



Mrs T Pickup
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

Planning Application Ref: APP/21/01041

I most strongly object to the above application for the following reasons:

The developers previous planning application was refused on several grounds, one being (Refusal para 1) – “the development would fail to respect building lines and depths”. Refusal para 2 states “adjacent to existing residential property, would have an overbearing and dominant effect, harmful to neighbours from loss of outlook, overshadowing and loss of privacy. The noise and disturbance from increased activity associated with comings and goings would be intrusive and harmful to the quiet enjoyment of neighbour’s amenity.

It is important to bear these points in mind when reading my objections to the latest application detailed below:

1. Siting / Position

The residential dwellings along this part of Padnell Road (North and South) all have large private and quiet rear gardens with all homes being set to the front of the plots to maintain this characteristic amenity of peace and quiet. The proposed sighting of Plots 3 & 4 to the rear of the plot will have a severe impact on the character of the area much to the detriment of the neighbours in the fact that it will introduce a new level of activity into what is currently a quiet and dark back garden area in the form of vehicle noise, additional non-natural light from vehicles and dwellings and pedestrian noise from the comings and goings of any future potential residents. In addition, social activities in the form of parties, BBQs and gatherings are almost guaranteed to occur in the future thus creating more disturbance to the further detriment of current and future neighbouring residents.

There is a range of residential styles in Padnell Road but there are no backland developments and no plots have been sub-divided so as to provide development of habitable dwellings to the rear of the plots. Most nearby dwellings sit within quite large plots (as is one of the primary characteristics of this area). The proposed plots No 3 & 4 would sit behind and to the rear of plots 1 & 2 and to the rear of the site. This is contrary to and against the character of the area as a whole and detrimental to the current residents. NPPF Para 127 sets out that any new developments “function well and add to the overall quality of an area including in the long term, are visually attractive, are sympathetic to local character and ensure a high standard of amenities for existing and future users. This proposal does not meet these requirements.

The proposed sighting of the rear buildings would constitute an intensification of development which would appear incongruous and out of character with the overall appearance of the street.

The siting of the proposed buildings on plots 3 & 4 also completely contradicts the previous refusal statement para 1 - "the development would fail to respect building lines and depths". In his previous application the proposed building extended approximately 15m beyond the established (and accepted) building line. In the current proposal the rear buildings on plots 3 & 4 will start approximately 16m beyond the recognised and accepted building line. This is in complete ignorance of the council's planning refusal.

Planning policy statement 3: Housing advises that design which is inappropriate in its context should not be accepted and that development should be well integrated with and compliment the local area.

Developers drawing No 2021/04 shows the path of the sun. This is clearly a copy from the developer's previous application and relates to the month of March (See App/21/01041 Planning Design and Access Statement). This is not a true reflection of the sun's path for the other eleven months of the year and the developer appears to have omitted the sun's path and in particular its shadow effects during the summer months (April – September) The sun rises higher in the sky and further round to the East when viewed from my rear garden. This provides bright early morning sunlight to the rear of my garden until mid-morning when the sun disappears behind the trees. The proposed siting of plots 3 & 4 will block this early morning sun and place the bottom of my garden into shade. This is to the detriment of those residing in this property.

2. Character/Appearance/Amenities

The proposed rear dwellings at plots 3 & 4 are of a dormer style and have a height of 6.3m. Whilst this may well reflect a similar height of the chalet style at No 32 it should be borne in mind that No 32 is located at the front of its respective plot and not to the rear end. At 6.2m these buildings are more than three times higher than the boundary fence with adjacent properties. Whilst there are no side elevation windows proposed, the high side elevation will dominate and be continuously in the field of vision from any position in my rear garden presenting an outlook of a foreboding, bland, incongruous, and ugly solid brick wall where previously there was nothing but trees. It most certainly does not create "a more aesthetically and pleasing environment complimentary to the street scene as a whole". The building will in fact dominate the southerly outlook when seen from the street and the rear outlook from neighbouring properties lying to the east and west. The building and its large roof area (2 x semi's) will also be clearly visible and dominate the outlook from the rear rooms of adjacent properties. This is to the detriment and disadvantage of current neighbours especially at No 26 and 32.

Contrary to what the developer states regarding "the subordinate articulated elements of gable roof are effective in minimising and breaking up the overall mass and scale of the building" it is clearly of a scale and mass that warrants the developer using these words in attempting to hide this fact and disguise the building. There are no words or actions that could be used to disguise this building or blend it in with its background. It is an elephant in the room that will stand out like a sore thumb due to it being sited in an area where there are no other buildings. It will cause serious visual and material harm and negative impact to the character and appearance of the area and as stated earlier is most definitely not "genius loci".

