

Letter to Aaron Wright
Planning Department
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX



2nd December, 2013

Dear M/s Wright

Re: Application No. APP.13.01037 Development: adj. 3 Montgomery Road – renovation of garage for 1 bed apt.

We are aware of two responses to our planning application for the above address and would wish to give our responses to these comments.

Response to Neighbour's comments of 12th November 2013:

We would like to make it absolutely clear that the building is not derelict. The building has been the subject of some vandalism in the past but our client has always been at pains to repair the damage in good time. The reason for this is twofold. Firstly he believes that vandalism if left un-repaired will encourage yet more vandalism. Secondly, our client has constantly used the garage building for storage of his belongings. Indeed, it has its own metered electricity supply and has a working heating and lighting system. This use remains to this day.

This application is for the plot adjacent to No. 3 Montgomery Road. The parking at No. 31 Bellair road although already adequate without the use of the garage site is we feel not a consideration for this application. The parking proposed for the new dwelling is sufficient within the Hampshire minimum parking standards that Havant Borough Council work with.

My client was careful to brief us that he wished that the residents of No. 3 Montgomery road were little affected by the proposals. That is why the modestly tall addition to the building is to be built in the corner furthest away from them. We have no overlooking windows from the extension facing onto this property. The rooflight is a replacement for one that currently exists.

The floor to height has purposely been kept to the barest minimum to reduce the impact of the modest vertical extension and as there is a backdrop of trees, a simple timber board cladding seems to be the most appropriate material to be used.

Although not specifically mentioned in their letter we did check the proposals in terms of loss of daylight. Not only does the extension satisfy the standard 25° Section in plane perpendicular (BRE Site layout planning for Daylight and sunlight a guide to good practice) to any window of No. 3 Montgomery Road, as this rule is normally accepted for a full linear

building, and this extension is only 4.6m wide, the daylight reduction is far below the maximum reduction allowed. Please note that this ignores the effect that the trees along the western boundary has upon No. 3 Montgomery Road.

My client did intend to pre-consult with the neighbour however because of a bereavement in his family was unable to but has since met them and explained this situation. However as part of the application drawings we did publish existing and proposed perspectives of the building taken from a view point on their land, in order to give the neighbour as much chance as possible to consider these proposals.

Landscape Architects response of 21st
November 2013

We too have recently visited the site and viewed it from the Hayling Billy Trail. On the picture Figure 1 I am not sure that we agree that the garage is very visible even at this time of year.

Figure 1 View of the garage from Hayling Billy Path
taken 30th November 2013

The extension is predominantly upwards and for the most part follows the line of the existing building. As this is the case I can see no additional pressure to prune the trees along the western edge of the site. We also suspect that some of the trees are dead and the evidence of this is that photographs taken on October last year show no leaves on at least one of the trees



and therefore we argue this tree is discounted. My client welcomes the presence of the naturally planted bank adjacent to his site and would fully support conservation work in this area. He would be prepared to enter into a section 106 agreement to supply a number of trees for the top of this bank as this would replace those that have died or are in poor health.



We too have seen the Wooden wall of Fairfield school and in fact do not agree that it is not intrusive and our proposed extension would be. I have added a photograph of this onto our drawing 4998/1202A. As we were proposing similar materials and indeed form I do not see why a distinction should be made between either. We would be happy to receive a condition on the building materials, however

Figure 2 The Fairleigh Wooden wall.

the design intention was that the timber cladding would be left in a natural state to weather down over time, exactly as the Wooden wall.

Furthermore in 2012 Havant Borough Council approved the Bloor Homes scheme to the Warblington School site. This development will have a significant impact on the Hayling Billy Trail and as far as I can see no architectural sympathy to the sensitivity of the path has been employed in the design of the 3 storey dwelling that will face the Hayling Billy Line. I hasten to add that our proposals demonstrate through the modesty of the amount of development and the careful choice of materials demonstrates that we have used architectural sensitivity.

The raising of the ridge of the roof by 0.5metres, which applies to over $\frac{3}{4}$ of the footprint area is we argue a very minor addition and will have no bearing whatsoever on the Hayling Billy Path. Where we are increasing the height, by using the same materials type as used on the 'Wooden wall' and with greater existing planting in front, this modest vertical extension will be lost and unobtrusive. On drawing 4998/1202A we have re-toned the timber cladding to reflect the final material bringing it more to the tone of the 'wooden wall'.

There is space on the proposal site for some mitigatory planting and this is clearly shown on our application drawings as Existing Landscaped strip. We would expect any planning approval to come with a condition requiring us to provide landscaping details for the site. I confirm that we would be happy to comply to such a condition.

Our client welcomes the presence of the neighbouring Hayling Billy Path and its planting adjacent to his site. Our proposals do no harm to this existing feature which in our view requires slightly more conserving and enhancement than it currently receives at the moment.

We trust that these comments will help the planning officer to better assess the proposals and would be pleased to answer any additional questions that may be raised.

Stuart Bone

pp PWP Architects