



08/08/19

Planning Officer,
Planning Development,
Havant Borough Council

Dear Sir/Madam,

Further to our objection raised via comment on the Havant Planning web-site – we would like to confirm our objection to Planning Application **APP/19/00362** .

Our grounds are three-fold :-

1. Errors/inconsistencies/gaps in the application
2. Noise and environmental issues
3. Area preservation

1. Application :-

- a. The application form item #5 is for the build of 3 pods. There is no mention therein regarding change of use yet the council description in their letter to us is for both build of pods and change of use.
- b. The application form item #6 states the use is as a Care Home. This is fundamentally incorrect as the building is currently classified as a Residential Dwelling (C3). Further, this misrepresentation might be seen as giving weight to the validity of building the 3 pods which is not appropriate.
- c. The address given by the applicant in the additional information document is given as Milton House , yet the name of the residence referenced in the actual application is Stanford Lodge. Further, as the current building designation is C3 – the implication that the applicant is resident at this address via application form item #2 would be at odds with the classification since there are already 6 residents.
- d. The application form item #10 states there are no trees on the site being developed. This is incorrect.
- e. The application form item #13 says the sewage disposal method is unknown. This detail is important as it may affect existing capacities for sewage extraction or may imply the use of cesspit or other. The latter options might have significant impact on the environment and on traffic to the site. Omission of the solution should bring into question the complete validity of this application.
- f. We would question the validity of the answer to form item #18 in the application. If 3 new residents are added then presumably some addition to staffing will be required.

2. Noise and Environmental issues :-

- a. Some of the existing clients at the home already create significant noise for the neighbourhood. On one occasion last year loud cries for help and for police assistance were quite clearly heard and on others significant noise from a resident or residents banging the wooden gate.
- b. The application states that the staff car-share. We would contest that this is not consistent with the observed increase in on-street parking on Fourth Avenue near the entrance to the road leading to #18 since the beginning of service. Being on a blind corner this additional parking increases the possibility of accidents occurring.
- c. In the Consultee comments document there is reference to the potential for a staff member to be occupying one of the proposed pods (thereby reducing the SRMS charge). This would be at odds with the application being stated as building 3 pods for independent living.

3. Area Preservation

- a. The proposed development of 3 residential pods constructed with a render finish and flat roofs is not in keeping with the surrounding area of residential housing. The surrounding buildings are brick built and mostly of Victorian origin. As such, the development would seem to represent a reduction in visual amenity of the area.

I would add that as a Vice Chair for a local charity which supports disabled children and young adults in the Portsmouth and surrounding areas, I do support the wish to provide the best care and support – both for the individuals and for their families. For that reason we raised no objection when the Residence was created back in 2017. At that time we were assured that resident numbers would be capped at 6 and that there would (and could) be no expansion. Also at that time we had not been subjected to the noise levels that have since prevailed.

In practice, the environment within the residence has led to a noise level within the neighbourhood which is at best disturbing and at times distressing. Put simply, if this were a normal residence – the frequency and level of the noise would have led to us making regular complaints to the authorities. We're now concerned that our tolerance to-date will potentially be 'rewarded' by additional residents and more disruption.

As an aside to our objections noted above, we can't envisage how 3 new residents (apparently more capable individuals) will be helped by living within the stress-laden environment that local residents can quite clearly hear on a regular basis.

We would ask that our all our objections herein are noted and passed to the appropriate planning officer.

Yours sincerely,

