

[REDACTED]

Planning Development,
Havant Borough Council,
Public Service Plaza,
Civic Centre Road,
Havant,
Hampshire,
PO9 2AX

20th May 2019

Re: Planning Application reference APP/19/00421,

Point View, 10 Western Parade, Emsworth, PO10 7HS

Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a replacement 1 No. 3 bed detached dwelling,
including balconies to front elevation and Juliet balcony to the rear.

Dear Planning Officer,

We wish to strongly object to the planning application APP/19/00421, submitted for the redevelopment of 10 Western Parade, Emsworth, PO10 7HS.

We live at [REDACTED] which is the neighbouring property located to the west of number 10 Western Parade.

Our reasons for strongly objecting are as follows:

1. **Daylight/sunlight Impact** - The applicant does not show nor has not considered the impact of the proposed dwelling on the elevations of the adjacent properties, [REDACTED].
 - a. At [REDACTED] there are 3 no. existing ground floor windows and 1 no. first floor window located along the eastern elevation.
 - b. At [REDACTED] there are 5 no. windows along the western elevation.
 - c. Advice from an expert daylight/sunlight surveyor has confirmed for [REDACTED] and in reference to the BRE guidelines the following are breached by the proposed dwelling.
 - a. 45 degree line is breached - at the front elevation
 - b. 25 degree line is breached - at the side elevation
 - c. Unacceptable loss of light to the internal habitable spaces and detrimental to our amenity.
 - d. Furthermore the proposed dark colour of the cladding will only exacerbate the daylight/sunlight impact and is at complete odds with external colours of all other properties in the vicinity.
 - e. Could we kindly request the officer encourages the applicant, as part of the design process, to produce a daylight/sunlight report. This would provide both officers and

adjoining property owners confidence all matters have been properly considered and where necessary make amendments to the design in line with BRE guidelines.

2. Building lines along Western Parade - The proposed dwelling is shown to sit:

- a. 6 metres further forward (to the south) of the existing building line of [REDACTED]
- b. 4 metres further forward (to the south) of the existing building line of [REDACTED]
- c. The proposed building line will destroy the set back nature of this row of houses and fundamentally disturb the rhythm of the street scene. It will impact the wider coastline vista when viewed from walking along Western Parade and from the water looking ashore.
- d. With the proposed dwelling set so far forward it also provides an unacceptable loss of privacy and overlooking to at least 4 of the neighbouring properties.
- e. Havant Borough Council Strategy March 2011, policy CS16 Clause 1 and Havant Borough Design Guide Supplemental Planning Document Dec 2011 clearly state the importance respecting 'existing building lines', the current design must breach these policies.
- f. Could we kindly request the officer encourage the applicant move the building line back (northwards) to match the adjacent properties.

3. Massing

- a. The massing for the proposed dwelling looks to be nearly double that of any other dwelling along Western Parade.
- b. The design does not develop a positive relationship with either of the neighbouring properties due to its dominating structure.
- c. The proposed design adopts a two storey massing for the full width of the plot. Other new build designs approved recently by the local authority along Western Parade, do not occupy the full width of the plot at two storeys, and adopt a single storey on their western edge for garages/carports.
- d. The proposed massing does not respect the natural vistas between properties and one would not see any of the green landscape prevalent at the rear of properties [REDACTED] and properties located to the north.
- e. Could we kindly request the officer review the design and steer the applicant towards massing that is reflective of the general character along Western Parade.

4. Privacy

- a. The three full height doors on the rear west facing return, are particularly intrusive and fundamentally impact the privacy [REDACTED]
- b. At [REDACTED], the rear and east elevations will be impacted and the full height glazing will look directly in 2 no. bathrooms.
- c. Furthermore, at [REDACTED] the same west facing glazing will look directly into rear bedrooms.
- d. Could we kindly request the officer review the design and steer the applicant towards addressing the clear privacy issues of the rear west facing return/glazing.

4. Inaccurate Drawings - The drawings are incorrect and with key information missing.

- a. The block plan shows the placement of the existing building incorrectly in relation to the adjacent buildings and boundary lines of properties.
- b. The overall building height is inaccurate. Other new builds along Western Parade have had to account for flood risk mitigation and raised ground levels accordingly. The design

- does not account for this. Therefore the impact on adjacent properties is misleading, particularly in regard to the daylight/ sunlight impact on [REDACTED]
- c. The details of both the adjacent property elevations [REDACTED] and proximity are missing which does not provide the officer with a true reflection of the impact. Significantly [REDACTED] is not shown on the existing and proposed elevation drawings.
 - d. Could we kindly request the officer encourages the applicant to include key dimensions on design drawing to allow all parties to have clarity on the design relative to adjacent properties, provide drawings at a more suitable scale, show the adjacent properties on the drawings and reference levels to datum AOD.
5. **Planning Policy** - It is not clear under what premise the application has been submitted.
- a. The Planning Design and Access Statement refers to "demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a replacement dwelling", which implies the application should have considered "Havant Borough Council Strategy March 2011" and new designs as set out in "Design Guide SPD Dec 2011".
 - b. Whereas all of the design drawings state "double storey side extension, new roof and internal alterations", and the DAS refers to "alterations to an existing dwelling", in which case "Extensions and Additions to Existing Residential Properties" within "Design Guide SPD Dec 2011" should have been considered. The application does not appear to have considered section 5.3 of the design guide, failing on multiple fronts "extension should not be bigger than the main building and therefore appear smaller in mass and height", "the front extension should not be prominent in the street and should respect the common building line". The design appears to fail on the design requirements set out in sections 5.35, 5.36, 5.37, 5.38, 5.41, 5.42, 5.43 and 5.44 of the design guide.
 - c. It appears the application and design does not comply with either sets of policy for a "new design" or for "extensions and additions to existing property."
 - d. Could we kindly request the officer clarifies with the applicant the premise of the application so it is clear what planning policy should apply and the application be amended to respect the appropriate policy and design guidelines.

We trust the above clearly sets out the grounds for our objection and look forward to a reply.

Yours faithfully

