

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

7th October 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 2nd October 2019.

Unfortunately, it appears there is very little change in the additional plans from those previously submitted and so we still wish to strongly object to the planning application APP/19/00421.

Apologies in advance for the length of this letter, but thought it important to flag where we believe the plans for no 10 do not meet the strict planning policy as set out by Havant Borough Council, Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan, Chichester Harbour Conservancy and previous precedence's set by the council for adjacent redevelopments.

1. **Daylight/sunlight Impact** - The applicant has still not considered the impact of the proposed dwelling on the elevations of the adjacent properties, no. 11 and no. 9 Western Parade.
 - a. Could the council kindly confirm back to us how they are satisfied the applicant has addressed daylight and sunlight concerns, in reference to CS16/Havant Borough Design Guide SPD page 36 and 37.
 - b. Has the applicant demonstrated to the council the design meets BS8206 Part 11?
 - c. Section 5.08 of the Design Guide states "new developments should not result in the loss of light to existing buildings"?
 - d. We believe the current design breaches best practice guidelines.
2. **Building lines along Western Parade:**
 - a. The additional detail provided by the applicant on drawing 18065-PL-101 supports our concerns raised in our previous letters. The building line for No 10 is still set forward of all other buildings along Western Parade, as evidenced on their own plans. Planning policy CS16/Havant Borough Design Guide SPD page 27 Table 4.1, clearly states "*New developments should follow the common building line i.e. that defined by immediate neighbours*". The applicant has demonstrated their building is set forward of both adjacent properties. To the east the ground floor balcony of no 10 protrudes c.1m further forward than the ground floor balcony of no 9. To the west the first floor of no

- 10 is set 610mm forward of no 11's first floor, the ground floor building line of no 10 (excluding balcony footprint) is set c. 2 metres in front of the ground floor of no 11.
- b. The building line of no 10, does not comply with Havant Borough planning policy.

3. Massing/Plot Width/Street build up

- a. The design for no 10 shows the building occupies the full width of the plot at two storey, when viewed from the street view. In addition its massing is significantly greater than any other building along Western Parade.
- b. Planning policy CS16/Havant Borough Design Guide SPD page 26 table 4.1 clearly states *"the width of the proposed building should be similar to that prevailing in the local area"*, and *"the gaps between buildings, or the lack of gaps between buildings plays an important part in forming the character of an area. The gaps can provide us with views to the countryside or landscape to the rear of the properties. New development should follow the established patterns of properties on the street"*. Page 28 Massing states *"New developments should follow the typical pattern of existing properties"*.
- c. The planning applications for nos. 7 and 8 (references 06/71371/000 and 08/72956/000 respectively) were both refused by the council because they did not meet policy, stating in letter dated 9th November 2006 for no 7:
1. *"The bulk of the development is considered excessive, giving rise to development at a two storey height across virtually the entire width of the plot, resulting in a loss of space about the building to the detriment of the visual amenities and spatial characteristics as viewed from the streetscene and the Harbour."*
 2. *"The proposed development by reason of its bulk, height and prominent location would be incongruous within the streetscene and as view from the coast"*
 3. *"The Development of the site in the manner proposed is considered over-intensive with the resulting footprint and design leading to a detrimental impact to the amenities of occupiers of adjacent residential properties."*
- d. The buildings for no 7 and no 8 were refused by the council, due to occupying the full width of the plot at two storey and excessive massing. The plans for no 10 are nearly identical, again showing full width at two storey and excessive massing. The revised buildings for no 7 and no 8 were subsequently approved by providing a single storey element for c. 1/4 of the building width and reducing mass.
- e. Policy from the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan, support the requirement for green landscape between buildings, p77 "Density and Scale – 43. Density of new development should give an impression of spaciousness with opportunity for green landscape between buildings." Also paragraph 44 "New buildings should be in scale within the context of the surrounding buildings and located where they will not overwhelm their surroundings."
- f. Policy from Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, "Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions", states "The acceptability of any increase in size (building size) will be dependent on whether the site can accommodate the increase while still respecting local character by reflecting the surrounding pattern of development and spaces between buildings."
- g. In consideration of the above there is a clear precedent set by the council for three previous redevelopments of nos 7, 8 and 9 Western Parade. The precedence, supported by planning policy has helped establish, the allowable building silhouettes, the allowable gaps between the properties, the allowable extent of single and double storey element and the allowable massing.

4. Privacy

- a. The western element of the front balcony as shown will look directly into the master bedroom at no 11. The balcony protrudes c. 2.5 metres forward of no 11. Could the applicant be steered towards a juliet balcony or the balcony end shifted further eastwards. This is wholly unsatisfactory as it stands.
- b. Policy CS16, clearly states "The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of...the loss of privacy".

5. Southern Water

- a. The response from the consultee, Southern Water letter dated 10th September 2019, appears to confirm the applicant has not yet satisfied Southern Water. They state "We would find unsatisfactory lack of proposals to amend the development site layout to maintain the public sewer statutory standoff distance 3m". From this response it appears Southern Water require further amendments to the rear element of the building, which in turn may impact nos 9 and 11. We will await further details in this regard.

6. Colour

- a. We support the building boarding colour "light grey, colour C51" put forward by the applicant.

We believe the planning policy in place and the clear precedence set by the council by refusing two previous permission (for no 7 & 8 Western Parade) on near identical plans to no 10, provides a clear mandate for the council to refuse permission for no 10.

We believe all other buildings along this stretch of Western Parade, and in particular those that have been recently redeveloped (nos 7, 8 & 9), strictly follow the council planning policy and the design guide SPD, in terms of building line, massing, avoiding two-storey full width buildings, providing a green vista through to the rear and privacy of neighbours. Why allow no 10 to be the exception?

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

Yours faithfully

