

Dear Lesley Wells

Your Reference: APP/19/00421

Thank you kindly for your notification regarding the above application.

I am afraid I must still very strongly object. Sadly, All my previous points still stand.

I continue to be hugely concerned about the application's extremely close proximity to No 9's western boundary.

The history of Planning permission along Western Parade appears to have allowed for one meter boundary spaces between each house.

This also allows for the attractive vistas between each building to be consistently maintained for not only now, but the future.

Planning submissions, showing less than this, have been turned down on this basis due to not conforming to Havant Planning policy guidelines. Reference No 8 and No 7 Western Parade.

When considering the design for No 9 Western Parade, maintaining a single storey element to allow for separation between builds and vistas through was a pre-requisite based on the clear guidelines the council established for both the designs for No 8 and No 7.

The problems with less than one meter in this situation is particularly exacerbated.

Illustrated by the photographs below.

1. The Roof Plan on the current application you have received does not show accurately the existing overhang/gutterings into No 9. It shows the boundary wall line, so is very misleading.

2. Therefore when examined it becomes apparent (as confirmed by my builders) that the new adjoining wall extension would also in part overhang/intrude onto No 9.

3. At a one story level (since they now also propose knocking down 1.1735m of the existing boundary wall) it becomes an even more of a harmful upsetting intrusion. + The roof overhangs/gutterings on both properties become much closer (nearly parallel) - making future maintenance for both a real problem.

4. It does not solve the massing which overshadows all other houses on Western Parade. This massing has, I believe, been commented on by most if not all the 23 objections you have received.

5. There is no agreement between No 9 and 10 properties, no request asking for, no permission granted:- for building a new roof, installing skylights ... from No 9's land.

No 10 is allowed access "for the sole purpose of inspecting, cleansing, repairing, renewing maintaining and painting the eastern wall of the new building and the windows and window frames in the said wall and the eaves spouts gutters and pipes of the new building which overhang the land.....' Said land referring to No 9 Western Parade.

Further legal advice is needed, however it is clear from the advice already received that the new building cannot be constructed as proposed without encroachment, would be an intrusion and have a significant impact on the amenity into my property.

6. There was mutual Agreement reached between **all** parties at the meeting chaired by Lulu Bowerman - that the whole length of the *new* build wall along their eastern boundary would be acceptable to all with a One Meter boundary space. I do not understand why this has not been enacted. It merely took approx 400mm off a Utility Room which they confirmed left them plenty of space for washer/drier etc...

I am deeply sorry for all of your extra time and work needed due to this good honest agreement not being enacted upon.

6. Southern Water:- State that work is needed 0.18m from No 9's boundary. This boundary line is still not shown accurately on No 10's Block Plan and Southern Water, I think, have not visited the site. Further clarification is needed on this and a site visit requested to Southern Water, especially important as it involves the sewer serving us all!

They also 'find unsatisfactory lack of proposals to amend the development site layout to maintain the public sewer statutory standoff distance of 3m.'

Is this something the council request? I am sorry I am not sure how this works.

Below photographs illustrating my earlier points.

I would also like to take this opportunity to comment on Mr Potter's recent council web site posting regarding No 9 stating "It has been confirmed it was built incorrectly to the approved planning drawings."

The planning enforcement officer when on site stated the building was merely three quarters of an inch out on one corner. The very crooked back of the garden boundary fence was incorrectly drawn. On August 30th her letter confirmed a clean bill of health regarding the building. Perhaps this incorrect submission should be removed for clarification purposes? My builders have done an excellent job of great accuracy - this misleading posting somewhat insulting them.

With many thanks and apologies again for the many difficulties being faced by you and so many with this application.

