Karen Wooden

From: Daphney Haywood
Sent: 16 April 2012 10:19
To: bst shared
Subject: FW: 5 Warren Close, Hayling Island - Application ref: APP/12/00052
Attachments: Photographs Accompanying Amended Proposal.pdf; 2911-201A.pdf; 2911-202A.pdf; 2911-203A.pdf; 2911-204A.pdf; 2911-205A.pdf; 2911-206A.pdf; 2911-207A.pdf; 2911-209A.pdf; 2911-210A.pdf

for meridio and web Please supersede all previous plans.

Daphney Haywood
Havant Borough Council,
Public Service Plaza,
Civic Centre Road,
Havant,
Hampshire.
PO9 2AX
_____

Web: www.havant.gov.uk

email: daphney.haywood@havant.gov.uk

Direct Phone: 023 9244 6513

From: Jeffrey Douglas [mailto:jd@jeffreydouglas.co.uk]
Sent: 16 April 2012 10:01
To: Daphney Haywood
Cc: tim.lines@oilfieldinternational.com; liz.lines@btinternet.com
Subject: 5 Warren Close, Hayling Island - Application ref: APP/12/00052

Dear Daphney,

I refer to your email dated 05/04/12 and attached letter from Langstone Harbour Board regarding the above planning application.

In response to concerns raised by LHB and echoed by you, my clients and I have reviewed the design and attach amended drawings for your consideration. These include the following revisions:

1. The main north facing monopitch roof has been lowered in pitch from 20^{O} to 15^{O} in order to lower the ridge height. This is the absolute minimum pitch for a slate-like roof finish where we would specify the Marley Eternit 'Melbourn' interlocking slate. It is also the minimum pitch for a SIPs panel roof construction which we intend to adopt for its many benefits, not least its high insulation, sustainable materials, and lower construction height. The resulting ridge level would be at 11.06m AOD compared to 10.73m AOD on the existing house, i.e. only 330mm higher than the existing house rather than 750mm shown on the previous design. We believe that such a small increase would be virtually imperceptible in the wider landscape particularly as the roof slopes away from the harbour and so the apparent height is foreshortened. The reduction in ridge height from the previous design also reduces the bulk of the building.

   The ridge height of 60 Sinah Lane Plot 2 (adjacent to 5 Warren Close and under construction) is approximately 0.38m higher than the proposed house. The upper flat roof of No 62 Sinah Lane is also higher than the proposed house, by approximately 0.13mm.

2. To accommodate the above change, the low pitched roofs to the side and rear additions would be replaced with flat roofs as shown on the drawings. This would also allow completely unobtrusive thin membrane PV panels to be applied to the flat roof single ply membrane, which will provide a valuable renewable energy source.

3. In response to any concerns with regard to the extent of glazing, we have carried out a study of recently constructed dwellings along the harbour edge in this vicinity which suggests that there are examples of buildings with much higher areas of glazing than is proposed at 5 Warren Close – Table 1 below refers.

Table 1: Comparison of North-Facing Glazing Areas for Selected Langstone Harbour Properties

Address of Property	North Facing Glazing Area (m2)
13 North Shore Road (Under construction)	72
56 Sinah Lane	55
62 Sinah Lane	31
5 Warren Close (Proposed)	28.5

In particular, the replacement house at 13 North Shore Road has an entirely glazed north facing facade to the harbour with a glazed area in excess of 72m^2 compared to 28.5m^2 for the proposed house at 5 Warren Close. This building is also much closer to the foreshore than the proposed house - approximately 32m from the foreshore for the former and 49m for the latter. This further increases the relative impact of the 72m^2 glass at No 13, and also makes its 6.6m parapet height much more prominent than the 7.2m ridge height of the proposed house. Further examples exist at both 56 and 62 Sinah Lane with glazed areas facing the harbour of around 55m^2 and 31m^2 and around 61m and 55m from the foreshore, respectively. Photos of all these buildings and of the existing house on 5 Warren Close are attached. Photographs 1-5 are taken from the foreshore on the footpaths adjacent to each house's rear garden; Photographs 6-10 are taken from the furthest safe distance at low tide in the harbour before the mud. In Photographs 5 & 10, the trees at the bottom of the rear garden to 5 Warren Close are clearly seen to provide screening from the harbour and are to remain.

4. We would imagine that the main concern with glazing in the context of the harbour is to do with glare and reflections from the sun. As the proposed house is facing north, this would not be possible in this context. Even the more oblique angle of the balcony glazing would not face sufficiently towards the west to produce glare towards the harbour.

5. Despite the above observations, we have also included some further measures to shade the glazing by extending the eaves overhang over the first floor windows and recessing the ground floor glazing under the balcony overhang still further.

In conclusion, we would trust that the amended design as now submitted will be acceptable in answering your concerns and those of the Langstone Harbour Board, and that the Langstone Harbour Board would therefore be prepared to remove its objection.

Kind regards,

Jeff

Jeffrey Douglas Chartered Architect

114 Havant Road, Hayling Island, Hampshire PO11 0LJ Tel: 023 9246 8889

I am using the Free version of SPAMfighter.
SPAMfighter has removed 2463 of my spam emails to date.

Do you have a slow PC? Try free scan!