

1. The only change is a change from a double storey side extension to single storey, broadly of the same dimensions as the existing conservatory. There are accordingly consequential changes to the first storey layout, whilst details have been provided of materials specifications for external appearance. All other external proposals remain the same.

Whilst this change is a little improvement, it does not go far enough, and we reiterate that the proposals represent an overdevelopment of this plot which is unacceptable, is contrary to local & national design policy and which have not been justified

2. the proposals should be refused because they do not accord with NPPF paragraph 130 or Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) Policy CS16 (High Quality Design), or the Havant Borough Design Guide 2011. In addition, the proposals represent piecemeal development and no material considerations have been advanced by the applicant which would seek to justify a departure from policy.
3. Despite previous requests there is no accompanying statement of why the proposed changes have been made, or how they comply with local and national policy. The Planning Officers have not asked for any justification or asked for an explanation of how the development avoids impacts on local amenity and local living conditions. Such a justification is essential in order to fully appraise the proposals in the light of local and national policy.
4. Once again we need to restate the main objections to the development on design and amenity grounds. The application should be refused as over-development of the plot and contrary to national and Local Plan policy and representing piecemeal development. In summary, these objections include the following
 - a. The proposals fail to align with the local context of neighbouring properties which comprise single storey dwellings. The proposals over develop the site by producing a composite building whose mass and scale are out of proportion with the original.
 - b. The proposals are the latest in a long list of changes to the site which will result in piecemeal development contrary to sound planning practice. Such changes lack a coherent design and create an unsympathetic and confused building. It also creates a serious risk and precedent for further piecemeal changes to the site.
 - c. A 'family of forms' has not been respected where two storey extensions should be smaller than the main building with reduced ridge heights and similar pitch angles.
 - d. Similarly, the extensions do not look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such as ridge and eaves and brick coursing. The change to hipped roofs from eaves on the d western elevation makes this situation worse.

- e. The new driveway is also incongruous and unnecessary being only required because the way the 'garage' has been built precludes the accommodation of vehicles in the structure and on the existing driveway
- f. Other considerations include the proposed retention of a flat roof on the 'garage', the side extension and the porch, plus the genuine fear by neighbours that at a later stage the applicant could place new windows in the upper storeys of the eastern and northern facades which the neighbours would be unable to resist. Similarly, there are genuine fears that the way the garage has been constructed makes it easier for the applicant to change its use at a later date into residential accommodation

There are serious concerns about the proposed northern extension to the property and the adverse impact this will have on privacy and living conditions of both 81 Southwood Road and 4 Eastoke Avenue. Whilst there are many valid reasons for refusing this application, we are very concerned that the Offices keep repeating the same response that any future changes can be control through conditions and planning enforcement, when sadly over many years, there has been a blatant failure to enforce several previous breaches and the historic evidence of the applicant continuing to ignoring planning controls. Fears of the public about development are a material consideration which can amount to a good reason for refusal even if some people try to say they are not justified. They can rank as part of the human factor in decision making and could be given direct effect as an exceptional or special circumstance. In the present case there is ample evidence that local residents' fears are genuinely held based on the recent planning history of the site and on direct adverse personal experience of the applicant. The perception that this development will be one of many future incremental alterations to the property which will gradually erode local residents' amenity and living conditions is we submit, a material consideration and the weight to be attached is for the decision maker to judge. The objectors therefore urge the Council to accord this consideration such weight as to justify grounds for a reason for refusal.

Due to all these reasons and especially the future fears which we ask you to sincerely consider, we would like to see this application refused. However, if the Council is minded to approve it, a planning obligation is sought stopping any future changes of use or material alterations to the building. This must be included in a legal binding agreement. They realise that such restrictions might be achieved by planning condition, but given the history of the site and the change of use of previous extensions into separate residential accommodation contrary to planning condition, does not give them confidence that planning enforcement will be as effective as a planning obligation.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter