

21 October 2020

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

FOR THE ATTENTION OF MRS B CRAWFORD

Dear Sirs

Your Ref APP/20/00754
Proposed outbuilding providing ancillary accommodation
18 Kingsey Avenue, Emsworth, PO10 7HP

We are in receipt of your letter of 14 October inviting further comment in respect of the deposition of further documents, including amendments to the proposal.

Whilst heartened by Environmental Health's support of our identification of unacceptable smoke pollution from the originally proposed wood burning stove and their recommendation that "permission is not granted at this time", we are dismayed by the proposer's minimal amendments by relocating the proposed building 1.7m (5.6 ft) to the east and 1.5m (4.9 ft) to the south. This totally fails to address the admissible grounds for objections as listed on the reverse of your letter, namely:

- Effect on daylight, privacy and outlook
- Noise
- And we would add inevitable light pollution and nuisance, both within our accommodation and in the garden of our house.

It is pertinent to note that when permission was granted in May 2010 for the proposer's application for a two storey extension to the main house (Application no 09/61387/002), not only was the original design amended to reduce the roof height and include a hipped end rather than a gable to mitigate the overshadowing of our garden, it was conditional upon no windows being installed in the north elevation other than two roof lights "in the interest of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties..."

Surely, if this applies to a structure at a right angle to our rear elevation, it must be unequivocal that the same considerations should apply to a structure effectively facing the principal elevation of our property in terms of fenestration and principal rooms.

.../Continued

Page 2
Your Ref APP/20/00754
Proposed outbuilding providing ancillary accommodation
18 Kingsey Avenue, Emsworth, PO10 7HP

We are concerned that the photographs submitted on 5 October may not have adequately portrayed the enormity of the impact of such a large and tall structure, particularly our attempt on Photo C to draw the position of the proposed building where I fear we did not get the perspective quite right. We therefore forward four further photographs to clarify the intensity of the impact on us of this proposal.

In summary of all our objections to date, all of which stand, we consider the proposed outbuilding wholly inappropriate in terms of its height, size and proposed proximity to our house; buildings of this size would not be in such close proximity in a new development. There is undoubtedly adequate space for it to be positioned centrally in the rear half of the garden, with the principal elevation facing south where there are no existing dwellings, only rear gardens, in front of it, thereby obviating the inevitable nuisance factors. Even then, there can be no excuse for any of the permitted development limitations as to size, height, etc, to be exceeded. In its current form and location we expect you, as the Planning Department, to refuse permission.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

PHOTO 1

The top rung of the ladder shows the height of the proposed building in relation to the main house - ie, it is at the same height as the upper rear gutter on the proposer's house.



PHOTO 2

Clearly shows the upper gutter of 18 Kingsey Avenue and illustrates the height of the proposed building above the boundary wall/fence.



PHOTO 3

The top rung of the ladder indicates the proposed height of the building which equates to the top of the bay tree, whereas it appeared lower than this in photographs submitted on 5 October.



PHOTO 4

The red line indicates the height of the proposed building, as viewed from our lounge/dining room window.

