

RECORDED
DELIVERY

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

22 FEB 2021

RECEIVED

Ms J. Burton
Planning Services
Havant Borough Council
Public Services Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant, Hants. PO9 2AX

17th February 2021

Dear Ms Burton

Re: Ref APP/21/00091

Extension to front and rear - 7 Elwell Green
OBJECTIONS under Relevant Considerations of:-

Design	: Appearance	: Layout
Daylight	: Privacy	: Outlook
Noise	: Smells	: Fumes

Thank you for returning my telephone call of last Friday (12/21) and I refer to our discussions concerning the proposed extensions to No. 7.

also my request for a physical visit by the planners to view & understand Elwell Green and its design & layout - I felt this was extremely important in the circumstances. You agreed this would definitely be done.
Thank you.

Elwell Green is a cul-de-sac comprising 3 pairs of semi's and 12 detached bungalows. None of the semi's have been radically altered and currently are compatible with design/layout of road. Basically the area is a retirement zone - we fit that at 77/91 respectively.

To [redacted] Elwell Green, are one of the pairs of semi's

Firstly, there appears to be an incorrect answer re a section of the planning application form. The section referred to asks if any other property is affected by this application (I am now, for some reason, unable to access this section to verify because "it appears to have disappeared".)

The answer given was NO

It is felt this should be YES.

- 1) 71 [redacted] Elwell are a pair of semi's
- 2) [redacted] Elwell has shared foul drainage across the curtilage of 107 at the rear & side down to Inspection Chamber/Tumbling Bag
- 3) Foul drainage currently runs across open garden
new will be under extension floor

NOTE: There is a 90° bend in this system which hinders the proper flow of soil. In our 12 years of occupancy this has required rodding on 3 separate occasions.

Therefore [redacted] is "an affected" property in our opinion.

... OBJECTIONS under: Design. appearance. layout. outlook
Noise. smells. fumes. Privacy

... Front Extension at 4.485m (equating to over 22m) forward on the
1) property this is an excessive footprint on a small semi detached

— as mentioned to you, 11s Burton, No 11 has been extended. However the extension appears considerably smaller than proposed ~~and~~ ^{to} No 7 and it is still obtrusive.

No 11 is also DETACHED

2) Section 8 of the Planning Application Form — Parking
answer given is NO

However:— architect's drawing "proposed site plan" shows —

a) 2 cars parked alongside the rear boundary wall between

b) cars are not currently parked in this area.

c) will create nuisance of noise-smells-fumes being only .61m away from ventilation to main bedroom

... OBJECTIONS under: appearance. layout. Daylight

... Rear Extension objection is mainly to the massive size of the extension: its subsequent appearance.

Daylight will be severely compromised to the rear bedroom of

In conclusion:

Neither myself or husband are opposed to alterations but we feel very distressed at the excessive size of these extensions commensurate with a small semi detached bungalow.

It is also considered the applicant has been wrongly advised by his architect concerning size; appearance & due consideration.

Neither myself or husband wish to move OR feel we are going to be driven out. (Incidentally No 12 Elwell WERE driven out by the original extensions @ No 11: moved only a few weeks ago)

Unfortunately this scenario would not be possible even if required due to Covid 19 restrictions on movement

This letter of OBJECTION is worded & submitted by both

We await hearing from planning Department in due course
Yours faithfully