

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

7th July 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 Ms Lesley Wells,

Thank you for your letter dated 1st July 2019, and received on the 3rd July 2019. We are concerned by the incredibly short period provided for representations. Submissions are required by the 8th July 2019, allowing only 2 working days to review and comment. If we had been away for the week we would not have had the chance to respond and no doubt there are others who will not have the chance to respond in the required timeframe.

We still wish to strongly object to the planning application APP/19/00421, submitted for the redevelopment of 10 Western Parade, Emsworth, PO10 7HS, and our previous letter dated 20th May 2019 should still be included as part of our objection. Below are additional areas for concern based on the revised drawings.

1. **Daylight/sunlight Impact** - The applicant has still not shown nor considered the impact of the proposed dwelling on the elevations of the adjacent properties, no. 11 and no. 9 Western Parade.
 - a. We are deeply concerned the applicant has not been asked to provide an impact study to demonstrate the accuracy and design integrity of the current drawings.
 - b. The 45 degree impact line, now drawn from the front of no 11 Western Parade, demonstrates how inaccurate the applicants previous drawings were. Their previous drawings showed the building line 2 metres past the 45 degree impact line.
 - c. The position of No 11 Western Parade is not drawn correctly on the applicants drawings. The applicant shows the building 2 metres from the boundary. It is only 1.5 - 1.7 metres from the boundary, having used a laser measurer to check for ourselves. The buildings are closer together than shown on the drawings so a greater daylight/sunlight impact and the impact lines are therefore not shown correctly or at all.
 - d. The drawings show the applicant has raised the entire building by 0.5 metres above the level shown on the previous drawings, however they have not moved the position of the building or altered the roof line relative to the building position of no 11 Western Parade.

- e. We were correct in our previous correspondence to you that no 10 Western Parade is breaching the BRE design guidelines (in reference to 'point b' above). We are still deeply concerned by the errors still apparent on the drawings (building positions incorrect and building height increased, but no change to roof line) and that the BRE guidelines are still not being used correctly in the design.
- f. We previously flagged the eastern elevation of no 11 Western Parade is impacted and believe the design as currently shown does not comply with the BRE design guidelines. The applicant excludes any reference to the eastern façade and associated windows of No 11 Western Parade from their drawings. The same applies for No 9 Western Parade and their Western façade.
- g. We again would ask the officer to request the applicant engage an expert daylight/sunlight surveyor to demonstrate to both officer and adjacent neighbours the design has correctly satisfied the BRE guidelines in this regard.

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

- a. 4 metres further forward (to the south) of the existing building line of no. 50 Beach Road and no. 11 Western Parade. As drawn both properties will be faced with a 4 metre high wall (single storey and balcony).
- b. 2 metres further forward (to the south) of the existing building line of nos. 9, 8 and 7 Western Parade, and 60 Kings Road.
- c. The fact the applicant is having to show a 45 degree line for daylight/sunlight impact on the front elevation of no 11 Western Parade in itself should flag to the officers how out of context the current proposals are.
- d. 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 does not respect the existing building lines' of adjacent properties.
- e. We are also aware the previous owner of No. 10 Western Parade, unlawfully built a front extension to the property and now is the opportunity for the officers to ensure this is rectified and the building line is respected for this part of Western Parade.
- f. Could we kindly request the officer encourage the applicant move the building line back by at least 2 metres (northwards) to match the adjacent properties on the east side of the boundary, and by 4 metres (northwards) on the western boundary to match the adjacent property. The building line could be stepped to allow for this. We would also request the officer ask the applicant to ensure the 1st floor is set no further forward than the adjacent properties, and ensure the 1st floor is stepped back from east to west, as per the ground floor to match that of both no 9 and no 11 respectively.

3. Massing

- a. The massing for the proposed dwelling looks to still be nearly double that of any other dwelling along Western Parade. Furthermore the applicant has increased the massing from the previous submission by:
 - 1. adding 1 metre more to the overall depth of the building (increased from 11.3 metres to 12.3 metres).
 - 2. increased the overall width of the building by 200mm from 14.3 to 14.5 metres.
 - 3. increased the overall height of the building by 500mm.
- b. Massing appears to be an issue raised by multiple consultees, yet the applicant has responded to this by increasing the massing.
- c. 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 of no. 11 Western Parade and no. 50 Beach Road.
- b. 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 – We previously highlighted the drawings are incorrect and with key information missing. These errors still exist and to highlight further detail for the officer.

- a. The block and street scene plans show the placement of the existing building incorrectly in relation to the adjacent buildings and boundary lines of properties. No 11 Western Parade is not drawn correctly on the drawings and is only 1.5 metres from the boundary in places not 2.0 metres as shown on the current drawings.
- b. The actual width of the overall plot for No 10 Western Parade is c.16.8 metres, yet the overall plot width as shown on the drawings is 16.3 metres, the OS shows 16.0 metres.
- c. The applicant has increased the ground level of the building and adjacent ground by 0.5 metres. We are now concerned about how the applicant proposes to avoid run-off and flooding to adjacent properties that are at a lower level.
- d. Could we kindly request the officer requests the applicant to undertake a topographical survey including the building and boundary positions of No 11 and No 9 and adjacent ground levels, and base their design on these not from a 1:500 OS Map drawing which is an inappropriate scale and inaccurate. This will allow all parties to have clarity on the design relative to adjacent properties, provide drawings at a more suitable scale, show the adjacent properties accurately on the drawings and reference levels to datum AOD.

5. Planning Policy

- a. We have not been provided with an updated Planning Design and Access Statement to reflect the change in design, reference to planning policy and addressing the statutory consultee comments that have been received. We have therefore been unable to fully review and comment on all matters of the application.
- b. The application should have considered "Havant Borough Council Strategy March 2011" and new designs as set out in "Design Guide SPD Dec 2011". However, it appears the application and design does not comply with Policy CS16 High Quality Design which outlines that "its design", "uses the characteristics of the locality", including "massing, existing building lines, materials". The current design shows the massing is much greater than any other property along Western Parade, the building is set much further forward than all neighbouring properties and the applicant is in favour of a dark colour building, completely out of context of all other buildings in the vicinity.
- c. No planning statement has been provided to confirm how the design meets the planning policy kindly set out to the applicant by the policy officer.
- d. Could we kindly request the officer seeks to receive from the applicant a revised Design and Access Statement, including how the applicant has adhered to local planning policy and design guidelines set out within the policy.

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

Yours faithfully

