

OUR RESPONSE TO THE AGENT'S RESPONSE TO OBJECTION

This document is a response to the agents' response to the application which attempts to address our objections, we have responded as per the titles of the agent's response

Pre-Application Process

We cannot comment on the pre application process as we were not consulted

But the comment was made

'It is therefore important to recognise that many of the matters now raised within the neighbour representation are not new concerns. They are issues that were considered extensively during the pre-application process and were specifically addressed during the evolution of the design.'

We feel that to fundamentally argue that they had considered, taken into account and addressed our likely objections before we made them seems both unreasonable and presumptuous, and to potentially prejudice the decision by stating

'During this process, the scale and massing of the development, its relationship with neighbouring properties, the character of the surrounding area, residential amenity considerations and the application of the 45-degree guideline were discussed in detail. The findings and recommendations arising from those discussions informed the development of the scheme'

again, seems unreasonable, if it did inform the decision as stated we would argue that it did not inform it sufficiently.

The final statement in this section

'The proposal before the Local Planning Authority is therefore the result of a considered design process informed by professional planning advice, technical assessment and consultation with neighbouring occupiers.'

At no point in this process where we as direct neighbours consulted so this statement is incorrect.

Neighbour Consultation

The agent states

'[LPA note: the agent has provided details of the consultation taken prior to submission of the application which related to neighbouring properties – we have not published this in full to protect the privacy of the parties concerned] Whilst we fully respect the neighbour's right to object to the application, it is important that the Local Planning Authority is aware that meaningful consultation took place prior to validation and that changes were made to the proposal as a direct consequence of that engagement.'

We do not believe this statement to be correct; Other than casual verbal exchanges, we were not consulted during the pre-application stage and were finally sent plans on the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the main application having been submitted earlier that day. This obviously means we were not consulted in the way described in the application and the response to our objection.

We are also concerned that the agent claims to have recorded details of the consultation, if these exist, they were undertaken without our permission and we have no knowledge or record of them.

45-Degree Assessment and Residential Amenity

We do have concerns relating to whether the proposal may be in breach of the 45-degree guidance and welcome an independent measurement to address these concerns although regardless of the outcome we still believe the proposal has a significant impact on our amenities for the other reasons stated.

Scale, Massing and Relationship to the Boundary

The argument that they have considered the scale, massing and two storey proximity to the boundary and therefore it is addressed is again questionable, if so we feel they have not considered it sufficiently. Again, the statement that

‘also, through direct discussions with neighbouring occupiers’

Is not correct in our case.

We genuinely believe that if this neighbour consultation had happened in a more timely manner with plans been sent to us for consideration and possible amendment before the application was submitted. Most, if not all of our concerns could have been addressed.

Submitted Drawings and Visual Representations

The agent states

‘Whilst these images assist in communicating the proposal, the application should ultimately be assessed against the submitted scaled and dimensioned drawings, which accurately define the size, position and form of the development.’

These images were submitted as formal documents and part of the planning application to help influence a favourable decision. If they are incorrect or give a distorted view of the proposal, they should not be included. To state the decision should only be based on some of the submitted documents is very questionable.

Conclusion

We continue to be concerned by the impact of the proposal on our property and also on the existing street scene for the reasons previously stated and would ask that the application be considered in the context of its impact on its neighbours and the street scene and with reference to the relevant planning policies and guidance including Havant Borough Design Guide and in particular section 4.2 table 4.1 referring to building line and setback and enclosure.