

We have been instructed by (Redacted) to thank you for your letter dated 24th November and to notify you of his **OBJECTION** to this proposal.

It has been noted (from section 10 of the submitted 'Householder' application form) that no pre-application advice was invited from the local planning authority. Furthermore, a Design and Access Statement has not been presented as part of the application, to explain/justify the proposal.

The 'Existing east elevation' shown on drawing no.20175-PL-004 shows that the main two-storey body of the house presently stands the full width of the side garage away from the north boundary. The 'Proposed east elevation' on drawing no.21075-PL-005 shows, however, that two-storey development would extend virtually to the boundary and generate a dominant impact on residents to the north. As the proposal would stand due south of their homes and gardens, it is evident that such an arrangement would result in the loss of sunlight and daylight and have an overwhelming impact that would be detrimental to their outlook. Paragraph 5.08 of the Design SPD states that *"New developments should not result in the loss of light to existing buildings."*

The 'Proposed East Elevation' shown on drawing no.21075-PL-005 shows the eaves and ridge of the side extension at the same heights as those of the existing house. With specific reference to 'Side Extensions', paragraph 5.37 of the adopted 'Design' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that *"The ridge height of the extension can also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage."* As its ridge and eave heights would be the same as the main house, it is evident that the proposed extension would dominate the main frontage, in contravention of paragraph 5.37 of the SPD.

Drawing no. 20175-PL-005 shows a new window at first-floor level above the garage and the "Proposed First Floor Plan" on drawing no.21075-PL-003 indicates that said window would serve the 'Master Bedroom' - a habitable room likely to be in constant use. Our client is concerned that the introduction of a habitable room at first-floor level so close to the common boundary would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy in his modest rear garden.

Drawing no 21075-PL-001 shows that the two-storey north elevation of the house at no.17 presently stands 13.5 metres away from the rear elevation of no.19; the two-storey element of the proposed side extension would reduce that outlook distance by a third, to 9 metres. With specific reference to 'Side Extensions', paragraph 5.38 of the SPD asserts that *"...side extensions which have a negative effect on the gap between the buildings should be resisted."* It is evident that the proposed side extension *would* have a negative effect on the gap between nos.17 and 19 and thereby contravene paragraph 5.38 of the SPD.

Our client objects to the proposed extension because it would dominate the main frontage; would result in the loss of sunlight and daylight to his home and garden; and would, as a consequence of significantly reducing the gap between no.17 and 19, unacceptably reduce the outlook from the rear of his home. For these reasons, it is submitted that this proposal does not satisfy the requirements of the development plan and should therefore be **REFUSED**. If the Officers are minded to a contrary view, it is respectfully suggested that this application should be presented to the Planning Committee for decision, in order that our client's concerns may be reiterated in a personal deputation.

We would welcome confirmation of the safe and timely receipt of this submission and confirmation that this proposal has been refused. Thank you.

Kind regards,

Robert Tutton
Director

Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd
23 Romsey Avenue, Fareham, Hampshire, PO16 9TR