

97 Hart Plain Avenue, Waterloooville P08 8RG

This planning proposal has been carefully studied. We have serious and strong objections to this proposal as it stands.

Mr LeMay the house holder 97 Hart Plain Ave (HPA) was good enough some weeks ago to provide us with copies of drawings of the proposed extension to his property. Our initial thoughts then were that the proposal was much larger than we had been lead to understand in earlier conversations (perhaps our misunderstanding). Now that the formal application has been made to HBC we are able to view in fuller detail the proposed extension.

I have since spoken to Mr LeMay about some of our concerns.

Our main objections to the proposed extension in its current layout are as follows and will be expanded on further:

- 1 The proposal is too large for the plot, is out of scale for the location and will be overbearing as it will be too close to our property at [REDACTED] creating an oppressive impact to our property.
- 2 Due to the close proximity and height of the proposed extension we feel that unreasonable overshadowing would occur with the accompanying effect on daylight and sunlight.
- 3 We have considerable concerns on the actual building process and how this will impact on our lives/property for what could be a significant period of time (due to the size and close proximity of the proposed extension).

1 Appearance and Layout

The proposal more than doubles the footprint of the original house which we feel is too large for the plot/location.

The extension will be far too close to our property at Number [REDACTED] (much closer than any other two properties in the street.)

The site plan (Location & Block Plan P O V2) shows that the wall of the extension will form the boundary. (along with existing fences). This would result in the double storey extension side wall (NW side of the proposed extension) being approximately 1 foot from our boundary fence with property at Number [REDACTED] (and thus approx 4 feet from SE wall of our property, Number [REDACTED]).

If the design of the extension is to be in keeping with the existing building's appearance there will be an additional overhang of the eaves (It is not possible to establish fully from the plans) which could result in rain runoff onto [REDACTED]

We also have concerns due to the proposed roof design of the rear part of the extension which creates a gully between the existing roof and roof of the proposed rear extension which could result in rain runoff onto [REDACTED] especially in periods of heavy rainfall. How will this be prevented? Particularly as in future this will be very difficult to access for maintenance/clearing.

2 Effect on Daylight, Outlook and Privacy

The height and proximity of the proposed extension will severely impact on the amount of daylight/sunlight both to the side (facing SE) and front (East) of our property. There will be areas indoors where the light is severely reduced and outside the property there would be additional areas, compared to present, which would be in shade and these areas would be in shade for longer periods when compared to the present. Outside of the summer months some areas will become permanently shaded.

The double storey extension side wall will extend out far enough to the rear to obstruct around $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way across the downstairs hall window of Number [REDACTED] (as well as being too close). The hall window faces SE. Effectively the view from the downstairs hall window will be of a brick wall 4 feet from that window. Vertically from the window there will be no view or light at all, horizontally there will be very little light. (Particularly as the direction of the sun's movement is from the front of the properties in the morning round to the rear of the properties being behind the proposed extension side wall until well into the afternoon - or longer in the winter).

This will result in a huge reduction the light via the hall window and making the hall area permanently dark. It will also create a requirement for increased use of lighting and increased costs.

We have lived at [REDACTED] for 31 years in June so believe that this window has obtained a legal Right to Light via Prescription having been receiving natural light through into our property well beyond the 20 year requirement. This is gained via the 1832 Prescription Act and applies irrespective of the use of the room.

The increased shadow cast by the proposed extension will place most of the front of Number [REDACTED] and its driveway/garden into shade for most of each day except during the peak summer months when the sun is its highest.

Note: If the shading shown in the submitted 3D drawings is meant to represent shade cast by sunlight from the proposed final building then these are not accurate or representative of the actual situation and are misleading. For example, in drawing number P6, the sun would have to be situated to the NW of the properties to cast the shadows shown rather than the reality of rising in the east, traversing through south to set in the west (rear of properties). The sun has already set, all year round, by the time it is NW of the properties.

There does not seem to have been any study of the impact of the proposed extension on the reduction to daylight/sunlight or the increased shade caused by the proposed extension upon our property at [REDACTED] included in the planning application. This seems to have been ignored and we feel this is a serious omission.

In addition to the huge reduction in daylight/sunlight which will be available indoors via the hall window, the height and close proximity of the proposed extension side wall will block sunlight generally to a large part of our house's side wall which could lead to the increased possibility of damp in what will become a very narrow, quite enclosed area between the side of our property and the new extension wall which will get barely any sun.

We feel that the sheer size and closeness to our property of the proposed extension wall will have an oppressive and detrimental effect on our wellbeing and our living conditions in addition to the loss of light. There is also likely to be the knock on effect of increased lighting use at additional cost to us.

3 Construction period

Whilst understanding that the concerns mentioned in the next section may not be directly considered in the planning application we feel that it is worth expressing our significant worries regarding the construction work.

As the proposed extension side wall will be so close to the existing boundary fence we have concerns as to how, for example, the site will be scaffolded between ourselves and 97 HPA. Already our access to the rear and back garden of our property is very poor. Because of the size of the proposed extension the construction period is likely to be quite lengthy. The narrow path at the side of our house is our access route to the rear of our house. We could not manage without this access. Equally at the front of our property our garage, which we always use to secure one of our cars, will make scaffolding challenging. The garage is a flat roof, board and felted. It is not designed as a walkway or a working platform and we have concerns that the roof could easily be damaged by building materials/tools being dropped. Or worse, the roof being penetrated when our car is in the garage.

If the proposed extension did not come so close to the boundary then all works could be completed from 97 HPA's land which would at least limit somewhat the effect on us.

In conclusion we feel that the current proposal is too large, too close to our property and will be completely overbearing causing unreasonable overshadowing of our property. No doubt it will have some knock on effect to the value and desirability of our property at any future sale. The size and design needs to be reconsidered.

Request

It is requested that a site visit is held by the Havant Borough Council planning committee before a decision is made on this application.