



GBS Designs – Chartered Building Engineers
6 Shillinglee, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 5RW.
Tel 023 9225 8315 or 07881 776793
glenn@gsb-designs.co.uk

FAO Joseph Toole
Planning Officer
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire PO9 2AX

Dear Joseph,

**RE: Application APP/21/01346,
50 Bembridge Drive, Hayling Island, Hampshire, PO11 9LU.**

Further to being asked and appointed [REDACTED] please see below for my comments and observations on the above application:

Design and Access Statement

This document is very misleading, please see below.

Introduction

This document introduces the application as being a *'proposal to completely remodel the existing bungalow to with the addition of two floors and a front extension to create a modern style design'*.

Comparing the existing ground floor against the proposed ground floor, it is hard to see what, if any, of the original structure will remain. Also, given the size and weight of the 'extension', it would appear that less than 1 metre of the rear wall and only 9 metres of a side wall might remain. This means the majority of the existing structure will be removed.

Surely this means a demolition planning permission is required?

Alternatively, a full application for a new dwelling and all that such an application would entail?

Flood Risk

Whilst the ground floor dwelling levels might be raised, the new garage will be below ground level and therefore might cause flooding. Has sufficient waterproofing and/or tanking been incorporated into the design of the garage?

The Site and Proposed Design



GBS Designs – Chartered Building Engineers
6 Shillinglee, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 5RW.
Tel 023 9225 8315 or 07881 776793
glenn@gsb-designs.co.uk

Whilst Bembridge Drive is a road of mixed property designs, these designs are traditional and compliment each other. My client is not someone who tries to halt progress, indeed when she extended her home, a design that complimented both neighbouring properties was chosen.

However, the proposed scheme for No. 50 would appear to have been designed inside out and with little, if any, care given to the external appearance or how it interacts with neighbouring properties and the pleasant seaside environment it would sit within.

Furthermore, the proposed design would be completely out of keeping with the area. Examples of how out of keeping the proposed design would be are 76 and 78 Southwood Road, Hayling Island, PO11 9QF. Both of these dwellings resemble municipal buildings such as a library or a small office block – both of which are buildings that are designed inside out.

Sustainability

Whilst the design and access statement makes grandiose statements about sustainability, the bulk of the statements would be requirements of planning and/or building regulations – nothing else.

The act of demolishing a perfectly serviceable dwelling is in itself an act that is very environmentally unfriendly.

The reality is that very few, if any, of the materials will be locally sourced and even if they are the origin and transportation of them would be far from environmentally friendly.

Conclusion

The conclusion of the design and access statement is entirely self serving.

The reality is that the proposed scheme would have a decidedly detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties and overall environment both aesthetically and on a genuine sustainability level whilst establishing a dangerous precedent of destroying a delightful and peaceful part of the Hayling Island.

Community Infrastructure Levy

I note the applicants are attempting to claim this dwelling as their main dwelling. This might become true but up until now, their main dwelling has been No. 52 Bembridge Drive and that up until now No. 50 has been used as a holiday let with listings on several websites – see below:

1. <https://www.cottages.com/cottages/salty-lodge-ukc3456>
2. <https://simplyseaviews.co.uk/listings/143897/salty-lodge/>
3. <https://www.facebook.com/saltylodge/>
4. <https://www.booking.com/hotel/gb/salty-lodge.en-gb.html>
5. https://www.airbnb.co.uk/rooms/27434263?source_impression_id=p3_1641235145_QNxqgTDFm8wD%2Fnxg
6. <https://www.cottage-choice.co.uk/cottages-Salty-Lodge-UKC3456.asp>



GBS Designs – Chartered Building Engineers
6 Shillinglee, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 5RW.
Tel 023 9225 8315 or 07881 776793
glenn@gbs-designs.co.uk

7. <https://www.lastminute-cottages.co.uk/properties/united-kingdom/england/south-east/hampshire/havant-district/hayling-island/salty-lodge-48123fbd-b2cb-49b6-ac08-575a67c8d970>
8. <https://salty-lodge.business.site/>
9. <https://www.uk-holiday-search.co.uk/accommodation/salty-lodge-hayling-island-hampshire>
10. <https://www.rentbyowner.com/property/salty-lodge-no-50/AB-27434263>

In addition, it worth noting from the above 10 listings that 'Salty Lodge' aka No. 50 Bembridge Drive is listed as having 2 bedrooms not 3 bedrooms as described in the design and access statement. Therefore, the application is to expand the dwelling by a great deal more than is depicted by the drawings, the application form, the CIL forms and the design and access statement.

Also, see note below regarding the proposed bedroom count. Could this property be destined to become a very large holiday let, a holiday HMO/hostel or some sort of holiday retreat?

Drawings

There are numerous errors on the drawings and information missing from them.

Date and Project Number

None of the drawings are dated or have a project number assigned to them. This casts great suspicion upon the validity of the drawings. Are they actually from the highly respected I J Murray Associates practice?

