

From: Gary Tester [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 July 2016 [REDACTED]
To: Heather Lealan
[REDACTED]

Subject: HAYLING BILLY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT APP/16/00568

Heather Lealan
Planning Development
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

APPLICATION NUMBER APP/16/00568

Please see below objections and comments on the above application for your consideration please.

- **Scale and Density and Visual Impact** – The building at three stories high is very imposing and out of character with the area. It would have a major impact due its scale and density, stark white windows and the fact that building would be on an existing open car park space. A high rise brick building of three storeys would adversely impact the street scene onto Elm Grove.
- **Car Parking** – The proposal is for 16 one bed and 17 two bed for residents 60 or over. At age 60 car driving is a regular daily activity and therefore 23 car parking spaces would not be sufficient. There is no on road parking in the area and the developers should surely not be permitted to allow the public car park to be used as mitigation for failing to provide sufficient parking within the boundary of the development. Please also refer to the Inspectors report on the Churchill Appeal which states with regard to the public car park that *'most spaces were occupied at the time of my visit'. Further comments included 'on-street parking is very scarce' - 'the scheme is unlikely to provide sufficient parking spaces to meet all the needs that it generates for parking for residents, visitors and support staff' - 'competition for parking is from the shops and other businesses' - 'the lack of parking could have adverse consequences for the vitality of the district centre'.*
- **Design and Access Statement** – 2.3 annotated opposite the proposed development it states 'Local Amenities and Shops'. The only shop for regular daily/weekly use is the Coop.
- **Planning Statement** – The Development Plan:
 - CS1 - Is there an identified housing need for yet more retirement homes given the already acknowledged pressure on the health and dentistry facilities on the Island and the very limited (if any) social amenities for retired people in the vicinity?
 - CS11 - Can the trees be retained safely given the closeness to the proposed building – see tree section below?
 - DM2 – the current site provided a community facility with the name of the public house having some heritage status. The proposed development would not provide a community facility.
 - DM7/DM8 – what are the range of services and facilities close by for the proposed residents?
 - DM11 – please refer to comments on the Transport statement.

- 78 Not within easy walking distance of the main district centre for older residents.
- 85 What are the other retirement schemes in the vicinity? This is not positive but of much concern as it could adversely impact the local amenities on Hayling Island.
- 86 the car parking on site is not sufficient there is no on street parking. Pressure already exists on the only public car park in the vicinity.
- **Refuse Collection** It is noted that Chris Haynes, Operational Services Manager states in his response that ***'We need to ensure that there is a suitable location with room to accommodate sufficient residue/recycling bins for the bi-weekly collection, which is also easily accessible for collection by the operatives'***. The proposed location for the bin stores are considered inappropriate and should not be accessible from Elm Grove, particularly as these would obstruct the pedestrian crossing. If approved the design of the building should be changed to allow the bin stores to be accessed from St Mary's Road and emptied from within the site boundary. It is worth commenting that the proposed development of the Pullingers site by Churchill's, recently declined by the Planning Inspectorate at Appeal, stated that ***there was no dedicated service area and collection of waste from Elm Grove was not appropriate; the proposed development should be reviewed to allow the refuse to be collected from within the site boundary. It was further commented that collection from Elm Grove would cause obstructions.***

Servicing arrangements – Has adequate provision and analysis been completed to ensure all required access to the site for all appropriate vehicles can be achieved with the necessary turning provision provided (eg ambulances, refuse vehicles etc)?

- **Statement of Community Involvement –**

- **Executive Summary** At the meeting attended on 12/5/16 we made observations regarding scale and density, height and massing and car parking issues **as well as major concerns over the proposed site of the refuse collection facility on to Elm Grove and the lack of amenities in the area for the proposed population and how the trees could be protected. In addition, no consideration had been given to how construction traffic would access the site, storage of materials and very importantly where the construction employees would park.** No comments relating to the issues in bold above seem to have been included in the May 2016 paper. Many of these issues were also commented on in the written feedback provided.

- 3.1.1 - 4.1 given that there have been no changes since the public consultation in the scale and density, height and massing, refuse collection etc it is not considered that the requirement for the following has been addressed **'... that local people are involved in the development management process as early as possible'**.

- 4.4 **'.....gives local people the change to influence proposals at an early stage in the development process....'**

- 3.1.2 – **'To provide the community with a genuine opportunity to provide feedback on the plans'. To allow people to be actively involved in the process'. 'To identify and address any issues raised by the local community and stakeholders'.**

- **Parking (page 10) – Parking requirements for visitors/Bentley Walkers and visitors to school, height of the development on Elm Grove.**

- 3.10.3 (page 19) – Remains as three storeys in height – also it is proposed to have balconies which could overlook existing properties in the location. Car owning for those at age 60 is still very common – many people are still driving at 75+

- **Transport Statement –**

- 2.6 Elm Grove shops, Health Centre and Dentist (if any vacancies exist) are at least a third of a mile away.

- 2.9 what is the relevance of the reference to cycling? what is the average age of the residents?

- 3.17 this is disputed. There will be increased traffic from St Mary's Road (SMR). The current car park which exits into SMR is very small; the majority of shoppers/parents parked in the car park which exited onto Elm Grove.

- 3.20 Concern over the refuse servicing onto Elm Grove and so close to a pedestrian crossing.

- 4.3 Same comments as under 3.17

- **Trees** The Trees survey report accompanying the application clearly states under section 6.3 that 'ideally building lines should be at least 2m outside of the root protection area to provide working space for construction, however, protection measures can be taken if such, **in isolated cases**, is not achievable. Service runs should be routed outside the root protection area'. **Whilst the retention of the trees is very welcome, the trees health and well being must be protected and it is difficult to see how this requirement can be met given the size and scale of the proposed development and its proposed close proximity to the important retained trees.**

- **Trees – 6.4** it states that 'consideration must be given to future tree growth and orientation ie adverse shading and blocked views from windows raise concerns for incoming residents, which may lead to pressure to fell or remove trees in the future. **It is very important therefore to ensure the proposed development, if approved, is smaller to allow the trees to mature and survive with no risk of felling.**

The area is designated as part of the district centre providing amenities for the local community, and an application for yet more retirement homes is not appropriate for this area. It is respectfully requested that the application is declined.

However, if minded to consider, given also the Churchill's application for yet more retirement homes, a reduced number of apartments would enable a two storey building more in keeping with the area with adequate on site parking provided which would reduce the pressure on all local amenities and the retained trees. The summary from the Churchill's Appeal Inspector stated '*...some potential for economic harm to the district centre. The harm could outweigh the social and economic benefits of the housing and retail development such that this would not be a sustainable development in terms of either the development plan or the National Planning Policy Framework.*' *'The benefits of the development do not outweigh the design defects of the submitted scheme and it's resultant conflict with the development plan. In any case most of the benefits should be capable of achievement in a scheme with a better design and layout albeit that this may require a reduction in the number or size of the units of accommodation.'*

If the Churchills application is eventually approved and this site is similarly developed the ensuing traffic and parking chaos should not be underestimated if the developments are constructed in the same timeframe.

We hope that the above comments can be considered in assessing this application.

Gary and Liz Tester