FAO Mrs T Pickup Havant Borough Council - Planning development
31/03/24

I am writing to object to the proposed development of a two bedroom chalet/bungalow at

91 St Thomas Avenue, Hayling Island. Your reference APP/24/00179

Over development of the original plot size changing fundamentally the character of the road, With negative effect on amenity for neighbours.

I quote: HAVANT BOROUGH TOWNSCAPE, LANDSCAPE AND SEASCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT FEBRUARY 2007 328 LCA35 West Town, Hayling Island PG 328 (https://www.havant.gov.uk/media/8240/download?inline=)

"Built form and development: Consider designation of 'Area of Special Townscape Character' for Staunton Avenue and area to west, to allow control over infill development, inappropriate boundary treatments etc."

Since this date in 2007 the current applicant has enlarged his house from a three bedroom bungalow into a 5 bed property, submitting 5 other planning applications to gradually expand 91's footprint. Filling the end of the close. Two further bungalows have been given permission.

1. I believe that to add a further bungalow would indeed be detrimental to the character of the area and change fundamentally the view and peaceful enjoyment of the homes behind in Stuanton Ave and in the surrounding area of St Thomas Ave. An ariel photograph will show that the application proposes a larger bungalow than 89a and on a smaller piece of land.
2. The visual intrusion of the height of the roof, rather than the trees which were so revered by the same 2007 report, is unacceptable.
3. The applicants plans describing; snug and study, would also be described as bedrooms by an estate agent or letting agent. Therefore this is actually an application for a potential 4 bed bungalow.
4. NPPF standards state that plans should ensure: Electric vehicle charging infrastructure for each new residential unit with private off street parking. Space that is stolen for the shared driveway from the current home and may indeed prevent this in the original 5 bed unit.
5. There is the long term likelihood that cars will now litter the narrow high way from both properties and prevent visitors and service vehicles turning in an inappropriately sized turning circle, which in the applicants photographs has shown as a parking space. I note that another objection has raised the issue of distance/ space to access adjacent properties. The refuse waste collections will be unable to access and turn.
6. I appreciate the right of the applicant's team to make the best application possible for their client. Submitting a distorted photograph using a fish eye Lense does not assist an objective decision.
   -I would ask that the applicant is ask to submit pictures of plain sight so that it can be seen the tightness of his shared driveway exit point and indeed how disproportionate the width of this new exit point is in relation to the road and house scape.
   -That the picture of the roof heights' is also taken from further into the close so that the view of both 89a and the new property can be compared together rather than inferred around and behind the roof height of 89. This would in fact then be the view that 95 will have to see

every day out of their kitchen window. Currently a lot greener than it will be if this application is granted.

(I can evidence the issue via an insurance claim only last year when my vehicle parked on the highway in exactly the same place as the vehicle in the photograph (A2 PSS02 Photographic Street Scene)... was hit by an exiting neighbour due to the turning widths available at the end of the close. I had parked there to allow a service vehicle onto my driveway.)

7. The road size/ width, designed in 1960's, does not take into account larger vehicles sizes currently available. This is because the design of the entire of St Thomas Ave provided adequate facilities for at least two vehicles on each individual plot preventing the need to park on the highway except when visiting or working at the properties. Currently work vans often park on verges to allow vehicles to pass. Ruining the grass and flowers and again changing the character of the development.

<u>This application is therefore out of character for the area</u>.

If considering approving this application:

8. The application prevents a 5 bedroom house having more than one parking space.

I am unsure if a clause can be put on the current 5 bedroom house to ensure the garage is fully utilised by vehicles before resorting to the highway but certainly I would ask planners look at the capacity of an extra space for the current house of 91 possibly to utilise more side/rear garden space for parking.

This problem has arisen due to the previous expansion of 91 and I wonder if there were any planning restrictions at the time of this original application. The application is not availably digitally to refer to.

9. That the hedge at the front of the property at 91 be a retained in perpetuity as a condition of the planning permission. This is to prevent visual acknowledgement of the car which will have to be parked across the front of the house.
    a. (The space proposed is narrow and the lack of ability to get out of the car when parked there means it is unlikely to be used by any family unit with children).
    b. The hedges on other parts of the plot be legally kept at a height agreed with neighbours to allow natural screening of the intrusive development.

10. The roof height should be lowered, and the extra roof room disallowed as inappropriate development in the rear garden, a single story dwelling would have less impact on the neighbours gardens in Staunton Ave. They are greatly nearer this proposed property than 89a was when constructed. 89a was also constructed without reference to a property next to it and windows overlooking and noise from the rear access points may adversely affect the sleeping areas of their bungalow. There is still sufficient extra room space on the ground floor to allow for a dedicated carers suite, with private facilities. The applicant cannot expect another 4 bedroom property on the same plot as a 5 bedroom.

<u>Drainage</u>

<u>Ground water</u>: I note the plans have a 3 meter soakaway planned for the rear garden. I am concerned that given 89a also has a soak away, where all this extra ground water will soak away too?

11. The ground water level is fairly high on Hayling island and in fact the extensive development a little more than 50 meters away has had to install vast quantities of under ground pipes and pumps to ensure that the ground water does not indeed lap at the doorsteps on the properties. (Pebble Walk housing Development). This is not helped by the London Clay subsoil.
12. The raising of groundwater levels in all the surrounding properties is indeed a concern.

Foul water drainage:

13. I am concerned about the capabilities of the current very old drainage system to cope with more foul water.
    a. All the houses in this part of St Thomas Avenue are currently under occupied compared with bedroom size and currently the drains block quite regularly. The construction of the drains is a shared, soft, none clay sewerage system. The concerns regarding this old end of life sewerage system is returned on every survey for the houses bought.
14. I am unsure from the drainage diagram if the rise and fall of the waste water this has been considered by the applicants team and ask for it to be formally considered with them and Southern water before this application is granted.
15. The property is at the beginning of a system that is at that point exceptionally shallow and concerns about flow exist.
16. The aim would be to stop the regular nuisance of smelly sewerage flowing out of shared manholes on neighbouring properties and the road, in front of many.

17 That adequate review is made of the capability of the plan to meet the: Development Quality Standards:

a) That being the ability of the sustainable Drainage systems (SuDS) to actually deliver in the ground water situation of this specific site on Hayling Island.

b) Provide for the sustainable management and maintenance of any new 'common parts' through a legal agreement. That consideration be given to the future legal separation of the two plots to different owners and how this affects the two properties with access to drainage manholes and what type of boundaries should be made in light of the loss of habitat for birds, hedghogs, bats and animals of the road. etc.

18 If granting please also consider Considerate construction policies including restriction on building times between 0800 and 1700 hrs and no bank holidays and weekends.

19 Please also consider how a Scandi house and/or other construction materials will be delivered and still meet the observations on the impact of development on transport on Hayling Island.

20 Please also consider where the waste bins area is to be placed as it appears to be currently next to the bedroom in 89a.

Contd.

21 I attach four photos:

Three that show the current 91 St Thomas Ave,

one front on,

one showing the angle the cars will be leaving the property from any new drive way,

one of the wider street scene which normally does not have cars parked in it,

a fourth of the opposite end of the close where development has been less obtrusive.

In summary this may be an attractive quick win for another housing plot in the Havant Borough but does not meet the councils own standards or the NPPF national guidelines. I would ask for careful consideration of the precedence that may be given regarding the declining nature, character and density of this particular area of Hayling which is not designed with sufficient infrastructure to meet modern housing densities.

Your sincerely

[Redacted text]


89A


89A
33
H1 SPL
T15 PDR




77
Avalon
RE21 KXB
79a