

Mrs R. McMurray
Principal Planner
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

14th November 2018

Dear Mrs McMurray

Amended proposed application APP/18/00816 at 19 Westbourne Avenue, Emsworth PO10 7QT

This is formal notification of my objection to the amended proposed plans for the single storey rear extension, flue and garage at 19 Westbourne Avenue, Emsworth PO10 7QT.

This document is organised as follows:

SECTION	CONTENT	PAGE
1	Introduction	2
2	Summary of concerns	3
	Breaches of planning criteria, design guidance and design expectations:	
3	North Elevation – Removal of existing north chimney	12
4	North Elevation – Single storey rear extension	13
5	North Elevation – Other considerations	16
6	East Elevation – Removal of existing north chimney	17
7	East Elevation – Single storey detached garage	18

I would be grateful if you could keep me informed on the progress of the planning application.

Yours sincerely

Section 1: Introduction

1. I am basing this report on the amended proposed plans and also applicable statements made in the Design and Access Statement (undated) and the Application Form (25/07/18).
2. In response to the Design and Access Statement, please refer to the content of my document, namely pages 3–18.
3. This document is structured so that each section can be read independently of other sections and the content reflects this. Additionally, sections 3–7 have comments for each elevation of the amended proposed development that impacts me.
4. I feel that the amended proposed design adheres to certain applicable rules but not to other applicable rules.
5. I feel that all elevations, that impact immediate neighbouring properties, should be of equal importance to the streetscene. The streetscene should not be of greater importance.
6. I feel that planning rules are put in place to be followed by everyone. If not then they are pointless.
7. Many companies and individuals have a vision identifying what they would like to aspire to, achieve or accomplish. But this vision should not be to the detriment to others.

Section 2: Summary of concerns

I object to the amended proposed plans for the single storey rear extension, flue and garage at 19 Westbourne Avenue, Emsworth PO10 7QT. My main concerns are:

1. The development has breached Havant Borough Council's policies and guidance

I feel that the development still breaches planning criteria, design guidance and design expectations. I feel that this is unacceptable to neighbouring properties and the impact on the streetscene. These breaches are detailed within this document (pgs.12–18).

2. Appropriateness of design and impact on the streetscene and neighbouring properties

- The visual impact of the rear extension (including the design, appearance, layout, bulk and massing, detailing and materials) is not sympathetic to its surroundings.
- The rear extension is overbearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing developments in the vicinity.
- Due to regular maintenance of the green sedum roof at first floor level, I will suffer a loss of privacy and increase of intrusion and overlooking into my habitable rooms.
- There will be noise from regular and continual maintenance of the green sedum roof and cleaning of the frameless glass link and rooflights.
- Due to the size and proximity of the rear extension there will be overshadowing of my property including my established vegetation which will cause long term damage to my vegetation on the northern boundary.
- With regard to the position and height of the new chimney flue, Environmental Health have stated (30/08/18): "Based on the current proposed positioning and height of the flue, there is a possibility for smoke nuisance to applicants own property and to neighbouring properties, linked to wind direction and operator efficiency".
- Due to the position and height of the new chimney flue, fumes (i.e. products of combustion) will penetrate my property. Neither the flue manufacturer nor AR Design Studio nor the Applicant nor Environmental Health can guarantee that the products of combustion will not enter my property. Nobody can control the nature of wind.
- There will be an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbours.
- There will be a detrimental impact on the character to the immediate neighbourhood.

3. The development is ugly

I feel that the rear extension is ugly and not well proportioned for its proposed setting. It is not respectful to its setting because it is overbearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance, including the proposed non-vernacular materials (e.g. timber cladding, aluminium coping stones, green sedum roof), compared with existing development in the vicinity.

The rear extension design causes unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its visual impact and very close proximity (re: rear extension and flue). I feel that in its proposed setting the rear extension is not sympathetic and subservient to the Edwardian villa.

The removal of the north chimney has a negative impact on the streetscene and from the north elevation. It unbalances the original Edwardian roof design by leaving only one chimney on the roof (on the south side).

