

23 School Lane,
Emsworth
Hampshire, PO10 7ED

14 January 2013

Planning Department, Havant Borough Council

We write with regard to the revised Planning Application No [APP/12/01279](#) - Westminster Works, Nile Street, Emsworth and would comment as follows:-

Our comments and suggestions (listed below), with regard to the proposed development, made on 25th October, still stand. We acknowledge that, to a certain extent, the immediate issue regarding overlooking into the School Lane properties has been addressed. However, loss of privacy, particularly for No.s 21, 23 and 25 School Lane, immediately opposite the proposed development, still remains a major problem.

Moreover, the economic arguments for demolition, as opposed to refurbishment of the Old Chapel Building are erroneous. Rebuilding costs are estimated at £415,00 - £519,000 in the Market Report. With an approximate floor area of 138 m² for each new house, at today's average building prices for new works, it would cost in excess of £550,00 to construct these two new dwellings. We refer to Paragraphs 4 and 5 of our comments below, stating that a more imaginative and potentially profitable use of the existing commercial building is indeed viable for the town and should be given serious consideration.

13(15) NILE STREET EMSWORTH PLANNING APPLICATION APP/12/01005 APP/12/01006

Existing Building

1. Conservation area appraisal and management plan identifies the building as a heritage asset and it has been highlighted as being of local interest and making a positive contribution to the conservation area of which Nile Street forms a part. Policy CS11 in the Core strategy requires that key landscape & built form elements are retained or enhanced.
2. The existing use of commercial activities (Class B). Policy DM3 requires such employment opportunities to be retained and change of use will only be considered in exceptional circumstances.
3. The documents supporting the application seek to prove that the existing building is not capable of being re-used. The inspection report (appendix 3 of the Market Report prepared by Vail Williams) is not a detailed structural survey of the existing building. Page 2 of the report states, "Our report is based on a visual inspection of the building

elements” and “The report should not be construed as a full building survey or a comment upon the overall condition and the quality of its structure.” This would suggest that it is only a very superficial assessment and should not be used as evidence permitting the demolition of the building.

4. There must be a presumed case for taking a more imaginative approach to the re-use of the existing building after a proper detailed assessment by a specialist in the field.
5. Small short term let (perhaps shared service) business or craft units could be considered. These could be specifically tailored for small startup businesses. This would comply with Policy CS2. Perhaps mixed use could be considered (small residential & micro business units).

Proposals

1. The proposed design exceeds the height of the existing building.
2. There are serious overlooking problems from the first floor living room and kitchen areas at the rear of the proposed properties, resulting in a serious loss of privacy for the residents of School Lane. This cannot be satisfactorily resolved by the projecting oriel windows indicated on the proposals.
3. The design & bulk of the proposed properties in no way respect the conservation area.
4. The proposals would not therefore comply with Policy CS 16 or HBC Borough Design Guide.
5. The parking provision does not comply. Only one car space per dwelling is indicated. This does not comply with the HBC SPD Residential Parking and Cycle Provision adopted 22 March 2010, (2 are required).

Summary

Considering the number of core strategy policies ignored by the proposals the applications should be refused.

This should be treated as an opportunity for a more imaginative approach in view of the previous history of the site and refusals.

Marilyn Eva