

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/X1735/W/23/3328946

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

APP/X1735/W/23/3328946

Appeal By

MR BRIAN LONG

Site Address

27 Emsworth Road
Havant
PO9 2SN

SENDER DETAILS

Name

Address

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Having made an objection to the Havant BC application for the land adjacent to 27 Emsworth Road Havant PO92SN I wish to make the following comments.

My numbered references are to the Appellant's Statement of Case.

*Please note that I should like to invite the Inspector to view the site from my garden.

4.17 Par 27 of the NPPF states that Planning policies should ensure that developments:

- a.Add to the overall quality of an area.
- b.Are visually attractive.
- c.Sympathetic to local character and local environment.
- f.Create places that promote health and wellbeing.

The application appears to fail on all those. There is also much emphasis in the NPPF on beautiful places. I would argue that the scheme fails on that too.

4.19 Noise and disturbance.

Avoid noise giving rise to significant impact on health and wellbeing. NPPF.

The application site is located next to a busy public house and restaurant. The ventilation system runs most days from opening time until 11.30pm. The units are situated on first floor kitchen extension to the pub. This is directly next to the site. The external courtyard garden is also next to the site. It is busy and creates noise. There is often live music in the main building.

Summers are getting warmer and it would be hard to imagine how residents could open the windows of these studio flats for ventilation when the pub and restaurant are busy. Any noise from the pub would impact on the outside space of the patio or balcony of these studio flats. Residents would not have a quiet enjoyment.

4.52 Ground floor boundaries.

The Havant Borough Design Guide says out that rear boundaries must be masonry and not a fence to limit noise disturbance. The plans show a fence rather than a wall.

4.54 Household waste.

There is no space allocated for bins. Locally it is a two weekly household collection. Storing waste for two weeks in a one too. flat would not contribute to health and wellbeing for residents.

5.20 Size and overdevelopment of the plot

In this section section of the Statement of Case a comparison is made with the development at 44-54 West Street. Emsworth Road is not in the town centre. 44- 54 is very different in terms of outside space. It is located just two minutes from Havant Park and at the front opened into a traffic free space with trees and beaches that residents can enjoy and sit out.

There is no scale drawing of the proposed development.

5.29 Homes behind a hoarding.

The appellant states that the development would take prominence away from the hoarding and then goes on to compare the hoarding to a house behind a hedge. If anything a house behind a hoarding

would attract attention and not in a positive way.

5.30 Visual Interest.

The appellant states there would be a greater degree of visual interest if the development was built. Currently both when standing in the gap by the hoarding and standing across the road there is a long view of the backs of the houses in Oaklands Road and these match the Edwardian style of the Wheelright Public House. The gable end of the proposed development would be the view for the residents of Bernard Powell House as they enter and leave their flats.

5.31 The unkempt site.

The site has been in the applicants ownership for over a decade and should have been well kept like the gardens around it.

5.45 Outlook over residential gardens.

The ground floor flat would have the uninteresting view of a wall. The upstairs flat would look down into private gardens where children play.

5.47 Over shadowing.

The submission from the Havant Civic Society clearly shows overshadowing.

I feel that the Planning Officer gave sound reasons for refusal and I hope the Planning Inspector will uphold this decision.

Housing should provide good quality sustainable homes to provide a good quality of life. These studio flats would not.