



24th September 2020

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

Dear Mr Toole,

Planning Application APP/20/00774
110 Southleigh Road, Havant, PO9 2PS

Thank you for the letter of 16th September regarding the above planning application.



Having studied the documents on the council website, we would like to make the following comments:

Size of Extension

The significant increase in size of the property, increasing the number of bedrooms from 4 to 7 is, in our opinion, an over-intensification of the plot.

The size and appearance of the extended property would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding properties.

The HBC Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, 5.35 General Guidance on Extensions, states:

'In general, an extension should not be bigger than the main building and therefore should appear smaller in mass and height. Extensions should look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such ridge, verge and eave finishes, head and cills, brick coursing, dressings and quoin work. The positions and proportions of solid wall to opening of windows and doors is also important. The roof form and slope should also reflect that of the main building.'

However, the proposed extension appears to almost double the size of the property.

Also, the Section 8 of the application **Materials** states that the walls will be finished in 'Sand and Cement render to match existing'; this does NOT match the existing which is all plain brick.

Parking

Section 8 of the application 'Will the proposed works affect existing car parking arrangements?' has been answered as 'No'. This is clearly incorrect.

Until recently, the current parking area of number 110 has often been absolutely full with vehicles, at least 6 and sometimes 7, and no vehicles are kept in the existing garage. It would appear that, since submitting the planning application, the number of vehicles has been reduced, but we suspect that they may be parked in adjacent side-roads or in the layby down the road.

The extension would appear to reduce the parking area by around 50%, which would not provide parking for even the currently reduced number of vehicles.

Any vehicles parked on the drive outside the property, for visitors, deliveries etc. block the access to three of the other properties on the drive, so all vehicles need to be parked inside the site area of number 110 to avoid disruption to the other properties.

Conclusion

We wish to object to the application due to the over-intensification of the plot, the fact that it is out of keeping with surrounding properties and the reduction of parking area on the site.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]