

G J Haskins LCIBSE, Eng tech, MIE-T& Dr B Martin-Haskins
BSc, DC, FMCA
17 Lovedean Lane
Waterlooville
Hampshire
PO8 8HH

21st February, 2017

Mr David Eaves – Planning Officer
Havant Borough Council
Planning department
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Hampshire
P09 2AX

Dear Mr Eaves,

RE: Planning Application APP/17/00068: Proposed erection of 1no. 1 bed chalet bungalow and new crossover to parking area. Land adjacent 60 Gladys Avenue, Cowplain, Havant, P08 8HS (former rear garden of 17 Lovedean Lane)

We note that comments/submission of support has been submitted by the occupants of 60 Gladys Avenue and uploaded on to the portal.

As they appear to have made references to comments of objection that have been submitted and uploaded on to the portal, we feel it only right to write to correct them on a number of their responses/comments.

Referring to the submitted comments (*in italics*):

Planning for a single storey dwelling has previously been refused on the following ground:

- It would be an incongruous feature within the street scene and would appear as a cramped and over intensive form of development to the harm of the visual amenities and character of the area.

Gladys Avenue is a mix of properties from bungalows through chalet bungalows to medium and large two storey houses built from the 1930s to recent years which all contribute to the eclectic nature and character of the street scene. This new application proposes a chalet bungalow of a design sympathetic to nearby chalet bungalows which blends into the visual amenity of this evolving street scene and addresses the concern that it would be an incongruous feature.

Within Gladys Avenue, there is no evolving street scene, just attempts by various greedy developers/builders to 'garden grab' and build and make profit from an area that is already over developed.

- It would have an overbearing impact on 15 and 17 Lovedean Lane. - It would detract from and dominate the previous spacious setting and outlook from these properties. - It would introduce an unacceptable relationship between dwellings.

This plot has been derelict for many years, containing a huge shed and brambles which were much higher than the fencing separating the plot from 15 and 17 Lovedean Lane, so the view cannot have been considered a 'spacious setting and outlook' as asserted. In fact, without the brambles, which had to be removed to survey the site, the view is the large shed and garage wall of our property. Whilst it is understood that householders 'do not have a right to a view' the revised positioning and design of this new proposal ensures that it will not impair the view or overshadow 15 and 17 Lovedean Lane.

The statement in respect of the site being derelict is factually incorrect. The garden is not derelict, it has suffered neglect as a consequence of lack of suitable care and maintenance by the past and in particular, current land owner. Like any garden, without regular maintenance it would become overgrown. It is not derelict, it is not suitably looked after/maintained. The garden used to be home to mature trees that not only provided a pleasant outlook, particularly in the summer months, but also housed wildlife that used to thrive from their home environment. These trees and associated wildlife were decimated by the current owner and, we believe, purposely turned into a rubbish dump.

A fence panel was removed between the land and the boundary of 60 Gladys Avenue in September/October 2016. This is still the case providing an avenue for further rubbish accumulation and adding further to the appearance of willful neglect.

In respect of right to a view, we have a right to privacy and enjoyment of our property including the garden. Refer to the Human Rights act, in particular Protocol 1, referred to in previous correspondence. It overlooks our property

and causes unacceptable harm to our property and use there of through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking. This is a clear contravention of Havant Borough Councils Core Strategies.

- The rear gardens and rooms of 15 and 17 Lovedean Lane would be in close proximity to limited private amenity space and lead to lack of privacy and disturbance from noise and activity.

The revised positioning and size of the dwelling, together with re-positioning of the driveway to the north, substantially increases the distance between the proposed dwelling and 15 and 17 Lovedean Lane. These measures also increase the amenity space of the proposed dwelling as well as improving privacy and reducing disturbance to neighbouring properties. The proposed higher fencing and planting of mature indigenous species also contribute to resolving the above issues.

Even with the revised positioning it will overshadow our garden in respect of sunlight, it overlooks our property and causes unacceptable harm to our property and use there of through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking. This is a clear contravention of Havant Borough Councils Core Strategies.

Mention is made to higher fencing, this is incorrect, the application refers to existing fencing being retained. Though the height of the existing fencing stated within the application is also incorrect and is in fact 0.2m lower than the height stated on the application documentation.

- It would not provide satisfactory private amenity space for future occupiers. - The amenity space and rear of the dwelling would be overlooked by 17, 15 and 13 Lovedean Lane to the harm of the occupants' privacy. - The proposal to set the dwelling further into the slope and the frontage boundary treatment would result in the front bedrooms within the proposed dwelling having a poor outlook and restricted light.

Repositioning and the design of the proposed dwelling, together with repositioning of the driveway, greatly increases and improves the amenity space of the occupants, ensures the dwelling is not overlooked by neighbouring properties and ensures the rooms of the dwelling do not suffer a poor outlook and restricted light.

We cannot see how the comment can be made 'the dwelling is not overlooked by neighbouring properties'. The proposed dwelling overlooks the neighbouring properties of 13, 15 & 17 Lovedean Lane, causing unacceptable harm to the respective properties through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking. This is a clear contravention of Havant Borough Councils Core Strategies.

Whilst many pages of opposition have been written concerning drainage issues the opponents should appreciate that planning permission has not been refused on these

grounds. The Drainage Strategy Report anticipates there will be no problems whilst the HBC Engineering Consultant felt there could be issues. BUT, both experts propose a simple soakage test at design stage to clarify

the issue and the HBC Consultant anticipates 'it may be necessary to introduce a high-level overflow into the existing system' which will resolve the issue.

Within the previous application, there was insufficient information to conclude that the drainage strategy was totally unachievable, though the facts that could be compiled from the submitted contradictory information on the drainage and building construction, it clearly pointed to contravention of the Havant Borough Councils Core Strategy CS15.

With the vast increase in impermeable area on the site, and the resulting increase in surface water run-off, the risk of flooding can only increase. Providing simple soakaways does not control this increase.

Finally, there has been opposition that the build resembles a 'granny annex' which is clearly not the case. Also that 'the developers make their money then exit leaving locals to deal with the reduction of what was previously good property.' This is obviously not the case as, apart from the fact the owner intends the dwelling as a home for himself and young son for the foreseeable future, the bungalow will be a self-build project which requires him to live in the dwelling for a minimum of three years from completion.

We would have to beg to differ in respect of the 'granny annex' comment. A one bedroom property such as that proposed, crammed into such a small footprint, in what was the garden of 17 Lovedean Lane, is no better than a granny annex.

Furthermore, we cannot see how a small one bedroom property is suitable for occupation by the applicant and his son, who we believe from the previous application correspondence would be 5 or 6 years old now.

We hope the above and attached is self-explanatory and we would be grateful if the council would take our further comments into consideration when deciding this application.

Yours Sincerely



G J Haskins LCIBSE, Eng tech, MIE-T& Dr B Martin-Haskins BSc, DC, FMCA

