

Planning application APP/25/00229 which seeks to regularise that

1. the boat stores have been built to a higher height than provided for under the approved planning permission. *Although it was clearly the intention of the developer to build these higher than approved we do not object to this retrospective regularisation of the consent.*
2. the office building has been built to a higher height than provided for under the approved planning permission. *Again, the increase in height appears to have been intentional but we are not objecting to this retrospective regularisation of the consent.*
3. The office building was approved for the purposes of the Even Keel Project, this application seeks to change to a marine related use. *We object to this change for the reasons given below. The application is unclear, marine related use could be anything, not just office use.*
4. The boat stores approved are only to be used for purposes incidental to the use of the approved dwellings, as per condition 4 (APP/13/00317) of the planning permission dated 27 November 2015. *We object to this change for the reasons given below. The dwellings have not been allowed to make use of the boat sheds as intended by the original planning permission. There is no evidence to support this change, and no effort has been made to encourage residents of the dwellings to make use of the boat sheds in fact quite the opposite as detailed below. There are many negative consequences which would follow a change of use.*


We have added to and adapted a current objection by a neighbour.

Point 3

If the change of use was for any leisure marine charity we would have no objection as this is in line with the original approval, or marine related office use. The planning statement is ambiguous, and very wide, it does not restrict the change of use to a marine related office use but refers to **any marine related use which could be unsuitable in a residential environment** – it could be any kind of commercial use or sales. We therefore object to the proposed change as currently worded.

The current traffic in and out of the present 'office use buildings is plenty for the 'luxury' plot these houses sit on.

Point 4

The planning statement that accompanies the application doesn't clarify the intended use of the boat store lock ups in the detached boat store. The additional document which requests and provides confirmation from the agent regarding the use of the boat stores states 'The use would not be incidental to the approved dwellings. The buildings would be used separately for marine-related commercial use. End users do not know at the time of writing.'

Our objection against this change is for the following reasons:

1. The current large luxury houses sit on a small plot and the property was sold in by the marketing team to include a pontoon space for a boat. That was the beauty of the property being on the waterfront and part of the draw to live there. The pontoon space did not get built and the allocation of the boat sheds to each property was assigned with a request for an extra fee to owners and tenants. We objected to the fee and subsequently was not given boat space as promised on or off the water, being told this was for property OWNERS only
2. Planning was for a luxury gated housing community with an elevated charge in rent and a view to purchase. I quote the recent sales documents by Marco Harris Ltd...
An exclusive gated waterside development, that is located in the serene northern enclave of Hayling Island Offering unparalleled views of the tidal Mill Rythe, part of the stunning Chichester Harbour. This prestigious newly built detached home is perfectly situated for those seeking a tranquil retreat away from the hustle and bustle of city life, providing an idyllic setting to unwind and

relax. Constructed in 2020/2021 by a reputable home construction company known for high-end accommodations, Yachthaven represents the pinnacle of luxury living.

3. The unsold and unrented properties was subsequently used for Air BNB guest and a manager was bought in to sell this prospect, who also lived on site, moving around empty properties. Subsequently the properties became party houses most weekends with no consideration for our *'idyllic setting to unwind and relax'*. Even though negotiations for discounted rent with a view to purchase the property, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] excessive visitors, vehicles, party noise and guest videoing neighbouring properties. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] My point is, with an unknown, clear change of planning and knowing the landlord / owner really pays no respect to the property owner, all of the above and more could escalate out of control very quickly, compromising all tenants and neighbours along the creek front.

Below is a copy and paste of neighbouring concerns which equally we agree with

1. Condition 4 (APP/13/00317) provides the following reason for the condition : In the interests of clarity, to prevent the occurrence of unplanned residential development in the countryside and to control the amount of activity in this environmentally sensitive location, in order to protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with NPPF, the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy). The proposed change of use **will mean that there is no control on the amount of activity in this environmentally sensitive location**. The activity will not be from residents of the dwellings but from uncontrolled third parties.
2. Only one dwelling has been sold to date. Other sales have fallen through, and potential purchasers have not proceeded (despite being in solicitors hands) because they have not been allowed to include a boat store lock up in their offer to purchase a dwelling. This is completely against the aim of the original planning permission as approved under application APP/13/00317. Having a boat store lock up and direct access to the slipway is one of the reasons why the properties are attractive. The residents are very likely to engage in marine leisure activities such as kayaking, paddle boarding, windsurfing and dinghy sailing, the same as other residents along the creek. Where are they going to store such items if no boat store? Two of the resident houses currently engage in marine leisure activities and use the slipway. One of these houses has nowhere to store such equipment.
3. The result of the houses not being sold or appropriately marketed is a transient population. The current occupiers are a mixture of 1 owner, 3 tenancies and two houses used for Airbnb. This is already not as envisaged by the original planning permission. If the change of use is allowed so the boat house use is not incidental to the dwellings, it will be much harder to sell the houses, leading to an increased transient population as the existing leaseholders leave - negatively impacted by the Airbnb's. The houses are purposely **not** marketed for sale on the basis of each having the use of 1 boathouse lock up included in the purchase.

General comments

The development of Yacht Haven has included many breaches of the original planning consent, some have been noted and acted against but much has been allowed to happen. *What is the point of planning if this carries on or if the original uses that were welcomed and for which permission was granted are now changed?* The breaches of the permission include but are not limited to:

- The areas to the front of the detached boat house office building are covered in tarmac, not garden or grassed areas as per the Proposed site layout under application APP/13/00317. These areas are now shown as tarmac on the Site plan attached to the current application.
- Many trees were felled prior to commencement of the development particularly along the access route and boundaries despite the tree preservation orders.
- The coastal Meadow has not been created in accordance with the submitted plans to the original application, neither has the conservation grassland.
- Condition 28 (APP/13/00317) provides 'The soil levels within the root spread of trees / hedgerows to be retained shall not be raised or lowered.' The soil level to the conservation grassland has been increased in height by over 1m, resulting in a significant difference in level to the adjoining property. Many trees were felled to avoid to allow the change in level and improve the views. This has resulted in run off water from the conservation grassland filling the land drains of the adjoining properties and leaving behind stagnant water in

the ditch created by the difference in level. No land drain to discharge the run off water into the sea was provided for in the build up of the conservation grassland.

We trust that you will take our comments into account and that permission will not be granted for the changes of use. Such a change of use would materially impact the dwellings, the estate and it's character.