the reader by misrepresenting the present situation, the policy guidance and the proposals themselves.

We believe that any of the above shortcomings might be enough to justify the refusal of the proposals. However, taken as a whole the cumulative impact of them certainly does so.

The proposals are over development of this restricted plot located in a critical position where the impact upon neighbouring properties will be detrimental to their amenities, will result in an unacceptable increase in traffic generation and represent a design solution that is inappropriate, out of character and detrimental to the street scene

Yours sincerely,

R Tate.

57 Brodrick Road, London, SW17 7DX

For the attention of Mrs H Lealan
The Planning Service
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX



26th March 2013

Dear Mrs Lealan,

Planning Application – APP/13/00064

My family have lived in this house since my parents built it in 1952. It was a post-war build with considerable constraints on design and materials. Despite my affection for my long-term family home it now has insurmountable issues. There is subsidence both on the front of the house and the back. There are also serious structural issues inside, some relating to original structural omissions, with inadequate main supporting beams, and considerable damp issues which my father never managed to solve over the 59 years he lived in it. Thus the cost to repair these problems to an acceptable standard is not feasible. The house was always an ugly house and very different to the other architecture in the road, and as it has aged has become an eye sore. Thus the consideration to redevelop the plot.

In long discussions with the potential developer, Derek Warwick Developments, I have striven to encourage them to design buildings that are sympathetic to the local architecture both in terms of appearance and materials. I have been very concerned to develop this site in such a way as to be acceptable to the neighbours, many of whom I have known for very many years. The garden is much larger than other gardens in the locality (apart from no 13 Lodge Road) and lends itself to a single storey bungalow on the back, leaving each plot with a proportionate sized garden. Attention has been given to making sure that there is no overlook into neighbouring properties, and that there is adequate parking within the boundary of the development for 2 cars per house. Derek Warwick Developments is a well-established company that specialises in small developments of high end houses such as would be suitable on this site. The houses are all designed to be houses for life. I have looked at several properties built by Derek Warwick Developments and am impressed by the exceptional quality of the design and of the building work itself. Great efforts have been made to design these houses in keeping with the local street view, and the property at the back would not be visible from the street at all. I have talked to neighbours who do not have concerns about the idea of having a single storey property on the back. Consideration has been given to a single property on the front but unfortunately this would not be economically viable, so the semi-detached properties on the front, in keeping with others locally, and with a very similar footprint to what is here at the moment, appears to be the only way to resolve this. Attention has been given to making sure that access and egress can be forwards. I have discussed landscaping with the developer, and this has been very well done in the other properties of theirs that I have seen, so I am assured that this would be carefully done on this site too.

I do hope that you will be able to approve this proposal.

[Redacted signature block]

28 Lodge Road, Havant, Hants, PO9 3LL

For the attention of **Mrs H Lealan**
The Planning Service
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX



26th March 2013

Dear Mrs Lealan,

Comment on Planning Application – APP/13/00064

It is my opinion that the proposed development will certainly have no negative affect to the amenity of Lodge Road. It has been carefully designed to ensure that none of the neighbours will suffer loss of a pleasant outlook. The design has made use of the natural lie of the land together with existing trees and fences to ensure that there is no increase in the overlooking of adjacent houses and gardens. There is neither any loss of light nor other intrusion that would have an adverse effect on neighbouring houses and gardens. Furthermore, careful consideration has been made to accommodate the vehicles that will be associated with the new houses with provision of forward access and egress. This would be a distinct improvement compared with the existing house on this site and, indeed, compared with all of the other existing houses in the street.

The house that currently stands on this land is suffering from severe subsidence and it also has a number of serious latent building defects. It is beyond economic repair. It is a rather large and unsightly building in need of significant updating, and its demolition and replacement is the only economically viable proposition. This opportunity to remove the existing house and redevelop the land with the proposed buildings will be a distinct and sympathetic improvement to the street scene, and it will contribute strongly to the attractiveness, value and amenity of the upper end of Lodge Road. It is not a back land development proposal, rather it is a proposal to demolish and then redevelop the land in its entirety.

This is a considerate and sympathetic development proposal and I commend it to the planning officers and to the members of the planning committee. I hope that the development will be permitted.

Yours sincerely,



Graham Grieve

[REDACTED]

Sent: 26 March 2013 16:40
To: Planning and Development Shared Mailbox
Cc: Havant Auto-Reply
Subject: App/13/0064 dev at 28 lodge rd

For the attention of mrs Heather Lealan

Have been in conversation with other residents of lodge rd, and wish to object to this development application. The traffic and parking in this road is already a problem and this development would significantly worsen the problem both temporarily with builders vehicle access and permanently with overspill parking from the proposed development, this effect will knock on down the length of the road.

I also wish to say that I am fully in agreement with the points raised by Ron Tate at number 24 in his letter dated today 26 th march

Yours sincerely
Dr mike smithard
21 lodge rd

Sent from my iPad

APP/13/00064

26 Lodge Road
BEDHAMPTON
Hampshire
PO9 3LL

Dear Mrs Lealan,

I am writing
to say I agree
with everything in
the letter written
by Ron Tate on
26/3/13.

yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

[REDACTED]

Sent: 27 March 2013 17:38
To: Representations
Cc: Planning and Development Shared Mailbox
Subject: App. No. 13/00064

OBJECTION

Dear Sir or Madam,

I refer to the proposed development of 28, Lodge Road, Bedhampton, PO9 3LL.

I act for my wife and the resident at No. 12, Lodge Road in objecting to the proposed development at 28, Lodge Road – App. No. 13/00064, in the strongest possible terms.

Whilst I/we have not been in pre-application discussions with nearby residents co-ordinated by Mr. R. Tate, of number 24, Lodge Road, I/we have been fully appraised of the situation through recent discussions and your website/Mrs. Lealan.

I/we are in full agreement with all the points raised in Mr. Tate's letter dated 26th. March 2013 and wish to object to the proposal based upon the issues contained therein.

I/we are concerned over the apparent lack of attention to detail, by HBC, before going public with this proposal. For instance, HBC should have been aware that cycling along the link passage, connecting Lodge Road with Bedhampton Hill Road, is forbidden. Also on the subject of safety, is the fact that the danger to any pedestrian emerging, from the link passage into Lodge Road, would be greatly increased if this development were allowed to proceed. The removal of hedges etc. would not serve to alleviate the danger to the blind or partially sighted.

Yours sincerely,

David R. West.
14, Lodge Road,
Bedhampton. PO9 3LL

[REDACTED]

Sent: 26 March 2013 17:31
To: Planning and Development Shared Mailbox
Cc: Havant Auto-Reply
Subject: RefAPP/13/00064

Dear Mrs.H.lealan

We have been part of the joint pre application consultation with nearby residents coordinated by Mr.R.Tate at number 24 Lodge Road.We are in agreement with all the points he has raised and wish to object to the proposal based upon the issues contained in his letter dated 26th March 2013.We have discussed at length the implications and effects it will have on our lives, my husband is [REDACTED] mobility scooter due to the increased parking which will only be increased by the application that is being made. Yours sincerely Mr and Mrs G.Munden