

APP/20/00699. Please accept these comments as duly made objections to the revised submitted material.

APP/20/00699 Single storey extension (south); first floor (north) extension; render and cladding; attached garage and new access on Southwood Road. 2 Eastoke Avenue, Hayling Island, PO11 9QW
REVISED DRAWINGS AND DETAILS MARCH 2021

I write in connection with the latest revised drawings, viz, PROPOSED SITE PLAN REV F 1466586, PROPOSED NORTH AND WEST ELEVATIONS REV E 1466589, PROPOSED SOUTH AND EAST ELEVATIONS REV E 1466587, PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION MATERIALS 1466588, PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR SITE PLAN REV B 1468735, and MATERIALS SPECIFICATIONS 1466590, all published for consultation on 17th March 2021.

1. My clients remain concerned about this application and wish to reiterate their objections to it. In particular, for whatever reason the revised drawings has been submitted (and no explanation has been provided to accompany the consultation), they still fail to be acceptable.
2. The only changes we can discern from the new plans are the change from a double storey side extension to single storey, broadly of the same dimensions as the existing conservatory and a change back to a gable end for the eastern and western elevations. There are accordingly consequential changes to the first storey layout, whilst details have been provided of materials specifications for external appearance. All other external proposals remain the same.
3. Whilst this change is welcome, it does not go far enough, and we reiterate that the proposals represent an overdevelopment of this plot which is unacceptable, is contrary to local and national design policy and which have not been justified.
4. My clients therefore wish to reiterate that in their view the proposals should be refused because they do not accord with NPPF paragraph 130 or Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) Policy CS16 (High Quality Design), or the Havant Borough Design Guide 2011. In addition, the proposals represent piecemeal development and no material considerations have been advanced by the applicant which would seek to justify a departure from policy. Consequently, the application should be refused.
5. Despite previous requests there is no accompanying statement of why the proposed changes have been made, or how they comply with local and national policy. We are surprised that officers have not asked for such a justification or have asked for an explanation of how the development avoids impacts on local amenity and local living conditions. We consider that such a justification is essential in order to fully appraise the proposals in the light of policy.
6. We would like to take this opportunity to rehearse once again the main objections to the development on design and amenity grounds. The objectors consider that the application should be refused as over-development of the plot and contrary to national and Local Plan policy and representing piecemeal development. In summary, these objections include the following:
 - a. The proposals fail to align with the local context of neighbouring properties which comprise single storey dwellings. The proposals over develop the site by producing a composite building whose mass and scale are out of proportion with the original.
 - b. The proposals are the latest in a long list of changes to the site which will result in piecemeal development which is contrary to sound planning practice. Such changes lack a coherent design and create an unsympathetic and confused building. It also creates a precedent for further piecemeal changes to the site.
 - c. A 'family of forms' has not been respected where two storey extensions should be smaller than the main building with reduced ridge heights and similar pitch angles.

- d. Similarly, the extensions do not look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such as ridge and eaves and brick coursing. The change to a hipped roof from eaves on the northern side makes this situation worse.
 - e. The rear north extension will loom over and dominate No. 4 Eastoke Ave to an undesirable degree. It is not sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the building being of equal height and excessive depth.
 - f. The rear extension fails to observe local design guidance by being less than 2 metres from the neighbouring property and projecting more than 3 metres beyond the wall of the house. It is also less than 20 metres from the extension to the neighbouring property to the rear.
 - g. The new driveway is also incongruous and in the objectors' view unnecessary being only required because the way the 'garage' has been built precludes the accommodation of vehicles in the structure and on the existing driveway.
 - h. Other considerations include the proposed retention of a flat roof on the 'garage', the side extension and the porch, plus the genuine fear by neighbours that at a later stage the applicant could place new windows in the upper storeys of the eastern and northern facades which the neighbours would be unable to resist. Similarly, there are genuine fears that the way the garage has been constructed makes it easier for the applicant to change its use at a later date into residential accommodation.
7. In conclusion, the objectors would like to see this application refused. However, if the Council is minded to approve it, they request that a planning obligation is sought stopping any future changes of use or material alterations to the building without express consent. They realise that such restrictions could be achieved by planning condition, but given the history of the site and the change of use of previous extensions into separate residential accommodation contrary to planning condition, does not give them confidence that planning enforcement will be as effective as a planning obligation.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]