

The Planning Inspectorate
3/10a Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Our ref: 091/P/157.02/KG
Your ref: APP/X1735/A/13/2198520
LPA ref: APP/12/00969
3rd September 2013

Dear Mr Neale,

RE: PLANNING APPEAL COMMENTS - IN RESPECT OF THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING 2 BED DETACHED BUNGALOW AND GARAGE. CONSTRUCTION OF 1NO. PAIR OF 3 BED SEMI DETACHED CHALET BUNGALOWS WITH INTEGRAL GARAGES AND ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. (REVISED APPLICATION.) AT 1 THE THICKET, WIDLEY, HANTS, PO7 5JL

1.0 I refer to the above together with your letter dated 14th August 2013 which included Havant Borough Councils Planning Statement.

McAndrew Martin acting as agents on behalf of the Appellant wish to take this opportunity to make the following comments

2.0 For ease of reference I will deal with each point as noted in Havant Borough Councils Statement APP/12/00969.

3.0 Section 6.1

The main issues considered by the Local Planning Authority are:

- (i) Impact upon visual amenities and character of the area
- (ii) Nature of the development and impact of any future occupiers

4.0 (i) Impact on visual amenities and the character of the area

6.4 states the development would result in a dense form with limited amenity space or open space with unsatisfactory plot sizes and a cramped congested layout.

Cont'd

The proposed plot sizes are similar to adjacent properties:

No. 3 – 394m² – garden area 185m²

No. 5 – 391m² – garden area 188m²

Plot 1 – 330m² – garden area 166m²

Plot 2 – 360m² – garden area 198m²

The above data / comparisons do not support the Local Planning Authorities contention, indeed the dimensions of the plots and proposed areas to be provided clearly demonstrate the proposed plots are both similar and by today's standards generous in proportion.

Indeed the Planning Officer gave formal support to the agreed scheme and raised no objections prior to submission.

The application had Officer support right up to and until the committee meeting whereby the professional opinion of the Planning Officer was overruled.

(ii) Nature of the development and impact of any future occupiers

6.5 states plot 1 is triangular in shape; however, it has a depth of 17.3m and also benefits from a Westerly garden area of land extending to 13.5m in width which when enclosed by appropriate fencing would provide an area of enclosed private garden in excess of the existing garden area to Nos. 3 and 5 The Thicket.

It is noted that the Local Planning Authorities design guide to acceptable rear garden depths state 10.0m as being acceptable for new residential developments.

As alluded to by the Chairman of the Development Committee at the review meeting, the existing plot is in effect under developed and clearly has the potential for further development.

This particular point was addressed under 7.12 and 7.13 of the Planning Officers Report to the planning committee and states "on balance it is considered that whilst Plot 1 has a small amount of garden area it will not be unacceptable in regard to the amenities of any future occupants due to the private nature of the plot itself".

5.0 Section 8.0 – Conclusion

It is evident from reading the Planning Officers Report to committee that there was a recommendation for approval which was clearly changed at the last minute and has resulted in both confused and ill thought reasons for refusal which do not stand up when scrutinized under the Local Planning Authorities own development standards and recommendations.

Cont'd

I trust you will find the above comments to be helpful in this appeal, however you have any concerns or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely
For and on behalf of McAndrew Martin

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'WIC McAndrew', with a stylized flourish at the end.

WIC McAndrew BSc FRICS ICIOB
Director