

Our Ref:- H/129/MK

Your Ref:- APP/22/00837

Havant Borough Council
Development Control
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

7th November 2022

Dear Mr Christie

Land at Cowplain School, Hart Plain Avenue, Waterlooville PO8 8RY

I have been asked by [REDACTED] to submit an objection to the current planning application which proposes:

'Erection of a 64 bed care home (within Use Class C2) and 6No. dwellings (within Use Class C3) with associated works including access, parking and landscaping'.

Proposed 64 Bed Care Home

[REDACTED] It is understood that this currently forms part of the school's playing field. The family's concerns primarily relate to the proposed 64 bed care home element of the proposal.

The site plan does not identify what type of boundary treatment would be erected along the red line boundary with [REDACTED] On 12th August 1988, HCC sold a small triangle of land between the current red line boundary and [REDACTED] An existing fence boundary to No. [REDACTED] is insitu closer to that property, but this does not align with that property's ownership.

Paragraph 6.82 within the Planning Statement states that an existing fence along the eastern boundary will be retained. As this fence is not within the application site, it is not for the applicant's agent to make any comment on this.

Without boundary treatment along the alignment of the application red line on the ground, there would be nothing to prevent trespass onto [REDACTED]

The Travel Plan submitted for the care home inaccurately measures the Plot 1 site at 0.73ha, whereas this is stated on the site plan to be 0.53ha. The Transport Statement also refers to an inaccurate site area for Plot 1.

The proposed site access for the care home site is objectionable. It is located too close to the boundary with [REDACTED]. This is further compounded by having 12 of the 29 car parking spaces arranged in bays abutting the boundary [REDACTED]. There is concern with the noise and disturbance likely to arise from these cars parking close to [REDACTED] with engines starting and doors slamming. Furthermore, visitors and, more so, staff could arrive and depart at all hours of the day, causing noise and disturbance throughout the night-time.

There would be merit in locating the site access away from [REDACTED] as has been previously shown on earlier plans. A previous layout identified parking in front of the care home and the plans should be amended to show this again.

The proposed site access for the care home would result in the loss of an unrestricted part of Hart Plain Avenue used by parents for picking up and dropping off their children at school.

The submitted Noise Assessment fails to assess the impact of the noise likely to arise from the proposed care home use and its activities on the [REDACTED]. Sources of noise disturbance would include cars entering the site and parking in the 12 parking spaces close to [REDACTED] as well as servicing within the site, including weekly refuse and daily grocery delivery vehicles entering and egressing the site, and unloading and bin emptying. The service entrance to the care home would be within its eastern side elevation [REDACTED]. The proposed refuse store would be located on the ground floor, in the north-eastern corner of the building, with its entrance only a few metres away [REDACTED].

It is not clear where any external flues would be sited on the proposed building, to emit smells from the proposed kitchen on the second floor. [REDACTED] is concerned if any flues were to be sited on the eastern elevation [REDACTED].

The Transport Statement refers inaccurately, in paragraph 7.1.5, to the refuse store being to the northwest of the building.

It is understood that Sport England currently object to the loss of playing fields to facilitate the proposed development at Cowplain School and their comments are welcomed.

Proposed 6 Dwellings

[REDACTED] which was previously a tennis court and is currently used as a car park. His concerns primarily relate to the proposed 6 dwelling element of the overall proposal.

The two pairs of semi-detached dwellings appear, within the proposed northern elevation, to have exceedingly high ridge heights, which are higher than those proposed for the flanking detached units. The semi-detached units would therefore appear discordant in the street scene.

The House Type 1 plans show that the westernmost proposed dwelling would have a first-floor bedroom window within its side elevation. There is concern regarding an invasion of privacy resulting from overlooking into this new bedroom from an existing first-floor bedroom window within the side elevation of [REDACTED] and vice-versa. The lack of separation distance between the two properties does not help in this regard. The nearest dwelling should be moved further away from the boundary with [REDACTED] or the bedroom window should be obscure glazed.

The site plan shows that the 6 dwellings would be served by three access points onto a busy main road. A better solution would involve one central access being provided and an internal private drive arrangement inside the site serving the driveways of each of the dwellings.

The provision of new access points would displace parking for parents picking up and dropping off their children, although it is acknowledged there are currently double yellow lines in place.

[REDACTED]

The submitted Noise Assessment is fundamentally flawed as it fails to acknowledge, or measure, the associated noise from the working garage [REDACTED]. One of the six dwellings would have its garden located in very close proximity to the existing garage. It is understood that some of the sources of noise from the garage include engines running and revving and the use of trolley jacks, air guns, hammering, pressure washers and compressors.

The Planning Statement states in paragraph 6.83 that the housing site adjoins to the west [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Other Issues

The application form refers to an overall site area of 0.94ha. This does not reconcile with the two site areas of 0.21 ha and 0.53ha on the site plan.

The Nutrient Balancing Assessment also needs to be amended to reference the Plot 2 site area of 0.21ha, not 0.20ha. The associated Nutrient Budget Calculator has not been published on the Council's website, but this must also be incorrect if it also refers to an incorrect site area of 0.20ha for the Plot 2 site. This must be rectified before any Habitats Regulations Assessment is produced by the Council.

The Planning Statement inaccurately refers to [REDACTED] as a residential dwelling (para 2.2), when there is a clear sign on the road frontage advertising [REDACTED] which is a working garage.

Paragraph 2.3 of the Planning Statement refers to a Plot 1 site area of 0.73ha, which does not reconcile with that shown on the site plan.

Question 6a has not been answered on the submitted CIL Form 1: Additional Information.

It is not clear why elements of the Public Utility Supplies Statement Report have been redacted. This is not at all helpful to the public who wish to read this document.

The applicant needs to respond to satisfy the Lead Local Flood Authority by providing the further information requested in their consultee response.

I would be grateful if you could take on board the above concerns when determining this application. Please also let me know if any amendments are made to the application so that [REDACTED] can have a further opportunity to comment as appropriate.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Michael Knappett