

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
11 FEB 2025
RECEIVED

CPI

Re 48 langstone road, po9 1rf ref app 24 00957

1

We note its change to a 4 bed 3 bath house. That implies an increase, to existing services, sewers, etc, which are not the property of number 48, and due to substantial on going drains issues, evidenced on Southern waters files, we DO NOT grant any increase to the waste current water flow exit [REDACTED]

If 48 wishes to extend, or part provide a larger property, whereby, under todays standards, would reasonably extend to include more bathrooms, toilets utilities, kitchen etc.

obliged to bear the burden of subsequent intensification of neighbours services, causing substantial damage [REDACTED] but we are not [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I trust our objection, which is quite reasonable, is absolutely and fundamentally clear. The applicant for this matter is fully aware. However, the status quo, legally can continue, but a 400% increase in services, CANNOT. (2 more bathrooms, and one new utility). [REDACTED], and relied on local authority enquiries, of any overriding interests, there were only 3 lavatories, [REDACTED] and 2 kitchens. This proposal changes this, beyond our control, to 7 toilets/bathrooms and 5 kitchens/utility kitchens. This is overload.

2

EXTERNAL fenestration of [REDACTED] I leave it to Havant to deal with obscurity etc, bearing in mind the existing angle is changed, and the m2 of the flank, and the % of glazing. The position of the house frontage is well set back from the road.

3

Building regulations are established to ensure properties new build, or undertaking substantial alteration are building regulation compliant. These proposals attract this consideration, (whereas existing/unaltered, do not.) In order for the property to be flood protected and damp protected, it does not achieve the 150mm dpc regulations. A french rubble filled external drain, does not. The ground floor plate is flush with external ground level.

[REDACTED]
The building 48, is in its current state unmortgageable, or substantial retention, required, until these works are completed. This COULD be arranged, if the entire 1st floor plate, was also raised, so as to accommodate minimum head heights on both levels. Restricted head height, is already noted on the proposed drawings. Perhaps this is why 46 was deemed uneconomic, and hence was a knock down, being the same builder.

4

The current drawings do not show the full "as is," position, on the northern flank.

5

It is a "material consideration" that the current site condition, and accumulation of detritus and local authority equipment and signage and food, etc has led to this site being unhealthy due to rat infestation, which Havant rat prevention department will confirm, is an ongoing issue. [REDACTED] former # 48, redeveloped, who left having stated, "we have had enough". If the site was maintained in a non antisocial behaviour condition, perhaps the neighbours would feel differently.

Conclusion

Our objections, relate solely to

government statutes, drainage, infestation and anti social accumulations of rats, possible glazing overlooking, Current government building specification and standards, And general rubbish

accumulation of the entire site, which could cause a fire hazard, on more than one occasion,
accumulated over decades. These are not "opinions", but "MATERIAL considerations. "

Yours faithfully