The detached garage's impact on the streetscene breaches Paragraph 5.40 of the *HBC Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* which states that a single storey extension should have at least a **1m gap** from a shared boundary. But, based on the plans, the garage will be built butting against the existing brick southern boundary wall. From the

streetscene, this lack of gap between the neighbouring building (No.17) is not in keeping with the local pattern of development and appears too claustrophobic from the streetscene hence unattractive. The *Borough Design Guide* states that it is important that gaps are retained between buildings as this helps form the pattern of development in an area which in turn influences local character.

4. Trees/bushes

Many houses on Westbourne Avenue have medium to large landscaped gardens with significant trees to front and back gardens. Mature trees and bushes should be preserved and maintained and not adversely affected by large extensions.

Having gone through the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement, I remain very concerned that the foundations for the rear extension will damage the roots of my trees/bushes on the northern boundary.

The proposed works are within 1.895m of our boundary. The Tree Protection Plan (TPP) submitted with the application shows one very large ash and one medium laurel tree located on our side of the boundary between the two properties. These are on the plan as potentially affected by the proposed works. Root Protection Areas (RPAs) are identified for these trees i.e. areas where the ground should not be disturbed, compacted or contaminated as the trees in question would be adversely affected.

The RPAs are represented as circles around the location of the trunks. Both trees are multi-stem (i.e. not single trunk) and we assume the RPAs will have been estimated using the size of each stem (usually measured at chest height) combined. This gives RPAs which are clear of or just touch the proposed area of work.

However the RPA can also be calculated using a single measurement around the base of the combined tree trunk nearer ground level. This approach gives a bigger RPA figure. In the case of our very large ash tree the RPA goes from a **7m circle (touching the work area)** to a **9m circle (well within the work area)**.

We also note that the RPA for the medium sized laurel **underestimates** the size of the individual stems in the tree which would make this RPA in the TPP too small. The laurel is only a few meters from the north wall of the proposed development so this RPA value is particularly important. Although the wall of the development is 1.895m from the boundary the builders will be disturbing the ground closer to the boundary than that during the building process.

Also **not on the plan** are other mature small trees and shrubs located next to the boundary on our side (northern boundary) and adjacent to where the works for the north-facing aspect of the development will take place. These are in the same bed as the laurel tree that is on the TPP but the TPP neglects to show the other plants and trees co-located in the same space.

We would therefore request that all construction activity associated with the north-facing aspect of the development be done "under arboricultural supervision only" and that the builders refer to the Arboricultural Method Statement associated with the works. These criteria are already attached to the proposed works on the south side of the property where there is another mature tree of comparable size to our ash tree. It would make sense to apply the same discipline to all trees on boundaries affected by the works.

Also, I am very concerned that overshadowing, caused by the close proximity of the overbearing and out-of-scale extension, will cause long term damage to my established vegetation on the northern boundary.

Paragraph 5.43 of the *HBC Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* states that the design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours. Without a doubt, the rear extension will have an adverse effect through overcasting and overshadowing not only to my property but also to my vegetation.

5. **New Chimney flue on the flat roof above the snug – Fumes / products of combustion**

I am objecting to the position and height of the new flue and not to the use of a flue itself.

The position and height of the flue on the plan has not been altered since the original plan was submitted.

Environmental Health have stated (30/08/18): "Based on the current proposed positioning and height of the flue, there is a possibility for smoke nuisance to applicants own property and to neighbouring properties, linked to wind direction and operator efficiency".

Nobody can control the nature of wind.

- The proposed flue on the flat roof above the snug sits forward from my first floor windows. It is too close to both my bathroom window and my master bedroom windows. I constantly open my windows throughout the year. I like fresh air.
- Without a doubt, I believe that products of combustion (from, for example, solid fuel) will penetrate my rooms whatever the wind conditions but especially during the usual south westerly winds.
- The Applicant will know when the chimney in the snug will be used and will close any rear bedroom windows accordingly. However, I will not know when the Applicant decides that the chimney will be used in order for me to close my windows.
- I do not want to breathe products of combustion (from, for example, solid fuel) through my open bathroom window and master bedroom windows both rooms of which are situated too close to the new flue.
- In its proposed position, neither the flue manufacturer nor AR Design Studio nor the Applicant nor Environmental Health can guarantee that the products of combustion will not enter my property for me and my family to breathe. Nobody can control the nature of wind.
- To reiterate, neither I nor my family want to breathe products of combustion.

