[redacted]

02-01-2023

Havant Borough Council.

Public Service Plaza,

Civic Centre Road,

Havant,

Hampshire,

PO9 2AX.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re:- Planning Application for 4 Privett Road, Purbrook, PO7 5HJ.

Your Reference:- APP/22/01182.

I received your letter dated 15th December 2022 on the 21 December 2022. I did telephone the direct line number on the 21st December 2022 and leave a message for Ms D Sheath, but I guess the work load and Christmas festivities have intervened.

I am strongly objecting to this new application firstly on the grounds as previously given to the first application Reference APP/21/00513, and also given below.

I AM STRONGLY OBJECTING TO THIS FURTHER APPLICATION Reference APP/22/01182

Historically when the area which was to become Privett Road was allowed to be built on by the then War Office it was specified that a number of properties numbered 1 to 38 consisting of single storey detached and semi-detached bungalows with one or two bedrooms were to be built for single occupancy or family occupancy and two in number two storey houses to be used/occupied by professional persons.

These two storey houses were Numbered 6 and 13. Since then, another two storey house has been built on land purchased from the back gardens of houses in Park Avenue and this is No.2A

[redacted]

The reason that no room details were available to the author of the two reports submitted with this new application is that the property has not been sold since 1951 and I also doubt that there were estate agents facilities to advertise properties at that time with detailed plans and of course no internet.

With regard to the Report produced by 'herrington consulting limited', which consists of much useful information as to regards HBC's and the BRE views on the matter of sunlight affecting adjacent buildings (Nos. 2 and 6), by the proposed building extension to No.4 Privett Road.

When one comes to the actual calculations [redacted] every room's function is marked as unknown and the sizes of the rooms are all wrong as are the window dimensions. These assumptions immediately negate any useful results as assumptions are not facts. I have not been asked for or given permission for the right to enter my property and take such dimensions. The use of counting bricks to evaluate window or other dimensions is largely not possible due to the majority of the walls [redacted] being of pebble dash render.

Given that the first part of assessment of daylight being affected, is that the '25 degree rule' is applied.

It is obvious that despite the proposed ridge line of the extension being shown as having been lowered as to regards the previous application, by looking at the submitted plans/sections it is the Dormers that are the limiting factor and by actual measurement this creates an angle greater than 25 degrees, namely 39 degrees. I don't see any improvement on that angle looking at the plans/sections as to regards that appertaining [redacted] either. So it fails that rule.

[redacted]

[redacted]

NOTE NONE OF THE AREAS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS ATTACHED TO THE REPORT ARE ACCURATE IN AREA OR PROPORTIONS.

I therefore respectfully suggest that the report is worthless in respect of calculations and its assumptions.

The outlook from No.6 and No.2 will be seriously affected. From [redacted] views of the [redacted] will also loose outlook to the West.

The 3D modelling pictures I feel only go to prove how much No.2 & No.6 will lose in the level of daylight and outlook which they have received/enjoyed since Privett Road was established.

<u>I note the following in the Application Document</u>.

1, Under 'Materials', that walls will be 'red brick and white render'. Whilst the white finish render would help reflection of daylight [redacted] as the walls which it would be reflecting light from of No.6, are of natural stone finish render it have an inconsequential effect. This assumes also that this white finish would be maintained and that no change in colour would ever be applied by the current resident or any later one.

2, The proposed roof to the extension being tiled to match existing will have a minimal reflective value for daylight and the vertical part of the dormers of which there is a large area also will have minimal reflective value. There is no specification given as to the materials/finish of the vertical walls of the Dormers

3, The report produced by Robert Tutton Town Planning Consultants Ltd., on page 3 of the document, it refers to No.23 Privett Road 'as providing a useful comparison for the proposal'.

In this instance, yes side dormers have been added to this property, but because (A), it is located as the majority of the properties in Privet road are, on a level with the road way and (B), has not been extended forward of its original building line with the result that it has a minimal effect on the surrounding properties or the overall road.

This is not the case with the proposed extension to No.4 Privett Road. This is on a part of Privett Road in which the pavement is raised above the road and the plot of land on which it stands, rises by about 2.4M from front to back. This elevated position combined with the bringing forward of the building has a significant detrimental effect and is out of keeping with the main building and the visual amenity of the locality. It is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning policy Framework.

[redacted]

that no other property in Privett Road has ever been granted permission for extending past its original building line to the front. Incorporating a veranda has been allowed into the living space, as that was the building line, but not beyond that. The front of No.2A Privett Road was built in line with that of No. 2; 8; and 10.

4, With regard to the 'Trees and Hedges' question on the application document and with regard to removal or pruning of in order to carry out the proposals to which the box has been ticked yes.

Paragraph 6 of the Planning Access and Design Statement states, that 'No trees or protected species would be harmed by this proposal'. There is therefore conflict on that basis between the application document and the Report!

These trees and or hedges have not been shown on the plan accompanying the application, despite reference to that.

There is a very good hedge created of native shrubs with colourful berries, leaves and flowers at the appropriate seasons on land belonging to No.2 Privett Road, and which at present creates the boundary between No2 and No4. This extends from the front of the existing building at No.4 to the pavement. As the existing wall to No.4 is very close to that boundary a matter of approximately 100mm, there is a great risk to the roots of said hedge by digging foundations to the extension. There is no statement given as to how this hedge will be protected during any of the proposed development. It will also make construction of walls extremely difficult without damage to the well-established hedging.

There are no details given as to how the foundations would be constructed at this time as that is of course a Building Regulation matter. I know from personal experience, strip foundations were used for all properties back in 1920 when the buildings were being built.

As stated there is an existing fence acting as a physical boundary between No.4 and No.6. This fence belongs to No.4 and the front section is quite dilapidated and leaning into No.6 in several places. I

note that the intention is to plant native shrubs and hedges along the West, North and East Boundaries.

Please note that there is a land drain and a cable duct alongside this Boundary which are installed on [redacted] The land drain is ESSENTIAL to remove standing water from the foundations of the annexe and the 2 storey plinths. It is essential that plant roots do not enter the land drain and of a consequence block it. The annexe wall on the East Side is 550mm thick at the base and is built into the natural slope of the land to enable every floor level within the property to be the same. Due to that construction the land drain was necessary to avoid damp rising and to comply with Structural Engineer's and Building Control's requirements.

I am also concerned that the proposed native shrubs and hedges if planted are kept at the 1.5 M height that the existing fence is said to be and that they do not intrude into land [redacted] I.E. they are planted far enough away from the boundary to allow for their natural expansive growth sideways for those particular plants. Any increase over 1.5 M high will affect what natural light arrives [redacted] at those points. It would make more sense to repair the existing fencing on that boundary [redacted] t is a requirement of the deeds that a fence or other suitable barrier is provided and maintained by the owner of the property on their East Boundary.

[redacted]

During this and the previous planning application which was refused by HBC and dismissed by the Appeal Planning Inspector. At no time has the Applicant spoken in person to the owner [redacted] o explain his requirements and reasoning and for this further planning application.

He did state in an earlier response to Planning that he was 'led to believe by the previous owner of the property that he had intended to do this and it would not be an issue'! According to both applications, Pre-application advice has not been sought from HBC Planning on his ideas prior to submitting the applications.

[redacted]

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]