

28th November 2022

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

By Email

110 Southleigh Road Proposed Extension: Ref APP/22/00941 2nd November 2022

Dear Mr Toole,

Thank you for your letter of 2nd November 2022 describing the above referenced planning application and inviting objections.

In summary, this is a further iteration of the previous applications; **APP/20/00774** (which was refused in November 2020), **APP/20/01124** of December 2020 (which was subsequently withdrawn), and **APP/21/00366** which was approved in September 2021 in the face of strong, multiple objections from all the surrounding neighbours.

The original application was refused on the following grounds:

- 1) The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed inappropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be unacceptable, contrary to the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality. In accordance with guidance in the NPPF, permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- 2) The proposal by reason of its height, mass, bulk, design and siting would result in an overbearing impact in relation to the neighbouring properties of 5 and 6 Spindle Warren. In addition the proposed windows would result in unacceptable over looking and loss of privacy to neighbouring residents. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Scrutiny of the third (approved) application documents shows only minor changes from the original refused application.

Examination of the current application shows a reversion towards many of the elements from the original, refused application. In particular, an increase in the height of the eaves hence increased height, mass and bulking; the extraordinary height of, and unnecessary nature of the steeply pitched garage roof; and the re-introduction of overlooking first floor windows. Thus we wish to register our strongest objection to this Application.

I wrote to you in response to each of the three previous applications, so firstly I would ask you to re-examine those objections in conjunction with the following as they form part of this objection.

Third party planning consultant's view

To assist us, I have employed the services of a professional planning consultant (BSc (Hons.) Dip TP Dip UD MRTPI). He is of the view that my previous objections regarding overdevelopment of the plot were not given proper weight, and that the current design to raise the eaves level, to a point higher than that refused under APP/20/00774, is unacceptable.

My consultant highlights that the current application would seem contrary to **Policy CS16 1 (a)**, as informed by **paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)** and the **Borough Design Guide SPD**, especially those parts indicating domestic extensions ought not to dominate the original built form.

My consultant also points out that the works would indeed be overbearing and overlooking to surrounding properties, in particular to the north and east.

Also noted is an observation that if the Council is to be consistent in its decision making, the raising of the eaves height of the proposed first floor extension is marginally worse than what was refused under APP/20/00774, and should be resisted by the Council for the reasons it stated in its refusal.

Garage roof- undeclared further extension by 'stealth'?

The plans for the new garage show a very steeply pitched roof (the existing garage has a flat roof). The resultant total height is extraordinary at 4.9 metres, higher than many modern 2-storey residential buildings. This is way beyond any reasonable requirement to accommodate 2 vehicles and is higher than the in original (rejected) application. We object to the inappropriate added bulk, overdevelopment, and overshadowing of some of the surrounding properties. But of equal concern to us, taken in conjunction with other aspects of this and previous applications, is it looks like another attempt to 'game' the system and ultimately achieve two undeclared additional bedrooms. (In support of this supposition please consider that the original application included six rooflights in the pitched garage roof).

Access

The plans show a new access to the property directly off the main (Southleigh) road. This would of course benefit the other residents of the shared access road. However, it is noted that this new access is marked as only '*possible*'. We do not believe the applicant is necessarily serious or committed to the new access, and is perhaps a 'sweetener' to the other residents, who suffer frequent noise and obstructions the high level of domestic and (the applicant's) business-related traffic the property attracts.

Hence we in no way object to the new access, in fact we would respectfully ask that it is made a mandatory condition of any approval, to the extent that it is put in place prior to any other works, to allow delivery of materials and parking of builder's vehicles and plant without undue disturbance and obstruction to other residents in the close.

Conclusion

The Application represents a gross overdevelopment of a restricted plot resulting in adverse effects on neighbours' amenity, and loss of character. It demonstrably falls foul of, and is contrary to, many of the Borough's planning guidelines (referenced in my previous objections) and additionally Policy CS16 1 (a), as informed by paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021).

We believe these multiple, vexatious applications are cynically attempting to 'game the system', to edge back towards the original Application which was firmly and rightly refused by you. Perhaps there is an intention that your, and the resident's resolve will be 'worn down'. This is certainly not the case, and I have already sought guidance on possible future options for action in the High Court if this Application is approved as it stands.

We would respectfully request that this Application be refused for all the above reasons.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.