

Beach Cottage
1D Beach Road
Emsworth

Mrs Rachael McMurray
Planning Development
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant PO9 2AX

3rd July 2017

Dear Mrs McMurray

Ref: Planning Application - APP/17/00633 – Objection

I am writing to you to notify Havant Borough Council of my **objection** to the proposed development at Orchard House, Western Avenue. I believe that the intensity of the proposed dwelling, the footprint and height is completely out of character with the appearance of the area.

In writing this objection I acknowledge the need for housing in the area. However a dwelling for 50 residents with balconies and open-roof spaces is not appropriate for this residential area, the poor design allowing residents and visitors direct view of my family living space and bedroom as well as neighbouring homes. The siting of parking for residents and visitors, and the access road, will be within 5m of my family's living space causing significant noise and light pollution as well as compromising our security. Furthermore the soil and drainage problems pose a risk of flooding of our home, Brook Garden and Beach Road homes. This is of great concern and has not been addressed in the planning application.

I am also concerned that this development is already being marketed and advertised and as of 3rd July is viewable on the McCarthy and Stone website. The proposed ***“luxurious range of two bedroom apartments”*** does not offer housing to meet residents' needs as part of a local community; it is not sympathetic to its neighbourhood.

I ask that this application be rejected on the basis that it will cause significant harm to the occupants of Beach Cottage (1D Beach Road) as well as numerous nearby homes.

I have outlined in more detail the main objections.

1. Impact on the character of the Area

The proposed site will be located in a residential area consisting of 6 two storey family homes in Western Avenue and backing onto family homes in Beach Road. The scale of the development, moving from a single home of up to 4 members to a residence of up to 50 residents, is out of keeping with the community and residential nature of the area. The proposed 25 two bedroomed flats, with additional communal facilities, will dominate the area and the surrounding homes.

A three storey 56m block of housing will dominate the outlook from homes in Beach Road, overlooking their gardens. The proposal is completely out of character in terms of scale and design, the current existing average house frontage being just under 18m.

This is in clear breach of the Policy DM7 that ‘the setting for the building is in keeping with the surrounding area’.

2. Impact on outlook of Beach Cottage, 1D Beach Road

The proposed development is 3 storeys high and will be immediately adjacent to a 1.5 storey home (Beach Cottage). The Cottage is 7.5m high and the proposed development is 17.49 m high. It will completely dominate the cottage, blocking the outlook from this property.

Our living space – kitchen & dining room & living rooms - all face south looking directly onto the current Orchard House garden. Residents of the proposed development will be able to gain a clear view of the Cottage living space and into one of the bedrooms. **All privacy will be lost. This is in clear breach of Policy CS16 as the design does not take into consideration the neighbouring properties with respect of outlook, overlooking and privacy.** Indeed the balconies and roof space (shown in the proposal with people viewing the surrounding area) indicates to that the design is not appropriate for a residential area such as Orchard Garden.

3. Impact of parking and visitors

The noise and disturbance will be extensive with each flat generating 4-5 vehicle journeys per dwelling. This does not take into account district nurses and GPs, other health staff, family and friends, internet deliveries. The impact of pollution has not been taken into account. One member of Beach Cottage suffers from asthma and this will be of concern.

I acknowledge that ‘parking will be considered on a site by site basis’ (in line with Policy DM13) but the proposal is for 25 *two bedroomed flats*. This indicates that it is likely to have more than one resident each flat. In addition the marketing is promoting easy access to the property by visitors e.g. **“there’s even a smart and comfortable on-site lounge where you can**

meet up for a chat with friends and neighbours” which leads me to assume that will be even more on and off site movements.

The shopping habits, increasingly of the over 60s, is for food deliveries – particularly where there is no large supermarket (nearest is Havant which is 2-3 miles away). The proposed 28 car parking spaces, including visitors, is inadequate for a development of this scale. It does not allow for deliveries and visitors. The spill over will be into Beach Road that already operates as overflow for visitors to local care homes, as well as visitors to the Beach and homes in Beach Road. The additional 100 vehicle movements will compound the heavy traffic on Havant Road, turning out of Beach Road and Western Avenue already being problematic.

At the first consultation, Mr and Mrs Stepien raised concerns that the smaller parking area (now notated as 8 visiting spaces) and access road is directly adjacent to their living space. There has been no acknowledgement of this concern or adjustment made in the final planning application. Beach Cottage kitchen and dining and living room areas are exactly opposite the visitor car parking (where the shed is in the photo below), there is only 5m distance between the only opening for the dining area and the road/parking. The upstairs bedrooms will be able to hear the vehicle movements. As well as noise, the impact of lighting in the parking area (as well as pathways), lights from vehicles coming in, turning and going out will be significant.



This photo shows the small patio area and that the road will run the length of the garden and patio. Where the shed is will be where the parking will be – in fact the proposals show it starting at the boundary wall. The brick wall between the cottage and parking is only 1.7m high. We will have no idea who would be coming and going at any time of the day or night. The security of

the family members of Beach Cottage will be compromised, in particular as these spaces are designated for visitors.

There will be significant disturbance, noise and pollution from 100 movements (4 per flat not incl visitors/deliveries) per day, this would mean one movement every 21 minutes within 5m of our living space. If movements are late at night, there will be disturbance to the family's sleeping arrangements. The photo below shows how close the parking and road would be to the kitchen/dining room.



I believe that this road and car parking cannot be built so close to the living area of a property and will cause significant harm to the occupants of Beach Cottage.

