COPIES OF 2 OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING ALREADY SUBMITTED BY EMAIL.

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
24 OCT 2025
RECEIVED

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
24 OCT 2025
RECEIVED

[redacted]

Originally submitted Monday 20th October 2025 via online comments.
Also emailed to planning.development@havant.gov.uk on Tuesday 21st October 2025

22nd October 2025

Please find a duplicate copy of our objection enclosed due to the previous objections not being shown on the planning portal.

**Planning Objection Letter**
*Regarding Planning Application at 95A St. Thomas Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 0EU*

---

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing to formally object to the proposed development at 95A St. Thomas Avenue, Hayling Island, as outlined in the current planning application.

[redacted] we have serious concerns about the scale, design, and impact of the proposed works on the character of the area and the amenity of surrounding properties. Our specific objections are as follows:

1. Loss of Privacy – Havant Core Strategy 16 Objection

The proposed full-width rear dormer and balcony introduce elevated views directly into neighbouring gardens and rear-facing windows. Even with the proposed 1.8m privacy screens, the potential for overlooking remains significant, particularly from standing occupants or oblique angles. This will result in a material loss of privacy for adjacent properties and those to the rear. The privacy screens themselves will also feel large and out of scale or context with other properties in the area. [redacted]

2. Overbearing and Out of Scale - Havant Core Strategy 16 Objection

The proposed extension, particularly the rear dormer and parapet detailing, significantly increases the bulk and massing of the property. This creates an overbearing presence when viewed from neighbouring gardens and is out of keeping with the modest scale of surrounding homes.

3. Design Out of Character - Havant Core Strategy 16 Objection

The proposed materials — including cedar cladding, anthracite aluminium windows, and off-white render — along with the double-height entrance and widened front dormer, introduce a

contemporary aesthetic that is at odds with the traditional character of St. Thomas Avenue. The development undermines the visual harmony of the street scene.

4. Dormer Design Conflicts with Local Guidance - Havant Core Strategy 16 Objection

The proposed dormers appear to conflict with Havant Borough Council's Borough Design Guide, which encourages pitched-roof dormers that are subordinate to the main roof and proportionate to the windows below. The rear dormer is flat-roofed, full-width, and includes a balcony and parapet detailing, making it visually dominant and inconsistent with the guidance. The widened front dormer also risks disrupting the proportional relationship with the fenestration beneath.

5. Loss of Light - Havant Core Strategy 16 Objection

The increased height and depth of the proposed extension will reduce daylight to neighbouring properties, [redacted]

6. Noise and Disturbance - Havant Core Strategy 16 Objection

The inclusion of a rear balcony and expanded internal accommodation may lead to increased outdoor activity and noise, particularly in the evenings and warmer months, impacting the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring gardens. No other properties in the area have balconies. With the balcony being so large, it would lend itself to being occupied for extended periods of time for the owners of 95A.

7. Overdevelopment - Havant Core Strategy 16 Objection

The scale and intensity of the proposed development appear disproportionate to the size of the plot and the surrounding context. The cumulative impact of the dormer, balcony, and multiple extensions suggests overdevelopment of the site. Even taking just the dormers alone, the development would remain overdeveloped and overbearing.

8. Planning Policy Conflict - Havant Core Strategy 16 Objection

The proposal appears contrary to the principles set out in Havant Borough Council's planning policy, which emphasises high-quality, context-sensitive design and the protection of residential amenity. The scale, materials, and elevated features of the proposal are not in keeping with the established character of St. Thomas Avenue and would result in a significant loss of privacy and visual amenity for neighbouring properties.

We would also like to note that no consultation or courtesy notice was provided to us by the applicants, despite the scale of the proposed works and their potential impact on neighbouring properties. Furthermore, it appears that construction activity has already commenced prior to the outcome of the planning application, which raises concerns about procedural compliance and respect for due process. For example, how does it impact trees and natural wildlife in the area? By demolishing walls and commencing work it removes the ability of the Planning Officers to conduct an inspection of the "as is" building.

It is our belief that the balcony has been included in the plans as a "sacrificial lamb" in the hope that other aspects of the plan would be acceptable, however no component of this plan takes into account neighbours.

Finally, and possibly quite importantly, the application incorrectly shows the Sun Room and the Boot Room as being part of the original building. However, as evidenced by the marketing pictures of 95A before it sold to the new owners, these were already extensions to the original building (probably they should more correctly be called a Conservatory and a

Porch extension). By granting permission to extend again, on top of what is already an extension this would be vastly overdeveloped.

In light of the above, we respectfully urge the Planning Department to completely refuse this application to mitigate impact on neighbouring amenity and the character of the area. If any member of the Planning Department would like to visit us to discuss this further, then we would be delighted to show them the works that have already commenced so an accurate determination of their impact can be made.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
24 OCT 2025
RECEIVED

Havant Borough Council
Planning Department
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Sent by email: planning.development@havant.gov.uk

Dear Planning,

**APP/25/00718 – Demolish original rear lean-to. Ground floor rear extension with balcony above. Proposed porch canopy and replacement external materials. Alterations to existing dormer on front roof slope and construction of new dormer window on rear facing roof slope. 95A St Thomas Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 0EU**

We write to formally **object** to this application. [redacted]

Number 95a sits parallel to the road with a hipped roof to the front and rear, and side gables. Within the front hipped roof slope is a modest centrally located dormer window whilst in the north gable is a single window to bedroom 4. The car port and garage are constructed up to our shared boundary.