The developer states that front building retains the gap between No 26 & 32. The NW corner of the front building is only half a meter away from the side elevation of No 26. This is not in any way, shape or form retaining the gap between buildings. No other dwellings along Padnell road are this close together. In this respect alone the proposal "fails to respect the local context or respond positively to local character and would result in harm to the local character and appearance of the area.

The proposed dwellings (plot 3 & 4) would result in an excessive bulk adjacent to the boundary of No 32 and particularly of No 26, detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties.

The use of 25- and 45-degree rules in the design of the proposed buildings does not mitigate for or negate the obvious visual impact that this huge building will have on the visual amenities of the residents of neighbouring properties.

3. Noise and Disturbance

Council policy is that any new development should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours. This proposal is contrary to this policy by the siting of residential dwellings to the rear of the site and the access road, parking and turning area. This proposal will, through the coming and going of vehicles, introduce an increase in vehicle noise into what is at present a quiet and peaceful area to the rear of neighbouring dwellings. Vehicle headlight use during the hours of darkness will also introduce a disturbance to existing residents by way of headlights shining into the rear facing rooms of neighbours, particularly No 26, and the introduction of artificial light (vehicles/residential/safety/security lighting) into an established dark area that benefits both current wildlife (bat/hedgehog/fox/owl) and neighbouring residents alike. This is clearly to the detriment of the aforementioned. There will also undoubtedly be residential noise (parties/music/TV/BBQ) introduced into the quiet area at the rear of the plots. A further affect to the detriment of neighbours will be the pollution caused by the vehicles using the rear parking / turning area. Air pollution caused by the increase in exhaust fumes and pollution caused by vehicle fluids (oils/coolants/lubricants) and brake dust all seeping into the ground and into the water table contaminating the ground where there has been nothing except native flora for well over 70 years. This is unquestionably to the detriment of the current neighbours and more importantly the environment.

4. Access / Parking

Access to plots 3 & 4 would be by a newly created access road (constructed on top of the natural drainage channel) immediately adjacent to the side elevation of plot 1 and less than 1 meter from the side elevation of No 32. No other dwellings in the vicinity have dedicated access roads running down the garden (except for garage access) with the sole intention of providing access to further habitable dwellings in the rear of their gardens.

View of the access, turning area and parts of the two dormers (plots 3 & 4) will be seen from the road and these buildings will be clearly and obviously visible from all neighbouring rear gardens. The access road is proposed to be constructed from Grasscrete blocks. To ensure these blocks have a firm and substantive base it will be necessary to excavate the topsoil and replace with hardcore before levelling and compacting prior to the blocks being laid. This will undoubtedly have an impact on the natural drainage channel and is likely to create additional excess water run off as the surface water will not be able to drain away as it does at present. This excess water is likely to accumulate eventually to the rear of the plot causing

localised flooding (neighbouring gardens regularly flood at the southern end during and after heavy rainfall).

The developer states that vehicles will be able to enter and leave the rear parking area in forward gear. Whilst it is fair to say that vehicles entering from the street can do so in forward gear, this will not be possible without a dedicated turning area (not mentioned in any proposal documents or shown on any plans). If a turning area is created this will certainly direct light from car headlight into the rear rooms of neighbouring properties, particularly No 26. This is unacceptable and will have a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbours.

With the proposed location of the rear parking area for plots 3 & 4 no consideration has been given to the undoubted future use of delivery vans for the potential future residents of these plots. The average delivery van being approximately 4.5 – 6m long it will be impossible for the van to turn around and exit in forward gear (the access road is only 3.7m wide). This will result in large van type vehicle having to reverse up the access road and onto (blindly) a busy main road. This is unacceptable and unsafe particularly as the vehicles will have to reverse past the side elevation of plot 1 and the front parking area. This situation is then likely to result in additional delivery vans being parked on street opposite the church exacerbating the traffic congestion along Padnell Road. This activity will contribute to the increase of noise level, light and air pollution in a quiet and dark area to the detriment of existing adjacent residents. Any emergency vehicles requiring access would also find themselves in the same predicament.

The “juggling around” of cars in the rear parking area will cause an increase in traffic movement, noise and pollution which is unacceptable and to the detriment of immediate neighbours.

