

Introduction

Chairman and members of the DMC, thank you for allowing me to represent Mr and Mrs Buckingham this evening regarding the northern ramp on the speed table at the entrance to the Bellway Halyards estate.

I am here to ask for refusal of this retrospective planning application because the current incorrect location of the speed table is causing and has caused demonstrable harm to the Buckinghams.

My suggested reason for refusal is based on model paragraph R133 and is as follows:

The location, shape, size and construction of the northern speed table in relation to the adjacent property at No 3 Hawthorne Grove is detrimental to the quiet enjoyment of adjacent properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy statement 1e.

Furthermore, the speed table as constructed does not comply with Model Condition D61 and this noncompliance causes unacceptable harm to the adjacent property and its occupants.

Two options

There are two options available to the committee this evening.

The first option is to REFUSE permission, and the effect of this choice would be to have the ramp relocated to the approved location that is nine meters south of where it currently is.

The second option is to GRANT permission, which would effectively grant retrospective permission for the location of the ramp where it is.

All consultees (including the Council Arboriculturalist) have confirmed that they are satisfied that the speed table may be constructed as per the original approved plans or as per this planning application. There are no objections from any consultees to either location, and indeed the location as per the original planning applications in 2014 was specifically approved.

Speed table

The purpose of the speed table together with the landscaping design is to reduce the speed of vehicles entering and exiting the development.

Taken together, had the landscaping been implemented in compliance with the approved plans, meaningful speed reductions could have occurred.

Specifically:

1. The kerb stones on the eastern side that were temporarily substituted with lowered kerb stones to allow HGVs to ride the pavement to enter the site have not been replaced with full height kerbs.
2. Tactile paving and the bollard at the entrance on the approved plans have been omitted.
3. The tall hedging on the eastern side of the entrance as on the approved plans and in the Bellway Biodiversity Plan has not been planted.
4. The screening tree at the most northern part of the site died through lack of care, and rather than be replaced as per the approved plans it was cut down at ground level and not replaced.

The latter two items, had they been implemented as per the approved plans, would have restricted visibility into and out of the development so forcing a reduction in vehicle speed and hence the speed of vehicles hitting the speed table and the resultant vibration felt by the Buckinghamshams.

Following suffering noise and vibration, and having had no success in getting the speed table location corrected in 2016, the Buckinghamshams contacted me and asked me for assistance. In December 2016, I asked HBC to enforce compliance with the approved location of the speed table.

Please note that the original plans showed the northern edge of the speed table to the south of the retained oak tree, well away from causing any harm to the Buckinghamshams.

Knowing that Bellway were due to exit the site early in 2017, I have worked with the resident group to encourage Bellway to finish construction as per the plans but have had little success and even an unwillingness of the Council to

engage in any kind of enforcement. Indeed, to avoid enforcement action, we have this request to approve this planning application and the harm caused.

Throughout the development of Halyards, I have experienced unsympathetic responses from Bellway in the resolution of issues. Two examples are the chopping down and cutting up of a telephone pole which was then thrown into a drainage ditch and which took a year to get removed. The second example was over-long screws used to fix notices with the sharp points protruding 30mm the other side of a fence and which children could have grabbed and pieced their hand, this was only corrected after five notifications and six months.

You may ask, what relevance have these comments to this planning application, and the answer is that the applicant has historically been reluctant to willingly comply with approved plans and drawings that were completed with good reason to mitigate the effect of the development.

Summary

I would now like to sum up.

There are two options available to the committee this evening.

The first option is to REFUSE permission, and the effect of this choice would be to have the ramp relocated to the approved location that is nine meters south of where it currently is.

The second option is to GRANT permission, which would regularise the location of the ramp where it is.

All consultees, including the Council arboriculturalist have no objections to the speed table being constructed as approved in 2014.

The consultees who visited came outside the peak traffic window and their presence caused a slowdown in traffic, photos taken of cars from a concealed location show fast moving vehicles not slowing down due to missing landscaping features that would have restricted visibility.

The vibration felt by the Buckingham of vehicles hitting the northern speed table ramp could be significantly reduced by siting the ramp nine metres further south, closer to the original location south of the oak tree.

The speed of the vehicles could be further reduced by enforcing the speed reducing landscaping features in the 2014 approved landscaping plan.

By leaving the speed table as it is, the Buckinghamhs will continue to suffer demonstrable harm. By having the speed table constructed as per the approved drawings, the Buckinghamhs will be able to enjoy a degree of peace and tranquillity that they will not otherwise achieve.

A compromise offer was suggested by myself to Bellway to regrade the existing ramp over 4 kerb stones, but the offer was refused by Bellway.

My plea is for refusal based on model paragraph R133 and is as follows:

The location, shape, size and construction of the northern speed table in relation to the adjacent property at No 3 Hawthorne Grove is detrimental to the quiet enjoyment of adjacent properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy statement 1e.

Furthermore, the speed table as constructed does not comply with Model Condition D61 and this noncompliance causes unacceptable harm to the adjacent property.

Thank you for listening to me.