Also, I feel that the chimney flue on the single storey flat roof, protruding and positioned so very close to my property, is out-of-character and unattractive in respect of its visual impact. It is very unsightly protruding from the flat roof.

I am not aware of any other comparable property with a single storey flat roof extension in the vicinity that has a flue protruding from its flat roof in such close proximity to a neighbouring property and its habitable rooms.

6. **Maintenance of green sedum roof and frameless glass link**

AR Design have re-confirmed that no permanent maintenance paths have been incorporated within the sedum matting on the amended proposed plans as they will be using sedum matting that can be walked upon.

However, I am basing my concerns (with regard to the maintenance of the sedum roof) on **Enviromat's** credentials, expertise and experience as the largest grower of sedum matting in the UK.

My objections are detailed below.

Green sedum roof – fallen leaves, twigs and detritus

The flat roof on the single storey rear extension is extremely large.

The entire flat roof of the rear extension and the flat roof above the snug area will be laid with sedum other than the following sections: (i) the louvre system over part of the terrace area and (ii) the two rooflights over parts of the living and snug areas.

The Applicant has a very large Willow tree nearby to the rear of the extension (towards the southern boundary) and other deciduous vegetation. My property has a very large Ash tree nearby (on the northern boundary) and other deciduous vegetation. Neighbours in the area also have deciduous trees and bushes.

An abundance of leaves are shed during autumn. Twigs, leaves and detritus are also strewn around all neighbours' gardens during gales and strong winds which occur throughout the year, not just during autumn and winter. Without a doubt, fallen leaves, twigs and detritus will get trapped by / in between the sedum plants.

The maintenance of the green sedum roof will be a very intrusive activity based on the following:

Green sedum roof – recommended maintenance procedures

There is a company called **Enviromat** which is a green roof specialist. *Enviromat* is the brand name for sedum matting grown in the UK by Q Lawns turf growers.

Enviromat states:

- "Today, 70% of the sedum roofs created in the UK incorporate sedum matting grown by *Enviromat*".

For sedum roof maintenance, *Enviromat* states:

- "Clear debris – never leave fallen leaves, twigs or detritus on a green roof for more than a couple of weeks.....they will suffocate and kill the plants".
- "NEVER walk on sedum plants that are frozen. If it's frosty outside or if cold weather is forecast. Keep off".
- "Try to spread your weight. Ease pressure on the plants by laying planks or boards before you walk on them. Especially if there's a lot of work to be done – eg [sic] barrowing gravel from one side of a sedum bed to another. Don't leave the boards down for too long though – sedums need daylight".
- "Don't walk on sedums any more than you have to. If you need to cross your sedum lawn or your green roof on a regular basis lay a permanent path with gravel, mulch or paving stones".
- "There is no need to remove spent flower heads from the sedum plants but please pull out any unwanted plants that may have established themselves during the summer. ESPECIALLY tree seedlings and/or any deep rooted or vigorous plants".

Green sedum roof – impact of maintenance to my property through noise and loss of privacy and overlooking

Given the above, regular maintenance of the green sedum roofs for both the rear extension and above the snug will be noisy, disruptive and intrusive from my property because:

- For safe and regular roof access, I feel that it is doubtful that a ladder would be used especially when carrying equipment such as boards or planks, pressure washer, leaf blower and garden vacuum etc. Therefore, a domestic scaffold tower, or similar, would probably be used to access the roof safely. This will cause regular noise whilst it's erected and dismantled at least every 2 weeks.
- Since there are no permanent maintenance paths / access routes then planks or boards will have to be regularly laid onto the sedum matting every 2 weeks in order to clear the fallen leaves, twigs and detritus. Additionally, debris will need to be cleaned out of the drainage runs at the edges of the parapet. This maintenance task will undoubtedly have to occur throughout the year (especially during autumn and winter). Planks and boards will be moved around the patio. This will make regular noise at least every 2 weeks.
- Presumably a leaf blower and garden vacuum will be used to pick up and 'blow' the fallen leaves, twigs and detritus. This will cause regular noise at first floor level and at least every 2 weeks. Additionally, there is a reasonable assumption that debris will be deposited onto my property – this is intrusive
- Maintenance work at first floor level will be required to hand weed the sedum matting and remove unwanted plants and tree seedlings and to also replace dead sedum plants.
- If the matting is not maintained on a regular and constant basis then the sedum plants will suffocate and die. As such, the debris and the dead plants on the flat roof will be even more unsightly from my property as well as the surviving sedum matting itself.
- I will suffer continual overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and intrusion. This is due to the very close proximity of the extension (i.e. the flat roof snug which forms part of the northern boundary and flat roof living/dining areas) to my property by maintenance personnel working at first floor level on the extension's roofs, through the regular and constant maintenance programme that is required for the sedum plants to thrive and survive. This will occur regularly at least every 2 weeks.
- Working at first floor level, especially on the northern boundary, maintenance personnel will have a clear and direct line of view into my two living areas, my master bedroom and my bathroom (when the bathroom window is open).
- Currently, I do not have this noise and invasive overlooking issue therefore this regular and continual intrusion at first floor level into my privacy at least every 2 weeks is unacceptable.

