

17, Queen Anne's Drive,
Bedhampton,
Havant,
Hampshire, PO9 3PG

25 May 2017.



Dear Madam,

**Application: APP/17/00451.
11, Queen Anne's Drive.**

I am writing on behalf of myself and my wife to register our objection to the proposed development at number 11 Queen Anne's Drive.

Although not directly affected by the proposed development, my wife and I have lived in Queen Anne's Drive for almost forty years now and we do feel that we should do our best to preserve the amenity of the area.

Our objections are as follows:

1. Parking. Over the years the volume of parked vehicles has increased dramatically and the addition of further accommodation can only exacerbate the problem.

The proposed developers contend that each house will have 2 parking spaces. One of these would appear to consist of a garage. Most, if not all of the houses in this road and nearby Norman Way and Parkside, have garages. Many are used for storage and some have been converted to living accommodation. The reality is that few cars seem to be garaged. Many remain on the road. The occupants of the new houses may have more than two cars per household and may themselves convert the garages to living space.

The situation in Queen Anne's Drive is already bad and worse in Norman Way. The congestion will only be made worse still if the proposed development proceeds.

2. Overdevelopment. The existing property occupies a reasonable size plot with most of the garden to the east. Two houses, each apparently as large or even larger than the existing property on the plot, would have minimal gardens and would look very overcrowded.

It is suggested in the application that the property has an "uncharacteristic gap" in the frontage as if this was an unwelcome and undesirable feature.

To our minds, this is a positive feature giving the existing house a garden proportionate to its size and consistent with the layout of 23, Parkside and 13, Queen Anne's Drive, conferring a welcome element of garden space in an otherwise fully built up environment. The removal of this garden space would be quite detrimental to the street scene.

We would contend that the plot is simply too small to support two 4 bedroom properties.

3. Privacy. One can only sympathise with the owners of the adjacent property at number 6, Norman Way. If the proposed development is approved, they will be overlooked with extensive

high level windows on the south facing elevation of the proposed properties.

With such small gardens proposed, the owners of number 6, Norman Way could justly complain of a loss of privacy and peaceful enjoyment.

4. Brown field redevelopment. There seems to be a suggestion that the proposed development is consistent with the need to prioritise the redevelopment of "brown field" sites. This is not a brown field site. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that "previously developed land" does **not** include land in built up areas such as private residential gardens.

This would appear to be a clear case of "garden grabbing" with the developer anxious to build the biggest possible houses with the smallest possible gardens, having no regard to the amenity of the area.

5. PUSH targets. It is contended that the houses would be suitable to receive solar panels and contribute to renewable energy targets. No evidence is adduced in support of this contention. With the benefit of solar panels ourselves, it is certain that the house as it stands with a south facing aspect would be very suitable to receive solar panels. We are not at all sure that the proposed houses would be so suitable.

Overall, we would contend that the proposed development will cause considerable harm to the character and amenity of the area and we would submit that the application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of J. R. W. West.

J. R. W. West.

Mrs D. Haywood,
Planning Services,
Public Service Plaza,
Civic Centre Road,
Havant, PO9 2AX.