

Our ref – 13/RO02871

Your ref -

Date 15th March, 2022

FAO Graham Speller
Havant Borough Council Planning Development
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

By email: planning.development@havant.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

APP/22/00126 | Erection of two storey extension on eastern elevation, single storey extension on southern elevation and loft conversion. | 3 Durham Gardens, Waterlooville, PO7 7BB

We are instructed by the occupier of [REDACTED] who objects to this proposal for the reasons set out below.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] We note the substantial increase in roof height proposed, which will also result in dramatic increase in mass and scale towards our client's home. The combination of new first floor plus dormer, effectively brings the mass to 3 storeys when it is only 1 now.

The overdevelopment of the site will be very noticeable in the street scene. At present there is a gap which provides some spaciousness whereas the proposal will, given the angle of the footprints, effectively close this to almost zero, harmful to street scene (terracing effect) and public amenity. SPD (design guide) stresses such important gaps [5.38]. The proposal would result in the application dwelling being noticeably higher than others, alien in the street scene, contrary to SPD that expects no increase in height, it will lack subservience, there is no set back [see SPD 5.35-5.37]. Furthermore, it will result in loss of daylight to client's ground floor flank facing window.

The first-floor extension is shown with 'patio doors' to rear, which will facilitate direct overlooking to our client's immediate rear private amenity space, whereas the existing bedroom windows do not because of the acute angle and limited aperture of windows. These glazed doors are clearly intended to facilitate viewing from what is described as

hallway and office/gym, such that they will be likely regularly open for ventilation etc. Nothing is indicated to prevent the kitchen roof being used as a terrace. Nor would it be controlled development if the room lit by these doors becomes a bedroom.

The applicant has not submitted a daylight report. The council cannot conclude that our client's amenities will not be adversely affected.

The loss of privacy, day light and harm to street scene, are each very significant; combined they will severely harm amenities the adopted plan/SPD aims to protect. To create **high quality beautiful and sustainable buildings and places**, which is "fundamental" to what planning and development process should achieve¹, development must create **better places in which to live** and help make development acceptable to communities. It fails that test.

The Framework [NPPF 130] requires development to *add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, be sympathetic to local character and surrounding built environment, maintain a strong sense of place using spaces to create distinctive places to live, and promote the health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing users*. NPPF 134 concludes that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Per s38(6) PCPA 2004, planning permission must be refused, there are no material considerations that outweigh the harm to fundamental amenity protection found in the local plan and SPD. The matters set out above are of significant weight tipping the balance firmly against the scheme. Such conclusions are copper-bottomed by the development being unsustainable as defined by NPPF 2021.

Yours faithfully.

Kingsley Smith

Kingsley Smith Solicitors LLP

¹ NPPF 126