

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

30 MAY 2024

RECEIVED

Planning Application No: APP/24/00268 - Erection of 2no 3 bed and 2no 1bed dwellings, land between 26 and 32 Padnell Road.

Please find below my objections to the above planning application.

I would like to take this opportunity to invite the Planning Officer to my property / garden to view the site in question to gain a full appreciation of the detrimental impact that the proposed development would have on my property and the lives of those who live here and that of neighbours and their dwellings.

I would also like to point out that planning for the front of the site has been approved, and still the developer is not willing to be satisfied with this after three planning applications and two appeals. The principals for the rejection of past planning applications with development at the rear of the site remains the same. We now understand why the developer left a large access road running down the side of the plot in past planning!

I wish to summarise my strongest objection to the above planning application for plots 3 and 4:

- **Outlook and Privacy** - plots 3 & 4 will be an overbearing features that will be visible from rear gardens, living rooms and bedrooms from some neighbouring properties along the East and West side of the plot. The roof will have a dominating effect on the outlook even with a 'flat green roof'. These prospective dwellings will introduce noise and light pollution to the rear gardens where previously there was none. These proposed properties will also introduce social activities including TV/Music/BBQs and social gatherings detrimental to the peace and privacy of neighbouring properties. New perspective residents for these dwellings will require security and safety lighting to plots 3&4 this will be detrimental to all neighbouring properties with illuminations during the hours of darkness, this is currently a dark and quite space. The TPO trees to the rear will have their canopy lit up (Bats in the area). This area is and always has been a quiet, dark, and peaceful area.

The site of the bin storage for plot 4 are very close to the boundary

■ This will result in poor quality air, and in the summer months will produce a smell from these bins. The required 26 meter rule of distance between bin storage and pick up point has not been met. New residents in the rear plots will have more than 26 metres to pull/carry their refuse to the bin pick up point.

- **Site development –**

Padnell Road homes contain only one habitable dwelling all of which are in linear alignment towards the front of the plots, with large gardens to the rear. Plots 3&4 would completely go

against this trend and would be out of character with the rest of the neighbourhood. Most residents living on Padnell Road have purchased their homes because of this and are thankful for their large gardens. Previous applications for similar and smaller developments have been refused planning permission due to their siting to the rear of the respective plots and the harm they would cause to local amenities and outlook.

Other previous proposals similar in design have previously been refused planning permission:

Application Number: APP/21/01041 Site Address: Land between, 26-32 Padnell Road, Waterloo
Proposal: Erection of 2No.3bed and 2No.2bed dwellings associated parking and bin/cycle storage.

Associated to the above refusal: Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/W/22/3305931

APP No: 06/71368/001 was refused for being "Detrimental to visual amenities and quiet enjoyment of adjoining properties", "The proposal would set a bad precedent encouraging future development of rear gardens. This is out of character with the locality" and "Bulk and height would be an incongruous feature and detrimental to visual amenities". It should also be noted that the subsequent appeal for this application was also refused.

APP No: APP/10/00293 – was refused for "the proposal would result in excessive bulk to neighbouring properties to the detriment of visual outlook and amenity" "the development would substantially increase the built up appearance of the site which would be visible from the street and nearby properties which is harmful to the character of the area". It should also be noted that the subsequent appeal for this application was also refused.

APP No: APP/20/01026 – was refused for "the adjacent neighbouring properties by reason of noise and disturbance." "The proposal would not result in a sufficient high quality amenity space for the future users of the development"

All the above is also true for this proposed development so must constitute fair reason for refusal. The council cannot refuse other similar plans but grant this one in the same area and circumstances.

In relation to the proposed access to plots 3 and 4, running along the eastern side - I have concerns that this will have a negative effect on the surface water drainage channel (Hermitage Stream) that the access will be built on top of. This access will easily introduce contamination into the water course from vehicles (oil/chemicals/brake dust/particulates). The access road would not allow emergency vehicles access due to its lightweight construction being unable to support large heavy emergency vehicles. To enable this to happen a more substantial foundation would need to be built which would further damage and restrict the water course. If emergency vehicles were to access the rear plots 3&4, they would then have to reverse out the site which is not acceptable. It is also possible that residents/delivery vans will drive their vehicles down to plots 3 and 4 to unload shopping and heavy items. This would also be damaging to Hermitage Stream and the water course.

Loss of Amenities – There is no sign on the plans to replace any of the previously destroyed native trees and no indication in the use of newly planted trees for screening purposes to maintain the privacy and outlook of neighbouring residences. Plots 3&4 are extremely close to a large mature Oak tree subject to a TPO – I have concerns about the digging of foundations / new resident's garden requirements as this close to the Root Protection Area and the

damage it may cause. I am concerned about the lack of natural light into the two new properties. This will potentially result in the future reduction/felling of protected trees to increase light – something that should be avoided at all costs otherwise a TPO will be meaningless.