



26th November 2018

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: Planning Application APP/18/01043;
revised submitted drawing no. KAD/01/A/PP rev.A**

We wish to object to the above proposed development. Whilst we support the desire to maximise the potential of the property, we feel the development, as proposed and amended, would give rise to an unacceptable impact upon the amenities and enjoyment of neighbouring properties in general and our property in particular.

Our principal concerns are the design, scale and bulk of the extension which would cause an overbearing impact upon our property and garden, and design which would not be in character with the surrounding environs and local vernacular.

We consider the proposed and amended extension to be contrary to the development plan, in particular Policy CS16 (High Quality Design) of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, and associated guidelines contained in the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

- **Loss of light, amenity and enjoyment of our patio area and garden**

Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 5.43: *"The design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours."*

Policy CS16 High Quality Design: *Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:*

e) The development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking

The height and extent of the proposed extension (which includes a northern dormer almost to the height of the existing ridgeline) would further reduce available light into our patio and garden. Furthermore, owing to the offset nature of the property, further expansion to the rear would result in a structure almost the entire length of our garden,

interrupting our outlook, compounding a feeling of enclosure, and giving rise to an overbearing effect. The proposed revision to the rear extension does not address these points.

- **Scale design and character**

Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 5.41: *“Rear extensions should be sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building. They also need to have particular regard to neighbouring properties and should not cause an adverse effect, such as overshadowing. Rear extensions should maintain a distance of 8 metres plus from the extension and rear boundary wall and 20 metres from the extension and the neighbouring property to the rear.”*

We contend that the proposed extension as revised would not be subservient to the existing property by virtue of both its scale and mass comparative to the original building. The new rear elevation would have dimensions only marginally less than that of the main property, and its height, combined with a significant use of glazing, would dominate the rear façade of the property. The rear extension still presents a large, overbearing mass despite the slightly lower roofline. The shallower proposed roofpitch is not sympathetic to the original building. Extending the existing roofline rearwards still results in a blank end gable wall which appears cladded, not rendered. This is contrary to the proposed materials in the application which specifies render, consistent with the existing finish.

The rear garden of the property is already limited, and the proposed rear extension would be significantly less than the 8m from the rear boundary as set out in the Design Guide.

Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 5.42: *“Rear extensions should be a maximum of 3 metres from the rear wall of the existing house, providing that this does not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties. Outside of Chichester Harbour AONB exceptions to this may be considered, providing there is no adverse effect on neighbouring properties. In general, a single storey extension should be no closer than 1 metre to neighbouring properties and 2 metres for two storey extensions.”*

The proposed rearward extension of the roofline to the proposed gable end is well in excess of 4m from the rear of the main structure of the existing property, again exceeding the 3m specified in the Design Guide. As noted previously this would give rise to a significant adverse effect on the enjoyment of our property.

Policy CS16 High Quality Design: *Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:*

c) Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors.

Properties in Glenleigh Park have a consistent vernacular with hipped rooflines. The proposed development would considerably change the appearance and style of the property resulting in two large gable ends and large dormers extending almost to the

full height of the property. The proposed roof materials (grey slate) and dormer materials would be completely out of keeping with existing roof finishes. Materials for the dormer roofs are not specified. The dormer and rear elevations appear to be clad. There is no detail given for this treatment. Dormers in Glenleigh Park are clad in tiling sympathetic to existing roof finishes. Vertical elevations of no. 40 Glenleigh Park and similar properties are all rendered. The apparent proposed finishes are completely inconsistent with existing properties in Glenleigh Park. All the properties have interlocking concrete tiles that have weathered, maintaining a coherent appearance throughout the road. New concrete tiles will similarly weather, such that the appearance of the roof will be consistent with all the other properties in the road. This is a strong unifying characteristic.

The proposed northern dormer presents a rectangular mass over the existing roof pitch and the proposed forward extension of the roof line. This would significantly change the appearance of the property. In particular it will present a vertical blank elevation, less than 1 metre from our boundary and be in excess of the width and height of our south facing bedroom window. This will have a major impact on the amount of light reaching our window and obstruct our currently enjoyed outlook. It must be noted that the drawing is inaccurate. The side wall of the property is less than 1m from our boundary. The revised drawing represents, inaccurately, a greater distance to our boundary.

Effectively, the side dormers add a second storey to an existing single storey bungalow. As such this is contrary to SPD 5.42 which directs that two storey extensions should be no closer than 2m to neighbouring properties. The proposed change in the dormers' roofs from flat to pitched makes no appreciable difference. It is no more than 10 degrees. It still imposes a mass and block-like appearance that is entirely out of character with other properties and the local vernacular of Glenleigh Park. There are no side dormers in any other property in Glenleigh Park. Existing dormers, visible from the road, are all small and subservient in relation to the roofs they are sited on. See Havant Borough Design Guide SPD 5.47, 5.48 and 5.50.

Elevations facing the road in Glenleigh Park feature forward projections with distinctly lower roof lines and hipped roofs which are a defining and unifying characteristic. The proposed front façade is completely incompatible with this. The forward projection of the front façade with raised roof is a significant extension to the existing building. The proposed dormers are then extensions over extensions. This is excessive and out of keeping with other properties in Glenleigh Park. Hips on forward elevations are significant and substantial amounting to at least half of what would be the roof slope were it complete. The proposed token hip is inconsistent with roofs elsewhere in Glenleigh Park. As now proposed, the property will feature three substantially different roof pitches creating an inconsistent, haphazard and 'ad hoc' appearance. It must be noted that the existing front elevation extends just over 500mm forward of our front elevation. The drawing represents, inaccurately, that the elevations are level with each other.

Proposed fenestration has a haphazard appearance on the southern elevation, and the lack of fenestration on the proposed dormers gives rise to a boxy and oppressive form. The rear elevation utilises a significant volume of glass, which although unlikely to be readily visible, may result in significant light emissions if not carefully managed.

Overall, the proposed development would result in a property significantly out-of-character with the rest of the road, which is currently well defined from more modern development to the north. It has the potential to change the character of the neighbourhood impacting upon the consistency that exists between the houses and their surroundings. The proposed development is radically different in form, size and finish compared to the original property and other properties in Glenleigh Park. This major departure from local vernacular will create a significant precedent for further incompatible design developments leading to erosion of the distinctive established vernacular. We feel strongly that the design and size of the extension and additions would be too dominant and overbearing in terms of the host building and give rise to an urbanising effect upon the limited garden.

Summary

The proposed development does not accord with the development plan; in particular it conflicts with CS16 which requires high quality design. It will give rise to an unacceptable impact to the amenity and enjoyment of our property due to the loss of outlook, be of an overbearing scale, limit any enjoyment of our garden, and give rise to a severe reduction in the light available to our property. Further, the proposed extension is of a design which is not subservient to the main building, could not be assimilated into the existing design, and is not consistent with the general character of the area.

We trust you will give our views thorough consideration in determining the application, and would appreciate you keep us updated with any decision. Should there be any revisions to the plans, please ensure that we are re-consulted, as the property which is likely to be most significantly affected by the development proposed.

