PERMIT

STATEMENT

Pre application was submitted on the 16 April 2011 and the officers comments were positive as she could not see any problems/objections with the proposed (as usual, subject to a site meeting). After a site visit the officer was not happy with the rear extension due to the bulk and impact on the neighbouring property no. 4. The application was withdrawn and new two revised proposed options were submitted, showing the flat roof reduced and side pitched roves introduced for comment. There was a site meeting with the property owner, neighbour, planning officer and agent. It was communicated at this meeting that the neighbour has no objections to the reduced roof option. Officer asked for the roof to be reduce some more. This was done to her recommendations and submitted for a final comment. Her recommendations were shown the team leader and it was not acceptable.

Final comments from the officer below:

I have now had the opportunity to discuss your revised plan with my acting team leader. He has raised the following points:

1. The rear extension is unlikely to receive his support at the sign off stage due to excessive bulk adjacent to a neighbouring property. Essentially he highlighted some of my concerns and reiterated the point that some small single storey dwellings are just not designed to be lived in in this way. I understand that this will be frustrating for your client. I have pitched the proposal in the most positive light, however without his support the application will not go through.

2. In light of the above and bearing in mind the space your client requires I would recommend that you go down the appeal route. A fresh pair of eyes may go in your favour and may receive support from the planning inspectorate.

3. An alternative form of development would be mirror what has been constructed to the neighbouring dwelling to the rear. A gable end extension with blind dormer to the far side is likely to remove the perception of mass to the neighbouring dwelling. I note however that this has been the fall back position throughout, so I doubt that it is an option.

Please let me know how you would like to proceed, and my apologies for the outcome

An enormous effort has been made by the client and the agent to satisfy the council. The council could have avoided time wasting should the initial comments at the first pre-application stage have been made accurately, and again at the site meeting.

A new proposed plan has been submitted taking on board the final comments from the team leader and the rear extension has been moved away from the adjacent neighbouring property No 4 by 2.7 meters. Therefore there is nothing for the council to object to.

- We have listened, compromised and worked with the council.
- The compromise has been extensive.
- You have suggested having a large flat roof dormer to the front for compensation. This would be unattractive and the neighbour might object.

- The final proposed plan has been tastefully and carefully designed and is attractive.
- There is a much larger rear extension done next door on the same size property, therefore the comments about the house being too small for the proposed extension holds no value.

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
07 NOV 2011
RECEIVED