The refuse room for up to 50 residents will have significant impact on both 1D Beach Road and Clarement. Refuse for this number of residents being placed adjacent to both these homes is unacceptable and contrary to policy DM7. In addition to this the mobility parking space is also at the back of the property – all close to 1D Beach Road and backing onto other Beach Road properties.

5. Impact on drainage flood risk

There are three main issues that the proposal has not addressed and are of significant concern for Beach Cottage, and Beach Road homes.

i) Foul sewage

It is proposed that there is a new foul sewer from the proposed development to go into the existing sewer pipe in Western Avenue at manhole 0801. This

manhole has a flood detector because of previous flooding in the early 2000s. This is because there have been previous sewer overflows which continues to be a risk for Brook Garden properties 68, 70, 72. The addition of sewerage from 50 new residents will increase the risk – it will be a 1,000% increase in foul water into a manhole already designated as a flood monitor on currently existing flow rates.

The submission does not address how the increased risk of foul sewage will be dealt with given the current problems in the area.

ii) High ground water and surface water drainage

The natural slope on the proposed development is south east, surface water drainage being towards the Beach Road back gardens and Vine House, the overall site level drop is stated as 0.95m. This is a significant slope and will take away surface drainage from the proposed development into adjacent gardens, the drainage issue being further made worse because existing Orchard House surface drainage goes into the main sewer – this will no longer be allowed!

The proposed development surveys stated that surface water flooding is of low risk. However, the recent builds at 1D (back of 1A Beach Road) and 48 Beach Road were subject to foundation problems due to the low water table winter in 2016-17 with ground water surface levels being 16cm below the surface. The previous two winters of 2014-15 and 2015-16 saw standing water of plus 30cm for more than ten days in the garden at the site of the new cottage 1D Beach Road. Standing water in the gardens of all the properties adjacent to the new build is the norm when there are heavy rainfalls even in summer.

The issue of flooding to the back of Beach Road properties and Vine House will be worsened by a building that will occupy 5 times the footprint of the existing house, surrounded by more hard-standing (paths, patio and car parks). The loss of the trees and habitat will compound the problem of surface standing water that affects many gardens. This was expressed clearly by ourselves at our first consultation meeting – there is nothing in the proposal to alleviate our concerns.

The submission does not explain how the increased surface water will be fully addressed given the current problems of the Beach Road and Brook Gardens. This issue was raised at our first consultation and no consideration appears to have been given to the problems of the Beach Road properties.

Beach Cottage has been built, using piling due to the poor soil and high ground water, and is now at risk of flooding from any run-off from the extensive proposed building and reduction in natural drainage from loss of habitation etc. The family is very concerned that the Cottage itself will be at risk of flooding. The following photos show the flooding in Beach Cottage property – one in summer and one in autumn.



iii) Holding Tank

The application confirms that the soil is not suitable for surface water soakaways. It is proposed to collect surface water into a storage tank and to pump into a new surface drainage sewer running along Western Avenue, uphill to the manhole 9951 in Havant Road. The documentation states that the holding tank will be unable to discharge sufficient water during heavy prolonged rainfall due to the pumping restrictions (7.5 Such-Salinger-Peters). **Our experience is that the current surface water drain in Havant Road does not cope in heavy downfalls. Where will the surface water go in heavy downfalls if it cannot go into the Havant Road drain?**

The provision of a holding tank is not shown where it is and of what type. If it is underground in soil that has poor infiltration (see the Foul and Surface Water Drainage Assessment by Such-Salinger-Peters) the effect is likely to displace even more water in all directions including standing surface water. **The information in the proposal is not clear on how this tank will solve the issues, where it will be placed, size and material. What impact will it have on taking up even more ground space?**

6. Impact on the habitat

The development will remove many of the many trees, wildlife and shrubs on the site on which the quality of our environment depends and we would ask that the Council should satisfy themselves that there is no adverse impact on species of importance (see *Bat Protected Species*)

Given that planning law includes a special duty on Councils to preserve trees it is considered that in this context the proposal should be critically examined with regard to trees, both on and off the site. Permission should not be granted if there is adverse impact on existing trees and shrubs, either through explicit harm evident from the proposals or from impact on those to be retained over time.

The site includes a small wood on the western border where there are plans to put a car park. Crucially is the fact that Pipistrelle Bats are roosting in the trees in the wood on the western edge of the Orchard House site, they can be seen flying around the wood at dusk onwards. Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and it is illegal to harm them or disturb their roost sites. We would ask the Council to consider the effect of the development on this and any other protected species.

7. Supply of housing land

This objection acknowledges the need for housing and understands the pressure on the council to fulfil its obligations. However the presumption in favour of development must be countered by the appropriate nature of the development, and whether an improved development could better provide to meet the needs of the area.

Residents have been informed that the Council has undertaken an assessment of housing need with other Councils in the area. From my

understanding it is likely that the current five year housing need may, on the basis of latest Government figures, be less than the joint study indicates. The developers have already drawn on the housing need as a support for their policies. However this argument is now very much watered down, in the light of (a) the Supreme Court decision (which was not available when they spoke to residents) and (b) the reduced Government calculations of housing requirements (available to them but not revealed).

Any argument regarding the absence or otherwise of a five year supply of land is required to be tempered (through the Supreme Court decision, and the impact of Policy AL1) by a weighing of the adverse impacts of the development and conflict with policy. Key factors in this respect are the impact on the character of the area, the inadequate access arrangements, and the risk of increased surface or groundwater flooding.

I believe the objections detailed in this letter all point to the need to refuse the planning application.

Yours sincerely

Dwynwen Stepien