

APP/X1735/W/23/3328946
Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr Brian Long
Site Address: 27 Emsworth Road, Havant, PO9 2SN

OBJECTION

I object to this application for the reasons set out below and request that the appeal be refused.

The original application to Havant Borough Council (HBC) - APP/22/01194 – was somewhat disingenuous in its approach to the disadvantageous living conditions that residents of this development would face. The appellant's stated case (Reference 1) takes disingenuousness to new heights.

Reference 1 para 5.15 claims that, rather than the proposal being cramped and congested, the plans simply make efficient use of the site. A brief inspection of the site plan shows the proposal is indeed cramped and congested, with every square millimetre of the site built on or over, except for a narrow access path and a sliver of land in front of the building. Although the appellant has apparently altered his plans to include secure stowage for cycles and refuse/recycling bins there is clearly no room within the red-lined boundary for such a stowage to be constructed. Such amended plans, if they exist, have not been made available to the public. The two units would have a total of four 140 litre bins, which would inevitably end up being located on land not belonging to the applicant.

The dwelling units are claimed to meet the minimum space requirement, albeit by a whisker, but this is more apparent than real. It is noteworthy that the plans available to the public via HBC's planning website do not contain any measurements of dimensions, nor a scale by which dimensions can be derived. Once the area occupied by the lobby and stairway has been taken into account, not to mention the wall-hung cycle rack in the first floor unit, living space is tight indeed.

Provision for outdoor space is inadequate. The first floor balcony is between 0.8 – 1.4m wide, which is less than the 1.5m specified at Reference 1 para 4.53. The ground floor amenity space is of the same dimensions but, whereas the first floor occupant will have an outlook over the rear of Bernard Powell House, the ground floor occupant will have a view of a 1.8m wooden fence just a metre from his patio doors. In addition, the space will be completely overhung by the first floor balcony, with only a 0.5m gap for daylight to penetrate.

This is also relevant to the question of natural light and acceptable outlook. Reference 1 para 5.45 speaks positively of the "verdant" outlook to the north (rear) but the Inspector, on his site visit, will see that this is classic "estate agent speak". Indeed paragraphs 5.45-5.48 of the reference disingenuously ignore the unfortunate ground floor occupant, whose rear outlook is of a fence right in front of his nose, completely shaded by the first floor balcony. Further, his front outlook is not the highway, as claimed, but a 2m high brick wall, the existence of which is not at all obvious from the site plan.

Once again, a site visit will reveal that Reference 1 puts the clear detriment caused by the adjacent advertising hording in a positive light that is objectively unsustainable. Contrary to para 5.45, the

occupants' eyelines will be drawn to the hoarding rather than the highway, especially as the intrusion of the entrance door in the ground floor unit will mean the living space is biased to the east side of the property. Canting the windows on the south elevation slightly towards the east will not alter the direction of the occupants' eyelines away from the hoarding and, arguably, more daylight would be allowed to enter if the cant was towards the west.

Both units will be very close to the kitchen of the adjacent public house and can expect to suffer nuisance from the noise of the extraction fans and from cooking smells. Noise from the small public house garden will also likely be a nuisance during the summer months.

It is optimistic in the extreme for the appellant to imagine that the first floor occupant will religiously carry his cycle upstairs, round a 90deg bend and across his living space to the internal storage rack. Inevitably, it will end up living in the ground floor lobby, to the annoyance of the ground floor occupant and causing an unacceptable fire safety hazard.

In summary, this proposed development has been shoe-horned into an unsuitable site and would provide an unacceptably low standard of habitability to its unfortunate occupants. I ask that the appeal be refused.

[REDACTED]

3 January 2024

Reference 1: Appellant's Written Statement of Case, CPC Planning Consultants, 5 Sep 2023