

Your ref: APP/17/00352



Keith Buckingham
3 Hawthorne Grove
Hayling Island
PO11 9DW
21 June 2017

Dear Mr Kennedy

With reference to your recent letter concerning the former site 1 Hawthorne Grove I vigorously oppose this planning application. Since the 18th August 2014 we have experienced continual disturbance from this development at Halyards which has caused damage to my property.

During the pre-party wall act survey I was given a set of plans by a Bellway surveyor which clearly showed the traffic calming measure to be in a different place to its present location which is alongside my property.

Now that this development is complete we still experience vibrations during the continual flow of traffic on and off the estate when motorists are not slowing down on the approach to the ramp, added to the fact that they are not complying with the speed limit which I understand is now 20MPH.

I have appealed to Bellway (Wessex) the constructors of this site and to their chief executive officer at the Head Office in Newcastle. This resulted in a visit from a surveyor employed by the company to view the cracks in my bungalow which have appeared over the development period. Her report clearly stated that the damage caused could have been due construction work but as my home was not part of the party wall inspection this could not be proved. What has been proved by the party wall inspection report is that my driveway which is now cracked in several places was in good order at the time and this is stated in the survey. I once again wrote to Bellway (Wessex) and was told that no remedial work would be carried out.

My local councillor appealed to Bellway on my behalf and also I wrote to parliament about this matter and as a result I was contacted by our MP Alan Mak. We met and discussed this problem and he contacted Bellway and the planning department at Havant Borough Council on 1st March 2017 asking them to look into this matter. As a result of this further contact with the company an engineer visited me and again repeated that no remedial work would be carried out admitting that they knew the traffic calming measure was in the wrong place and that they were applying for retrospective planning to have it left in its current position.

Before a decision is made over this application I would welcome a visit from someone in the planning department to see the damage. As this ramp serves no purpose and being the only one on the whole estate I would suggest it be removed completely or levelled out over a longer gradient to the approach to the raised area in the hope we can get on with our lives and not have to suffer this continual disturbance.

Yours sincerely

Keith Buckingham

