



13 May 2023

Ms. L Wells
Planning Services
Havant Borough Council
Public Services Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hants
PO9 2AX

Dear Ms. Wells

Ref : APP/23/00112 Plan revision - Dale Lodge. 172 The Dale. Widley, Hampshire
PO7 5JE

Thank you for allowing further comment on the re-submitted application changes, please see the below details of our concerns;

Sewer, standing water and drainage

The possibility of a connection to a public existing sewer is yet to be confirmed (Southern Water ref:DSA000021889). If this connection were not possible, a septic tank arrangement would be the only other option. use of septic tank that will discharge into a soil that is incapable of absorbing the treated effluent and as such may pass on to the adjoining properties during periods of moderate to heavy rainfall. Surely a septic tank arrangement would also not permit the proposed mitigation for the category of a Nutrient Neutral development, as stated on the European Site Avoidance and Mitigation checklist.

There has been no comment from any party about the current issue of standing water and already flooding gardens and land in the area, despite many letters clearly stating this as an issue, which has then been further supported by proposed evidence that this issue was raised in other planning applications made for the local school.

Note the comment from Southern Water stating, 'The Councils Building Control or technical staff should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development' (their reference DSA000021889). No comments have been passed from the Council team. Removal of any existing trees and bushes will worsen an already difficult situation regarding standing water and drainage.

Proposed site layout, access and services (including Emergency services)

Current access to the property from the corner of The Thicket is an already dangerous corner, especially when school children are being dropped off or collected. A point that has been made regarding the addition of new double yellow lines. Site_layout_plan-174437 bins and recycle waste to be collected from Widley Gardens where section 5.24 of the Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document states that this must be 'the adopted highway' that serves the property, so is this adopted highway to now be the new address for the property? Although the new proposal for HFSR is to now access from the Widley Gardens, the access track entering from the corner of The Thicket still remains an unsuitable access for any other emergency services and any HGV traffic for the proposed construction. I refer you to your own document Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, section 5.32 'A private road serving five dwellings or less must take account of the servicing requirements of refuse collection and emergency vehicles'.

There is no safe 'drop-off' area suitable to serve a construction project with insufficient access and within a heavily used road network around the entrance. Not a suitable access for vehicles up to 32 tone (heavy-side construction traffic such as cement mixers). Insufficient retaining wall to the side of the track. Insufficient access and no turning ability as detailed in several consultation documents.

It also does not appear that the proposed development meets the criteria for development stated in the Building regulations Part M – Approach routes parts 1.3 and 1.6 part 'd'.

Increased use of the access track will serve for faster degradation of the surface and may cause issues with surrounding properties.

Following the details from The Havant Borough Council's 'Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, it appears that this planning proposal does not follow in the spirit of the Council's own guidance, in particular;

- 5.25 - 'many of these sites are situated amongst existing neighbours and can create an adverse impact. Development of backland and infill sites should not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties'. Clearly this proposed development does have an adverse impact on many neighbouring properties.
- 5.27 - 'Due to the problems of overlooking, noise and traffic disturbance, loss of amenity, cramping and the adverse impact on local character, successful tandem schemes are difficult to deliver successfully'. It does not appear this development could be delivered successfully without major changes to the living environment and the community.

- 5.29 - 'Combined, rear gardens and their landscape provide an attractive streetscene and backdrop to dwellings. This is part of the character of an area, which can be lost through backland development. Therefore, in these instances, backland development should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances'. The 'exceptional circumstances' of this proposed development has not been identified or communicated.

Figure 5.8 - 'Backland development should not have a negative effect on existing character and therefore should avoid development on cumulative rear gardens'. Hopefully, no comment needed to embellish further on this point.

- 5.31 - 'Routes should usually have a minimum separation distance of 3 metres from the edge of the access road to the edge of the nearest affected house, together with the appropriate boundary treatment to screen the access road from dwellings. In some instances, for example where habitable rooms and windows are closest to the access, this minimum separation distance may need to be greater'. The current access routes do not meet this criteria.

Whilst I appreciate that you have secured further information to gain some clarity on a couple of points within many original objections, none of the new submissions or documentation tackles the majority of the concerns points made by the local community. This rather feels like the council is not concerned by the objections from the community that it serves.

One final point, planning has already previously been declined at this property.

Yours sincerely

