

Comments for Planning Application APP/18/00607

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/18/00607

Address: 85A London Road, Cowplain, Waterloooville, PO8 8XB

Proposal: Rear two storey extension to provide 2No. two bedroom flats with rear first floor balcony.

Case Officer: Bee Crawford

Customer Details

Name: Mr and Mrs Colin Tuck

Address: 1 Summerhill Road Waterloooville

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Further to our meeting last week with the representative from Havant Council, we wish to formally complain against the revised plans to this application, as mentioned before we are against the balcony on the grounds that it will overlook our back garden due to its proximity to our fence and patio.

Having looked at the revised plans we are dismayed to see the car parking spaces have been moved so that they now run along the boundary to our property, this we now strongly object to on the following grounds:

1. These parking spaces abut our back entrance; barbecue & patio area - fumes from the cars - particularly (but not exclusively) space 3 that needs 5 manoeuvres to turn in what is a very confined space.
2. There are also two bedrooms at the back of our house and next to the spaces - which will be affected by noise; fumes and light pollution from these spaces. Whilst these spaces are not setting a precedent along this part of London Road, no other spaces are residential and are therefore only in use during office hours - or are situated at the other end of our garden. As mentioned before, Mr Tuck works shifts, the future residents will have the freedom to come and go - 24 hours a day, increasing the probability of disturbing his sleep.
3. The position of the spaces are close to the corner of our property - and due to the lack of space, increase the risk of damage to our property. We have had one fence panel damaged already - if a driver was to hit a panel whilst we were sitting in the garden we could be seriously injured. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] if our house was hit, [REDACTED] bedroom wall could come down. I am sorry, but neither scenarios is acceptable. The plans are proposing too much in too small a space.
4. Looking at the number of manoeuvres required to turn a vehicle in that plot makes the design

questionable, most modern vehicles (SUV's; estates; 4x4's) are too large to pass along the proposed driveway, let alone turn safely in the space provided. Any damage to our fence (or any property our side of the boundary) is not be acceptable - we have two dogs and need the boundaries in place to provide their safe keeping.

5. There has been a question over the boundary line within the last year. It seems that when our property was built, the builder put the fence in the wrong place to avoid a tree - on the condition that the back garden was cleared (and maintained) we let the mother of Mr Passingham change the boundary and keep the land IN GOOD FAITH. One year on, this piece of land is wanted for parking spaces, is currently over run once again; and appears to be harbouring rodents. Thus far we we have kept to our side of the deal - but the Passingham family have not.