

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 September 2016 11:08
To: Planning and Development Shared Mailbox
Cc: Havant Auto-Reply
Subject: For the Attention of David Eaves - Planning Application APP/16/00820

Dear Mr Eaves,

Re Planning Application APP/16/00820 – Gladys Avenue

You will probably be aware, my husband, Gary Haskins (17 Lovedean Lane), has sent you a formal letter regarding the above Application and I note that this has now been uploaded onto the Planning Portal. Currently there is one other letter of objection available for viewing. I hope you don't mind me contacting you separately, however I wanted to bring to your attention that I have been advised by two other local residents that they too have sent letters of objection to the Council, but neither of these appear on the Planning Portal website as yet? One was sent before the one from my husband. I was concerned that they may have gone astray?

As you are aware, I live at No 17 Lovedean Lane (on the corner with Gladys Avenue) with my husband [REDACTED]. The Planning Application concerns the small area of garden that was formerly the bottom part of our garden which of course has an external boundary along Gladys Avenue. The garden was divided by developers around five years ago while in the process of redeveloping No 17. Soon after this was done, a planning application was made for the piece of garden to build another house. Several applications and an appeal to erect a two bedroom bungalow have all been turned down due a number of reasons including *'overdevelopment of the area', 'too close in proximity to Nos 13, 15 and 17 Lovedean Lane', 'over-intensive use of the site' and 'overly dense form of development to the detriment of the visual amenities and character of the area.'*

We were totally bewildered to discover that the land is now subject to yet another application to build a two bedroom bungalow. We had been completely reassured by the two previous Refusals that the redevelopment of this garden contravened such fundamental aspects of Havant's Core Strategy that there was no prospect of further attempts to build on the garden. We in fact took advice on this matter before purchasing our house.

The land has apparently changed hands since then and we understand is now owned by a private individual although he has an agent acting for him. This gentleman wrote to us some months ago to say that he had bought the land and intended to build a bungalow for himself [REDACTED] and this was the only way he could afford a home for them both. He stated that he had already met with Planning Officers from Havant and they had advised him that his proposed plans had resolved many of the previous issues/ reasons for refusal on previous applications.

As you can imagine, we were absolutely shocked at this statement as we could not see how fundamental breaches of Havant's Core Strategy could suddenly be overcome when nothing materially had changed? The bungalow would still occupy the same piece of land that had been identified as *'over-development of the area'* last time round. We are at a complete loss to understand why, if it is true, Havant Planning Department would encourage a new application to redevelop this piece of garden when it has already been established formally, that it is in clear contravention of Havant Core Strategy?

The garden now has become an unsightly mess. The new owner advised us earlier this year that he was going to 'tidy up the garden' as it was somewhat overgrown. We thought he meant that he would clear the weeds and brambles and leave the lovely trees. A few weeks later a contractor arrived on a Sunday morning and cut down every tree, bush, shrub and the beautiful roadside boundary hedge. The trees and hedge were very mature having been there since the 1930s and contained nesting birds. We even had a resident woodpecker. I went out and explained all this to the contractor who was not interested. His boss (the owner of the land) turned up a little while later and told us he could do what he liked with the garden. So basically, this small area of garden with trees and shrubs was turned into an ugly brown patch with a metal fence replacing the hedge. He essentially made it look like building plot overnight rather than the garden it really is.

This latest application is basically the same as previous applications for the same bit of garden, but appears to use some different language to the previous applications; for example, the land has historically always been referred to as 'land immediately behind 17 Lovedean Lane, Cowplain', and 'former garden of 17 Lovedean Lane, Cowplain'. It is now being referred to as 'land adjacent to 60 Gladys Avenue, Horndean'. They have subtly changed the address and are now saying 'Horndean' instead of 'Cowplain' (which of course it is), just a subtle change, but enough to make it appear like an entirely different application for a different piece of land. New owner, different plot address/ description.

The new owner has advised that he has enlisted wide support from home owners in Gladys Avenue. Quite honestly the way that the area has been visually transformed from a garden to a building plot (now covered in weeds!) has probably gone a long way to persuade residents of Gladys Avenue that even the proposed bungalow would be an improvement to the unattractive square of brambles and weeds he has created by destroying every tree, shrub and boundary hedge! Left as a garden it could have been quite easily managed had there been a will to do so. We are very worried that because the land now looks like a building plot rather than a garden, any planning application to build on this piece of garden will be looked at more favourably.

For your consideration, at No 17 Lovedean Lane, all our living space, i.e., lounge, dining area, kitchen, master bedroom and a second bedroom are all at the rear of our house with only a small office and storage at the front. All our living takes place at the rear and we currently have an open southerly aspect with a view along Gladys Avenue. This would all be gone and we would be completely overlooked. Our garden is small, but we have an open south facing aspect at the rear, one of the main reasons we bought the house. Our only open aspect is the rear aspect as we are closed in to the other three sides by buildings. The erection of this bungalow would effectively box us in on all four sides.

I realise that you must receive many letters and emails like this and appreciate that you have to make decisions based on fact, not emotion. The very real facts here though are that this situation is causing my family and my close neighbours a great deal of stress, worry and anxiety. I would be very happy for you to visit my home, as would my neighbours at 15 and 13 Lovedean Lane so that you could see for yourself how incredibly close this house would be to us and how it would impact our lives.

Thank you so much for your time,

Yours sincerely,

Dr Bernadette Martin-Haskins

17 Lovedean Lane, Cowplain, PO8 8HH

Dr Bernadette Martin BSc DC FMCA
President, MCA



The information transmitted by this e-mail is private and confidential and is intended for the use of the recipients specified therein. If you are neither an intended recipient nor an employee or agent responsible for delivery to an intended recipient, you should be aware that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please notify us immediately.

Whilst all efforts are made to safeguard inbound and outbound emails, we cannot guarantee that attachments are virus-free