

By email

19 November 2022

Mr J Toole
Planning Services
Havant Borough Council
Public Services Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

Dear Mr Toole

Planning Application APP/22/00941
110 Southleigh Road, Havant, PO9 2PS

Thank you for your letter of 2 November 2022 inviting views on this application.

As you know this application follows three earlier applications (APP/20/00774 for which permission was refused by the Council on 2 November 2020, APP/20/01124 which was subsequently withdrawn and APP/21/00366 for which permission was granted on 23 September 2021).

I wrote to you about these earlier applications on 24 September 2020, 20 December 2020 and 7 May 2021 respectively. These letters, which appear in the Havant Planning Portal, give some background concerning the siting and proximity of my property to 110 Southleigh Road and I would ask that you read them in conjunction with this submission for context.

It is disappointing to see that APP/22/00941 seeks to resurrect some of the more obtrusive aspects of the previously rejected and withdrawn applications. In so doing it appears that having at last persuaded the Council to accept a third application the applicant now seeks to leverage this, chip away at your resolve and seek your agreement to reintroduce detrimental impacts that have been proposed unsuccessfully in the past.

For ease of reference, The Council rejected the original APP/20/00774 for a number of reasons including

- its adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality,

- that its height, mass, bulk, design and siting would result in an overbearing impact in relation to neighbouring properties, and
- that a loss of privacy to neighbouring residents would result.

Factors taken into account included

- the failure within its design to take account of local area characteristics including height, mass, plot widths and depth,
- that the proposed development would result in a structure much larger than the other properties in the area that would not be in keeping with its character, and
- that the proposed extension would not be subservient to its main building.

Unfortunately the revised proposals contained within APP/22/00941 include two elements that are detrimental to my own property and, in one case, to other neighbouring homes. These should lead to your rejection of this latest application for all the reasons set out above.

These detrimental elements are as follows:

- 1. The raising of the walls of the east and north facing two storey extension to a below eaves height of 4.46 metres along with the introduction of east facing first floor windows.**

Currently, the structure within the number 110 site closest to my home is a single storey, flat roofed, garage. The current two storey elevation of number 110, which includes first floor windows facing my property, is a significant distance further away from my home.

The proposed development will bring a two storey building much closer to my home and include reintroduced first floor windows into its now increased wall space. The most southerly of these would provide a clear line of sight into my lounge with a detrimental impact on privacy.

The most northerly new window would appear to cause similar overlooking issues for the rear of a neighbouring property in Spindle Warren.

There is a note on the proposed east elevation drawing stating that "*windows can be obscured and/or non opening below 1700mm*" This appears to relate to the proposed first floor windows. There is no clarity about what this means. 1700mm is approaching 6 feet. The sills of these windows are all well above 6 feet from the ground. The windows themselves are unlikely to be much more than 3 feet from sill to apex. In my view, to remove any doubt and avoid the gaming of any permission it would be essential for that permission to require that, if included at all, the windows be fully frosted and openable only to the minimum extent required by building regulations.

In addition to the problems highlighted above, the increased eaves height (which appears almost identical to, and possibly higher than, that rejected by the Council under APP/20/0774) imposes greater overbearing blank wall space impairing light and outlook for closely sited neighbouring homes in Spindle Warren. That cannot be reasonable.

Unfortunately, accurate comparison with APP/20/0774 is hampered by the absence of measurement information within the architect's eastern and northern elevation drawings supporting that application.

2. The inclusion of a very high double garage extension which greatly increases the east facing elevation of the proposed development.

Under the new proposals an (ostensibly) single storey large double garage extension (which includes a high pitched roof) will now sit squarely in front of my home. This significant contribution to site overdevelopment formed a part of the successful APP21/00366 proposals and it is astonishing that the Council felt it appropriate for approval for at least two reasons.

- The proposed steeply pitched garage roofline will be almost 4.9 metres from the ground. This is greater than the height of the average UK two storey house to its eaves which stands at 4.7 metres. This garage would be higher than that rejected as part of APP/20/00774 and will immediately dominate the western skyline as viewed from my lounge, spoiling outlook permanently and casting unnecessary shadow during the evening period.
- The proposed steeply pitched garage roof is completely unnecessary for the applicant to achieve his aims. It contributes over half of the total height of the proposed garage but cannot possibly afford additional accommodation for the vehicles to be sheltered within. This is excessive on any measure. The same vehicle accommodation space could be achieved by a flat roofed structure to the height of the currently proposed garage walls or one with a much lower pitched roof. In my view, if the applicant seriously wishes to find a solution that will meet his needs while demonstrating due regard for the impact on neighbouring properties, it will be essential for him to concede on this point at very least and it would be unconscionable for the Council to approve plans for such a completely arbitrary and seemingly gasconading structure.

In consequence I have no option but to object to the development now proposed. Considerable adjustments to deal with (1) the privacy detriment from the new first floor windows, (2) the newly imposed north facing wall height and (3) the completely unnecessary and inappropriate garage height would be needed before these latest proposals could be considered as both reasonable to achieve the applicant's aims and fair to surrounding homeowners.

For the avoidance of doubt nothing in this letter should be regarded as an objection to the 'possible new access from Public Highway' indicated on the Proposed Site Plan. This change would be beneficial in my view.

Finally, and additionally, I would reiterate the comments within my 24 September 2020 letter regarding potential future change of use for 110 Southleigh Road and request that the Council takes these fully into account in its deliberations.

