

Richard

Further to our meeting at your offices on 25th March 2014 I have looked at how we could address the points you raised and discussed them with my client.

I have produced a number of revisions as detailed on the attached drawings and we formally request that these are accepted as substitutes for our original drawings.

The amendments are as follows:

North west face of rear section. We have moved this wall away from the boundary so it follows the line of the main northwest wall at a consistent distance from the boundary

We have reduced the rear section by 250mm, as low as we could go before we came to an awkward clash with the front roof section. This reduction is taken off the front and rear eaves of this rear section.

We have prepared a comparative sun study drawing showing the effects of the building at Winter Solstice, Spring equinox, Summer solstice. Please note that Autumn Equinox will be the same as spring.

We suggest that the effect of the building is minimal and well within acceptable reductions as referred to in 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight A Guide to Good Practice, Paul Littlefair (BRE publication).

We have carefully read the objection to the scheme as available on your planning web page. We have extrapolated their points into the following headings and give our responses accordingly:

1.Right to Light/Shadows **As we suggest above and demonstrate with our sun study drawing right to light is unaffected and shadows are minimal and well within acceptable levels.**

2.Amenity Space **As we discussed we have amenity spaces in the front private garden, rear terrace and main courtyard. We were careful to explain this concept in our design and access statement section 3.1-3.3**

3. Long/high walls close to other sites. **We do not consider this an issue but we have widened the distance from building to garden fence.**

4.Garden Grabbing **We do not consider this development to be 'Garden Grabbing', but infilling which is a policy supported on acceptable sites by Havant Borough Council. We consider this to be a reasonable site**

5.Owner of Private Road not notified **The owner of the Private road was served notice on as the planning officer suggested and the public comment stage was duly extended to reflect this.**

6.Design not in keeping with surrounding houses **We do not consider the need to pastiche other house in the area, as an alternative we have produced a good and carefully considered design that responds well to the site and its environs. It is modern and we do not apologise for this.**

8.Three separate roof heights. No dimensions. Blank wall view from rear. **The differing roof heights are an inherent part of the design. There are no blank walls**

9.Future extension to high roof. **We do not understand this objection.**

10. Grass roof becoming eyesore. **We think that a green roof is an appropriate material to use here. We have described it as a green roof which is normally covered by Sedum plants which need little maintenance apart from yearly weeding and feeding.**

11. *Japanese Knotweed at no3/5 West Lane* **We do not have Japanese Knotweed on this site, however this is not a planning consideration.**

12. *Parking danger.* **The road that serves the proposed dwelling is a private road. The parking arrangement is the same for all the existing houses off the private road.**

13. *Rental property. Garden not maintained. Leylandi trunks on site.* **We do not believe this is a planning consideration.**

14. *Kitchen fumes.* **We do not believe this is a planning consideration.**

Stuart

Stuart Bone

BA (Hons) Dip Arch

DIRECTOR

e: s.bone@pwp-architects.com

