

Miss S Donophy
Case Officer
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

Our ref: 191/P/634.01/KG
Your ref: APP/19/00932
18th October 2019

Dear Miss Donophy

**RE: 42 ST JOHNS AVENUE, WATERLOOVILLE, HAMPSHIRE – DEMOLITION
OF EXISTING GARAGE; CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND
REAR EXTENSION – FORMAL OBJECTION**

I refer to your letter dated 27th September 2019 and in accordance with written instructions received from our client [REDACTED] write to **“FORMALLY OBJECT”** to the above proposed development.

Following our review of the proposals we wish to submit our clients objections which can be stated as follows:

1. The drawings / elevations are incorrectly drawn with the length of the side elevation not lining up with the proposed floor plan or the site plan.
2. It is evident that the existing site slopes from south to north with a drop in ground levels between No. 44 and No. 42 of approximately 500mm. The eaves to the existing roof of No. 42 being approximately 500mm above that of No. 44.

The proposed elevation drawings do not indicate this significant variation in ground levels but implies that the two sites are in fact level with one another.

This is clearly not the case resulting in an over bearing, extensive and dominant structure.

3. This boundary fence is owned by No. 44, clearly the proposal will undermine the dwarf wall and fence, there will be a requirement for a retaining wall at this boundary junction.



Regulated by RICS

Registered Office: 1 Swan Wood Park, Gun Hill, Horam, East Sussex TN21 0LL.
McAndrew Martin is the trading name of McAndrew Martin Limited registered in England & Wales
Company No. 06844071 • VAT Number 522 4925 56

A full list of Directors can be obtained from our Registered Office



4. The proposed southern elevation to the extension to No. 42 is located in very close proximity, being only approximately 100-200mm from its southern boundary fence line, it is clear that the habitable rooms and rear garden to No. 44 will be adversely affected by the reduction in natural light along this boundary line due to the height, bulk and mass of the proposed extension.
5. It is intended that the proposed new extension will extend for virtually the entire length of the rear garden of No. 42, this effectively only seeks to exacerbate the length bulk and dominance of the proposal.
6. A further and equally important factor is the orientation of the two properties, the front elevations have an easterly aspect which means the sun will rise and travel from the front eastern gable to the property through to the rear western gable and garden areas. The proposed increase in height of the extension above the fence height will result in a significant increase in the shadowing line, consequentially No. 44 will lose natural day and sunlight from not only the living accommodation within the dwelling but also the rear garden / amenity space.
7. From a rough scaling of the Plans it is evident that the extension will be approximately 500 – 700mm above the height of the existing 1800mm fence resulting in a very long dwelling with a continuous structure that is virtually 1000mm above the height of the fence and the existing height of No. 42 in turn adding to the bulk which currently exists.
8. It should be noted that there are no ground levels provided or indeed measurements indicating the building plan size or exact height of the proposed extension, or its exact location adjacent to the boundary.
9. The proposed development will result in the provision of a dwelling which extends for 60% of the length of the plot with a consequential increase in the internal floor area by some 30%.
10. The proposals substantially increase the floor area of the existing property and includes the demolition of the existing garage at the same time. This will clearly result in the requirement for additional vehicular traffic to and from the property. The loss of the garage parking will result in additional requirement for associated on site parking provision and in turn will also place further pressure upon the limited off site parking within St Johns Avenue.
11. There will clearly be a requirement for the owners of No. 42 to meet the statutory requirements under the Party Wall Act to ensure that the existing dwelling No. 44 and its land within the curtilage is not undermined by the proposed works.

It is submitted that in consideration of the above criteria the proposed Planning Application should be rejected due to the unacceptable, significant and detrimental effects that the proposal will have [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

For and on behalf of McAndrew Martin

[REDACTED]

WIC McAndrew BSc FRICS ICIQB
Managing Director

[REDACTED]

Encl. Photographs of existing boundary and existing extensions