[redacted] proposing to drastically extend their modest chalet-style bungalow to a large, effectively two-storey dwelling, to the detriment of the character of the property and area but more so to the detriment of [redacted] privacy, outlook, resulting in an overbearing and unneighbourly development.

Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant part of the Development Plan is *The Core Strategy (2011)*. The main policy of relevance in this case, is Policy CS16 (High Quality Design). Additionally, the Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document is a material consideration.

Part of the proposal, which is not included in the development description, is the demolition of the existing car port and reconstruction of the garage, including increasing the height of the garage on our boundary. This may be a modest change to the existing garage when taken in isolation however, when taken in combination with the larger aspects of the application, it will result in cumulative bulk along the shared boundary. What is absent from the application is details of the proposed replacement boundary treatment following the removal of the carport. The carport and garage [redacted] drawings do not indicate the boundary treatment the applicant intends to place along thi[redacted] boundary following the removal of the carport. Further, the proposed new porch over the front door will obstruct access to the garage and therefore, what is the purpose of this building, as it clearly cannot be used for parking of vehicles yet, the plans submitted do not indicate what its purpose is.

Externally, the applicant is proposing the use of cedar cladding to the side gables, rear elevation and dormer windows faces and cheeks, together with the use of slate for the main roof. These materials will appear stark and are uncharacteristic in this location.

In order to accommodate all of the proposed works at ground floor, the applicant is extending the depth of the ground floor by an additional 3.1m. Again, whilst this may be offset from our boundary, it sits directly south of our property and adds more bulk to the rear of this otherwise modest dwelling. However, it is the proposed works to the roof which greatly affects [redacted] residential amenity and to which we vehemently object.

The applicant is proposing to enlarge the two existing bedrooms within the roof to provide large suites, each with their own ensuite and seating areas; whilst the master bedroom will also have the benefit of a separate walk in dressing room. Additionally, it is proposed to provide an office/ music room with a full height window. To achieve all of this additional living accommodation, it is necessary for them to not only increase the front dormer window but also provide a new full width rear dormer window. This description as a 'full width dormer' is rather disingenuous, as the dormer window is effectively creating a full first floor. Further, the applicant proposes a full width balcony leading from the master bedroom suite creating an external an elevated seating and entertainment space of circa 16sqm.

Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy, against which this development should be assessed, is unambiguous that development will only be permitted where ***"The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking".***

It is abundantly clear that the applicant has failed to consider the impact of their development [redacted]

[redacted] Whilst there may well be a small window in the existing northern elevation, the increase in the amount of glazing and size of this aperture diminishes [redacted] privacy.

The applicant has included a privacy screen to the balcony, but this is a tokenistic gesture which does not account for the loss of privacy and [redacted] overlooking the balcony will have [redacted] This is contrary to Policy CS16 and therefore, the application should be refused.

Additionally, due to the combined length of the rear dormer window and projecting privacy screen together with the positioning of this extension [redacted] certainly appears to breach the 25degree rule of thumb applied to assessing impacts of new development on existing dwellings. This results in development which is inappropriate and contrary to Policy CS16.

Moreover, Policy CS16 goes on to state that development should respect local context and ***"Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors".***

The incorporation of a full width dormer window with rear balcony is not informed by local characteristics or proportions and results in a large bulk and mass of development at first floor which would [redacted] be overbearing and unneighbourly. The use of cedar cladding and slate tiles do not form part of the established character of this area. Again, the proposal fails to accord with Policy CS16 and should be refused.

As already identified, the Council's Design Guide SPD is a material consideration in the assessment of this application and states that dormer windows ***"should be designed to sit back into the roof, back from the front line of the wall below, in from the verge and below the existing ridge line"*** and, more importantly ***"Dormers should not dominate the roof or the existing building. To help avoid this they should be the same size or preferably smaller than the windows below. Generally, the dormers should have pitched roofs, with slopes in keeping with the existing roof"***. It is very clear that the proposed development fails to accord with the Design Guide SPD with both the front and rear dormer windows dominating the respective roof slopes. The reliance on such large dormer windows to provide the first-floor accommodation is evidence of overdevelopment. With very limited exceptions,

the use of dormer windows in the vicinity of the application site are for small, modest sized dormer windows which are set down in the roof slope. The proposed roof alterations would be entirely discordant with the established character of the area.

Separately, we note that within the application form, under section entitled "Trees and Hedges", the applicant has stated that there are no trees within falling distance of the proposed development. This is incorrect as there are two established trees [redacted] which meet this qualification and their root protection areas may be adversely affected by the proposed development. These trees include a mature ceanothus and eucalyptus. The applicant has therefore failed to demonstrate that their development, specifically their extended ground floor will not harm [redacted] trees.

Cumulatively, this development is an overdevelopment of the site resulting in harm to the character of the existing dwelling and the area, by reason of the excessive size of the roof extension and dominance of dormer windows together with the choice of materials. [redacted] The elevated position of the balcony also introduces external entertainment space and activity where presently there isn't any, this is again to the detriment to [redacted] amenity, [redacted] The resultant cumulative bulk and mass of the full width dormer window, balcony screen and increased height of the garage results in an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development [redacted]

Overall, the proposed development is discordant with Policy CS16 of The Core Strategy and the Design Guide SPD and should be refused. There are no material considerations which have been presented to suggest that the development should not be determined otherwise in accordance with the Development Plan as per the requirements of Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. We trust therefore that this application will be refused.

We have set out below a schedule of photographs which support our assessment and demonstrate the harm which will result from the development.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]