The rear parking area will also have a negative impact on the presence of flora and fauna, notwithstanding the area has already been de-spoiled (twice) by this developer.

Prior to the developers previously refused application he received advice from the council that car parking to the rear of his proposed building (sept 2020) was not acceptable. This advice has clearly been ignored as we now see that this aspect has been reinstated it into his development plans.

The developer states (Highways) that the parking survey demonstrates sufficient On Street capacity (17 spaces). In reality, there are thousands of on street spaces available all over Cowplain. The 17 spaces referred in his document are not allocated for the sole use of this development. Other vehicles from Health Centre, Church, Schools, Nightingale Lodge can, will and do park on the street along this stretch of the road. Considering this development is directly opposite the church and its car park entrance the additional on street parking is likely to add to the already unacceptable traffic congestion and delays particularly during the “school run” times.

5. Trees

A large Oak tree is located just over the boundary fence to the southern end of the plot. This tree is protected by a TPO. The siting of plots 3 & 4 raises concerns as to the protection of the tree and in particular it's Root Protection Area (RPA). The tree report calculation of the RPA is based a normal tree – If the tree is classed as a “Veteran” tree then the RPA will need to be increased up to a maximum of 15 meters. Therefore, the age and status of the tree must be calculated and promulgated for a more realistic and accurate RPA to be calculated.

This will bring into question whether the southerly building line of plots 3 & 4 are in, on or outside of the RPA. If they are on the edge of the RPA then the excavation, digging out and

construction of the footings will result in damage and harm being caused to the roots of a tree protected by a TPO.

Even using the current measurements, due to the size of the above tree its crown and canopy and the siting of plots 3 & 4 both dwellings will suffer from a distinct lack of natural sunlight to the rear facing rooms – in summer they will be heavily shaded by the tree canopy. Therefore, there is a high probability that any future potential residents of these dwellings will complain and apply for permission to reduce the crown of the tree (I most certainly would if it was me). These potential residents are also highly likely to want a patio area to the rear of the properties. Any patio that extends more than approximately 2 meters will encroach into the RPA resulting in damage to the tree's root system. Any future use of the "garden area" by potential residents will result future pressure on the tree causing further harm.

It should also be noted that the developer has already undoubtedly caused damage inside the RPA when he constructed the 2m boundary fence. This would have occurred whilst digging the post holes – I don't remember seeing any Planning application for this action.

Another area of concern regarding this tree is that it is more than likely used as a roost for bats. I would strongly urge a full study on this matter is conducted. It was suggested in the previous application supporting documents that there was no evidence of bats. This is totally incorrect as they can be seen hunting in the evenings between April and October. For further information regarding bat roost refer to <https://www.bats.org.uk/where-do-bats-live/bat-roosts/roosts-in-trees>

There is a real danger that the siting and construction of plots 3 & 4 could cause serious harm to these protected creatures.

All of the above, yet again point to a developer who is displaying no consideration to the environment, a disregard to council approved TPOs and the amenities afforded to potential future residents of his developments.

6. Future precedence

As is clearly evident along Padnell Road none of the rear gardens have been sub-divided to construct residential dwellings. The proposed buildings at plots 3 & 4 would extend to the west beyond the building line of the front plots and across much of the width of the site. Thus, the views of the access, turning point, rear car parking area, fencing to the amenity area of the rear plots and large parts of the rear dwellings would be clearly visible from Padnell Road between the buildings, as well as being clearly visible from neighbouring gardens. This will be extremely detrimental to existing and any future neighbouring residents. The proposal would increase the hard landscape and built-up appearance of the site with limited areas of soft landscaping or opportunities for biodiversity enhancement identified – detrimental to the wider neighbourhood community and the street and rear garden scene as a whole and to the detriment of the prevailing and established character of the area. (The developer has given no indication of his intention to replace any of the trees he had felled during lockdown when he de-spoiled the site entirely with any new plantings of native tree species.

The proposed development, if approved, will undoubtedly set a precedence for any future similar backland developments leading to widespread intensive development that is out of character with Padnell road. The proposal would create an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult to refuse further similar applications.

There have previously been several planning applications for similar backland developments (Ref: 06/71368/001 and the refusal) and APP/X1735/A07/20558095/NWF) and (APP/10/00293, APP/20/01026, and subsequent refusal reports) along Padnell Road all of which have so far been refused. Based on the similarities of the above applications to this one it I believe that this application must also be refused on the same grounds.