

Michelle Houghton

From: Richard Bendy [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 August 2017 17:47
To: Planning and Development Shared Mailbox
Cc: Tina Pickup; [REDACTED] Havant Auto-Reply
Subject: APP/17/00812 - response to Mr Keith Dummer
Attachments: Ecococon Straw Panels Technical Info.pdf

Richard Bendy & Sue Torry's response to Mr Keith Dummer's objections

The revised development appears to be of an experimental nature.

There are over 40,000 Passivhaus worldwide and a considerable number in the UK
<http://www.peterwarm.co.uk/resources/passivhaus-uk-map/> - it is therefore a far from being of an experimental nature

Is this style of structure fully approved for residential use in the area?

<http://www.bath.ac.uk/case-studies/straw-scientifically-proven-as-viable-building-material/>

It is out of keeping with the construction styles used in this area for residential properties.

Within a 150 metre radius of the plot are houses built in vastly different styles from the 1890's, the 1910's, 1920's, 1930's, 1950's, 1960's 1970's 2000's and 2010's – with variously brick, render and tiled walls and roofs of slate, concrete, ceramic tiles in various different styles and colours as well as one "modern" build with a multiple box structure and flat roofs; many have had solar panels retrofitted and at least three properties have roof-lights including 17 Glenleigh Park – with no defining style I think it would be fair to say with such a variety it would be difficult to describe the proposed house as "out of keeping with the construction styles used in this area for residential properties"

Has this style of residential build been nationally approved?

Approval for an exterior design of a single dwelling is in general a matter for local planning authorities and not national ones.

Does it meet fire safety and access requirements?

Yes - see response to building control - in addition straw panel fire certificate attached

The foundations of the revised build further encroach into the area of our Oak tree RPA as originally proposed.

The wooden verandah whose foundations will only require the removal of top soil and encroach on 0.009% of the RPA and as such is rated as low impact; the encroachment is therefore about 10% less than the original proposal contained in the tree report and 0.009% more than APP/16/01091 and at topsoil level rather than a full 3 metre foundation level

The RPA is further compromised by the revised siting of an existing shed (3 X 4 m)

We have been advised by the arboriculturalist who conducted the original tree report in September 2016 that the siting of the shed in this position will not affect the oak tree T1; neither will the siting of the yew hedge on the border of 17/19 Glenleigh Park.

and a proposed Yew hedge extending along 17/19 GP boundary wall and shed.

See above

No indication is given regarding the shed foundations or footings.

See above

We have been advised that water uptake by our tree is via its fibrous root system that extends to 0.6m below the surface.

As per the tree report of September 2016 submitted along with this application, healthy trees (of which this is one as per the report) can suffer 30 – 50% root severance with no ill effects; on the basis that surface foundations will be used in the affected areas and root severance isn't even being contemplated it would seem that as the arboriculturalist has advised neither the wooden verandah nor the shed foundations are likely to cause any ill effects to oak tree T1.