Furthermore, none of the drawings have proper Drawn By or Checked By initials. Which leads to the question/s as to whether this scheme has been designed correctly and checked correctly?

Whilst Ian Murray is fully qualified to handle a project of this size, are his associates suitably qualified? And, more importantly, is the person who designed this scheme suitably qualified?

Furthermore, is this application a genuine Ian Murray application? Ian is a high respected architectural professional, so it is very hard to believe that such an amateurish application has come from his esteemed practice.

Drawing Errors

Drawing A101, Site and Location Plans

The word Existing is missing from the drawing.

The drawing should show the boundary treatments and the location of them, not just mention them.

The Site Plan drawing does not show the vehicle parking arrangements.

The North arrow is correct for the Location Plan but wrong for the Site Plan.

Drawing A102, Floor Plan



GBS Designs – Chartered Building Engineers
6 Shillinglee, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 5RW.
Tel 023 9225 8315 or 07881 776793
glenn@gsb-designs.co.uk

The word Existing is missing from the drawing.
The plan labelled First Floor Plan is wrong, this plan is a Roof Plan not a floor plan.

Drawing A103, Elevations

The word Existing is missing from the drawing.

Drawing A104, Site Sections

The word Existing is missing from the drawing.

Drawing A105, Site Views

The word Existing is missing from the drawing.
The scale is stated as 1:1, this cannot be true and should be shown as Not To Scale.

Drawing A105, Additional Site Views

The word Existing is missing from the drawing.
The scale is stated as 1:1, this cannot be true and should be shown as Not To Scale.

Drawing A111, Site and Location Plans

The word Proposed is missing from the drawing and the Location plan is wrong (it is the same as Drawing A101).
The drawing should show the boundary treatments and the location of them, not just mention them.
The Site Plan drawing does not show the vehicle parking arrangements.
The North arrow is correct for the Location Plan but wrong for the Site Plan.

Drawing A112, B & GF Floor Plans

The word Proposed is missing from the drawing.
On the ground floor it is not clear what of the structure is current or existing. This important as I believe the majority of the existing dwelling needs to be demolished to create the proposed scheme.

Drawing A113, FF & SF Floor Plans

The word Proposed is missing from the drawing.

Drawing A114, Elevations

The word Proposed is missing from the drawing.

Drawing A115, Site Sections

The word Proposed is missing from the drawing.

Drawing A116, Site Views

The word Proposed is missing from the drawing.
The scale is stated as 1:1, this cannot be true and should be shown as Not To Scale.

Drawing A116, Additional Site Views



GBS Designs – Chartered Building Engineers
6 Shillinglee, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 5RW.
Tel 023 9225 8315 or 07881 776793
glenn@gsb-designs.co.uk

The word Proposed is missing from the drawing.

The scale is stated as 1:1, this cannot be true and should be shown as Not To Scale.

Proposed Roof Plan

There is not a Proposed Roof Plan drawing included in the application. Surely this is a requirement of planning law?

General Drawing Errors

Throughout the proposed floor plan drawings the word Room is used rather than designating the rooms. Having looked over the drawings the proposed dwelling could easily become a 6 or 7 bedroom dwelling. This would not be in keeping with the area and would require a much greater CIL charge.

Planning Drawings Errors & Missing Information

None of the drawings show the correct and full address.

None of the drawings show the paper size as which the drawings would be to the stated scale.

None of the drawings show a scale bar.

Proposed Roof Plan – as mentioned above.

Surely these are requirements of UK planning law?

Party Wall etc. Act 1996

Sadly, this piece of law is often overlooked which surprising as it is very powerful being, as it is, an act of parliament and should be taken into consideration most seriously, especially with a project of this size and on ground that is not the most stable to build on.

The excavation of footings to provide foundations will be within 3 metres of No. 50. A proper Block Plan at 1:200 or Site Plan at 1:500 scales would fully show the relationship between No. 50 and both neighbouring properties (rather than just No. 52 which is also owned by the applicants) and hint at how the excavation works could affect No. 48.

Rest assured that if this application to be approved; any adjoining owner would be most certainly advised to use the services of a party wall surveyor and a structural engineer to fully and comprehensively check the proposed scheme. Therefore and relation comments above regarding the drawings, the scheme needs to be correctly designed at this, the planning, stage and not later at the building regulations stage when the approved scheme could be altered.

Summary

Until some of the above are corrected the application should not have been made valid let alone be up for comment and view. The drawings alone make the application invalid as it current stands



GBS Designs – Chartered Building Engineers
6 Shillinglee, Waterlooville, Hampshire, PO7 5RW.
Tel 023 9225 8315 or 07881 776793
glenn@gsb-designs.co.uk

Unless the scheme is radically reduced and altered, the proposed scheme should be withdrawn or refused as it is utterly without merit.

At the very least it should be thoroughly checked, made valid and the whole 8 week process restarted.

I trust the above is of use to and look forward to seeing the application documents revised as detailed above and the application altered accordingly.

Yours sincerely,

Glenn Bramble-Stewart BA CBuildE FCABE AssocRICS MIET