



Objection to Planning Application: APP/24/0068. Land between 26 & 32 Padnell Road

I would like to point out that the developer's previous proposal (APP/23/00685) for two Semi-detached dwellings was approved by the council some time ago and it should be noted that there were only three objections registered to that proposal. The council granted Planning Permission for a development that consisted of 2 Semi-Detached dwelling sited at the front of the plot.

Now 5 months on from the approval of the above application we yet again find ourselves in the same situation with this developer trying his luck to squeeze as much profit out of this plot as possible by a proposal to add two further dwellings to the rear of the plot. This developer is clearly not willing to accept the fact that one of the primary contributing factors to previous refusals were his plans to develop at the rear of the plot - back land development.

In his latest Planning Application the developer states in his Planning and Design Access Statement that this scheme is similar to the refused application APP/21/01041 and the dismissed appeal APP/X1735/W/22/3305931 with the following changes

- Plots 1 and 2 have been reduced on the ground floor in order to improve depth of rear gardens to 11m whilst also providing a side area for plot 1
- Plots 3 and 4 are single storey contemporary design
- No vehicular access which could affect the living conditions of the occupiers of 32 Padnell Road.

Quote taken from access statement. 'Therefore, the main consideration will be the effect on the character and appearance of the area which we feel in this instance has been overcome by proposing relatively modest structures akin to outbuildings similar to some neighbouring properties at the rear.'

I most strongly disagree with the developer's statement above.

I draw attention to a primary reason for HBC's refusal of a previous planning application APP/21/01041 (paras: 1,2,3,4 & 5) with particular emphasis on:

- The proposed development would result in an undesirable form of backland development out of keeping with the pattern and layout of the area, which is characterised by linear frontage development having open aspect spacious gardens
- The introduction of two rear dwellings with associated access would give rise to a scale and mass of development out of keeping with the of the area and visually harmful to neighbouring residents and the street scene The proposal is considered to be at variance with local context and therefore contrary to Havant Borough Council Design Guide SPD 2011, policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The gardens of plots 3 & 4 would be largely overshadowed by protected trees giving rise to dark and unsatisfactory gardens for these plots. Overall the standard of living for future

occupiers of plots 3 & 4, would be compromised and unsatisfactory, harmful to their amenity, contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

In relation to the above three bullet point I notice that in his access statement the developer has completely failed to even mention these points let alone address the issues.

HBC reasons for refusal are further supported by the subsequent refusal to the developers appeal by the Inspectorate (APP/X1735/W/22/3305931) para 6 (I, II, III IV) and the Inspectorates reasons for refusal and in particular paras 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and in particular para 14.

All of the above (HBC and Inspectorate) refer in particular to:

- Backland development
- Out of character with the linear development (the building line)
- Effect on the living conditions of neighbours
- At odds with the prevailing built form and layout of the street
- Insufficient natural sunlight for plots 3 & 4
- Living conditions for residents of plots 3 & 4
- Backland and tandem developments are not evident or common features of the area of Padnell Road
- Access (pedestrian/vehicle/emergency services)

All of the above points remain applicable to the developer's latest application and therefore should weigh heavily towards a refusal of planning permission.

Once again attention to any of the above points is conspicuously missing from the developer's access statement.

By simply reducing the size of proposed dwellings at plots 3 & 4 to single story 1 bedroomed and styled with a flat roof will not detract from the fact that their proposed position will mean they are wholly and permanently visible from the rear rooms of neighbouring dwellings.

Additional points

Page 8 of the Planning and Access statement (Appearance) the developer likens plots 3 & 4 to the outbuildings in neighbouring gardens. I consider this to be completely unacceptable as none of these outbuildings are or will be used as habitable dwellings for residents. The outbuildings mentioned, in general, are workshops, sheds and storage areas and blend in with and contribute to the 'genius loci' and are therefore acceptable. I consider the design and style of the proposed dwellings at plots 3 & 4 to be completely out of character with the neighbouring dwellings and indeed appear to resemble nothing more than posh Porta Cabins.

I would also like to point out that the proposed design and simple construction processes likely to be employed on plots 3 & 4 will leave potential for future enhancements and additions to be quickly and easily applied making a single story building into a two story one for example. A point I would suggest that is not lost on this developer. This process is likely to leave the door open for the him to submit further applications in the future to quickly and easily increase number of dwellings on the site with the aim of eventually achieving his original goal of seven dwellings.

Furthermore the siting of the bin storage area for plot 4 is located extremely close to the boundary fence of No 26. This is not acceptable as due to stench, particularly in summer months, of rotting household waste and the high numbers of flies (and probably rats) that it will attract making the rear area of the neighbouring garden an unpleasant area to relax and enjoy. A further concern is in relation to Planning Application, Consultee Comments Building Control (HBC). Paras 2 - Fire Service Access and 3 - Waste Bins and in particular that "bins should not need to be moved more than 25m from the bin storage location to the refuse collection point. Something that has clearly been lost (or ignored) on the developer.

Summary

Previous planning applications regarding back land development along Padnell Road have been refused by HBC and the Planning Inspectorate for all the right reasons. The decisions were reached by councillors from and familiar with the local area and what it needs and does not need. It was based on the impact the proposed developments would have on the local residents and immediate neighbours not only in the short term but more importantly in the long term, after all it is these people who will have to live with them and not the developer. The decisions also took into consideration whether or not the developments would complement and / or enhance the characteristic of the local area and the impact it would have on the amenities. The decisions were most definitely not influenced by profit.

The conclusions drawn by HBC was that the proposed developments would have a negative impact on the neighbours, local residents and the characteristics of the area and will not enhance or add any improvement to the local amenities.

HBC case officers are experienced and knowledgeable in needs and requirements of local area planning and development and their decision for refusals was based on sound judgement not money. The councillors who made these decisions have full trust and confidence of the local residents that the decisions for their previous refusals was the correct decision for this site. I feel it only right that the only decision, and the correct decision in this latest back land development application is for HBC to reject the developer's application.

If this application is approved I have every confidence that this developer will not stop here but will submit yet another Planning Application that includes further "additions" to what has already been approved, e.g. plots 3 & 4 increased to 4 x 1 bed dwellings (flats) by simply stacking them on top of each other "Porta Cabin style". Eventually the developer will achieve his original wish list, whilst subjecting local residents to, as of now, four years of stress and anxiety.