

Planning Department
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Center Road
Havant
PO9 2AX



48 Station Road
West Town
Hayling Island
Hampshire
PO11 0EQ

7 Apr 16

Reference:

- a. **Planning Application Resubmission APP/16/00252 – Land Adjacent to 48 Station Road, Hayling Island – Objection**
- b. **Original Planning Application APP/15/00037**
- c. **Planning Inspectorate Appeal Reference – APP/X1735/W/15/3132354**

To Whom It May Concern:

Firstly I'd like to thank your Planning Officer for attending a site visit to listen and witness my concerns, regarding the many nuances and negatives that **WILL** affect both the surrounding properties and mine if this planning application were to be approved.

I wish it to be officially recorded that both my family and myself still **strongly object** to this planning application resubmission on the grounds listed below:

The very minimal changes to these resubmitted plans have not addressed any concerns in my objections to the original application APP/15/00037 that was refused by Havant Borough Council, and on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate,¹ so I wish my previous objections to remain in place.

In addition, the resubmitted plans; **have not altered any aspect of the permanent negative impact** on my family or our property 48 Station Road. The list below is in addition to my previous objections regarding the original application APP/15/00037 that has a direct reflection on this resubmission application.

1. The proposed movement of the dwelling wall 40cm further from the original plan, making a total of 90cm (approx.) distance from the **whole length of my boundary** will make no difference to the original decision that the proposed property will be visible from my rear garden, side windows, ground floor living rooms and external rear door windows. This length of the proposed building so close to my boundary combined with the long walls up to ridge height will have a harmful impact on my property and surrounding ones, permanently shadowing various living spaces throughout.
2. The movement of the proposed dwelling wall 40cm will still cause overshadowing and loss of light during daylight hours throughout the whole year, I feel that the paragraph in the Design and Access Statement regarding the overshadowing as 'disturbing' in that it is stated that my garden space would not be considered a 'recreational amenity'.²
I would like it noted that I as the owner of 48 Station Road consider my garden a recreational amenity 24/7 and the comment made within the Design and Access statement removed and questioned.

¹ Appeal Reference APP/X1735/W/15/3132354

² Design and Access Statement 4.3 (2)

It was also witnessed and proved during the consultation stages of the original application,³ that the sun-study was inaccurate to show in the favor of the proposal – the proposal indicated no shadowing of my property. This was proved inaccurate with photographic evidence and with a visit from the Havant Planning Department during daylight hours showing shadowing on my garden, and property from the proposed ridge heights.

The ridge height of this new building has not changed, therefore the proposed building will still produce permanent shadowing on 48 Station Road, 11 West Lane, 15 West Lane and other neighboring properties. This will be very unsightly and have a harmful impact on all properties dominating the length of all our rear gardens.

3. This application indicates that the pitch of the roof has been altered; with this resubmission, this change has no direct positive improvement to my property. Although they **claim** the eaves height has been reduced. The proposal still has the **same ridge height** as the previous application,⁴ which **will** cause the same shadowing and the same unsightly outlook from my habitable rooms within my property. This does affect my 'right to light' clause and current planning policies, including the planning 25 and 45 degree rule.
In addition to this: the proposal **will** also affect the direct amenity spaces and living areas of 11 and 15 West Lane including other neighboring properties.
4. This proposed development is an over-development of a very small irregular plot of garden land; it will be cramped and congested with a heavily built-up layout, which will give an unsightly overbearing impact and loss of light to both my neighbours and my properties including garden areas. This is contrary to various current policies.⁵
I would also like it noted that during this whole planning application procedure, there has been no sun-study on the properties of 11 and 15 West Lane, which this proposal also has a very large bearing.
5. It is noted within the Design and Access statement that an agreement has been made with me for this dwelling. I would like it noted that I object this whole-heartedly. I have not agreed or been consulted with; from any party regarding this application – this applies to both:
APP/15/00037 or APP/16/00252⁶

In summary to the above, the planned resubmission of these 'virtually' identical plans have made no positive impact to any of the surrounding properties within this proposed 'garden grabbing' development site. The ridge heights and boundary walls are all still overbearing and shadow direct living spaces and windows within mine and other properties.

The proposed building falls within the 25 and 45 degree rule for building/planning, failing both rules respectively, therefore this application has no substance and should be refused with immediate effect.

The length of the proposed building so close to my boundary combined with the long walls up to ridge height will have a harmful impact on my property and surrounding ones, permanently shadowing various living spaces throughout, with an addition fire risk due to the proposed close proximity to all neighbours boundaries.

This proposal is still contrary to current planning policies.

Japanese Knotweed has been reported to the Council and outsources departments and is still present on the site. The owners of the proposed building land have submitted no management plans,

³ APP/15/00037

⁴ APP/15/00037

⁵ Policy CS16

⁶ Design and Access Statement 3.1

therefore it is assumed there has been no management of this aggressive and anti-social species, meaning it is in a worse state of repair from being first reported in 2015.

The predicted sun study; which I consider to be incorrect for this building plan will 'still' cast a permanent shadow on my house and internal living area; this is due to no changes in ridge heights or size of the proposed development. I also feel disturbed that I am being dictated too by the architects - Design and Access statement that my garden area is not considered an amenity space!

The permanent shadows caused by this proposed development affect not only my garden, but also my living areas within my property.

This all proves the negative impact and disregard for the current planning policies this proposed building will have on the enjoyment of my property, whatever the season, or the time of day.

I therefore strongly object to this proposal and trust that Havant Borough Council can see the application resubmission is technically, morally and factually unsound, portraying a permanent negative impact within an established neighbourhood, therefore it should be refused with immediate effect.

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of Mr J Smith.

Mr J Smith