

The Executive Planning Service Manager
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire PO9 2AX

Your ref: APP/18/00109

19th October 2018

Attention: Lewis Oliver

Dear Sir,

**Land adjoining 15 Billet Avenue, WaterlooVille PO7 7SZ.
Erection of four dwellings with associated vehicular access
and pedestrian access and landscaping and replacement culvert.**

1. We have been instructed by Koyes Miah of 15 Billet Avenue to present our comments to you in respect of the amended proposals. Thank you for your kind agreement to allow us to return from holiday, in order to present our findings. We regret to inform you that the amended proposals do not overcome our client's concerns and he continues to **RAISE OBJECTION** to this proposal.

2. Vehicular and pedestrian access to the proposal would be gained via Billet Avenue ('the Avenue'), so the key characteristics of that street-scene provide the essential context for the proposal. Detached and semi-detached houses stand on both sides of the Avenue on deep, wide plots and the generous distance between frontages generates a particular sense of spaciousness. Woodland at the east end of the Avenue provides a sylvan end-stop to development and contributes positively to the visual quality of the locality. The spaciousness of Billet Avenue is a key element of the local character and that quality derives, in large measure, from the simple parallel rows of houses. Our client continues to be concerned, therefore, at the retention of a proposal for a substantial two-storey house on Plot 1, as its erection would harm a key spatial characteristic of Billet Avenue.

3. We recall that your Officers have consistently recorded the view since May 2017 that *'The most sensitive property to the proposed development is 15 Billet Avenue...the units are in close proximity to the boundary with this property and could create significant overlooking into its private amenity area'*. The revised proposal has not adequately addressed or settled this issue, for the reasons set out below.

4. Our letter dated 12th April asserted that three notable features of no.15 Billet Avenue would be most affected by the proposal - the lounge that projects from the eastern part of the front elevation; the rounded sun-lounge at the northeast corner; and the open-air swimming pool in the rear garden. The 'Field of View' that has been portrayed (on drawing no.16A_071 006 Rev.H) from the first floor of Unit 1 is unrealistically narrow (45 degrees from the centre of the pane is customary) and our client continues to be concerned at the prospect of being overlooked from Bedroom 3 in his front lounge. He would welcome the use of obscure glazing for the other first-floor windows of Unit 1 (ie the en-suite, dressing room, bathroom and landing) but such windows would need to be fixed shut or restricted opening (by planning condition) in order to ensure that his privacy is respected. In similar vein, our client would require a restrictive condition to be imposed on the obscure-glazed windows that are now proposed at first-floor level on the front elevations of Units 2, 3 and 4.

5. On the matter of 'High Quality Design', Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy requires that *"All development should demonstrate that its design...Responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context...identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site...(and)...The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking."* Our client continues to hold to the view that the north-south arrangement of the proposed houses thrusts Unit 1 forward into the east-west street-scene, to the detriment of the Avenue's spatial character and, while he welcomes the introduction of obscure glazing of windows at first-floor level in the front elevations of Units 2, 3 and 4, his garden and swimming pool would still be overlooked, if said windows are not fixed shut or restricted in their degree of opening. For these reasons, it is contended that this proposal still conflicts with the requirements of criteria (a) and (e) of Core Strategy Policy CS16, so it should be **REFUSED**. Should, notwithstanding these objections, the Officers be minded to support this proposal, it is respectfully requested that the application be presented for determination by the Planning Committee, in order that our clients' concerns may be pursued in a deputation directly to Members. Thank you.

Yours faithfully



Robert Tutton
Director