Frameless glass link – noise and loss of privacy and overlooking

In addition to the aforementioned points, fallen leaves, twigs and detritus will lay / get collected / pile up at the end of the frameless glass link's slope which joins the proposed rear extension. These will have to be cleared and:

- Presumably a pressure washer will be used to clean the glass link (as well as the two rooflights). Again, this task will presumably occur whilst cleaning the sedum at least every 2 weeks – causing further noise.
- Due to the very close proximity of the frameless glass link to my property there is a reasonable assumption that dirty water and debris may be deposited onto my property – this is intrusive.

7. **Application Form Householder Application for Planning Permission for works or extension to a dwelling Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (declaration date 25/07/18)**

Applicable statements made in the Application Form still apply to the amended proposed plan. I disagree with statements made in the Application Form for the following reasons:

- **Page 3 section 5, Materials** states that the existing material for the roof is "single ply membrane, slate tiles". This is incorrect.

The domed extension is covered in lead. The flat roof extension (with the lantern rooflight) is also covered in lead. These roofs are clearly visible from my property. There is no single ply membrane on these existing roofs. There are slate tiles on the main roof.

- **Page 3 section 5, Materials** states that the existing materials for the windows are "white PVCu". This is incorrect.

The existing windows on the east, north and west elevations are wood (painted). I don't know about the windows on the south elevation. Other than the south elevation, these wooden windows & wooden French doors are clearly visible from my property and the street. They are not white PVCu. If I'm wrong then they are excellent imitation wooden windows. However, white PVCu windows are quite obvious.

- **Page 4 section 13, Declaration** is the agent's declaration (Mr Johnathan Oswald, AR Design Studio) confirming that facts stated on the form are "true and accurate". But statements made on the Application Form are not true and accurate, as shown above.

8. **Conclusion**

Applicable statements made in the Design and Access Statement still apply to the amended proposed plan. I disagree with statements made in the Design and Access Statement for the following reasons:

8.1 "The proposal has been well considered..."

- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1) as it does not respond to, draw inspiration from and respect the local context. The design of the extension and use of non-vernacular materials are out of character in terms of their appearance.
- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1a) as the extension does not respond positively to existing features of the Edwardian villa or to neighbouring properties.
- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1b) as the extension does not apply characteristics of the local area into the design.
- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1c) as the extension does not use the characteristics of the locality with regards to its height, existing buildings lines, materials and proportions of existing windows.
- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1e) as the extension is overbearing, out-of-scale and out-of-character. The size and design of the extension and chimney flue causes unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property in respect of the extension's dominant visual impact, the loss of privacy, overlooking and smoke nuisance that will be caused by the flue.
- The garage butting against the south boundary wall breaches Paragraph 5.40 *HBC Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* because single storey extensions should have at least a **1m gap** from a shared boundary. Also it is important that gaps are retained between buildings as this helps form the pattern of development in an area which in turn influences local character.

8.2 "The design aims to meet the clients' living requirements for a long term home, while remaining respectful to its setting and surrounding neighbours".

- The rear extension development is ugly, dominant and not well proportioned for its proposed setting.
- The rear extension is overbearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of appearance, including the proposed non-vernacular materials, compared with existing developments in the vicinity.
- The rear extension is not respectful to its setting and surroundings.

8.3 "The replacement is far more considered and is of a higher quality design, in reference to Policy CS16 of the 'Havant Borough Core Strategy.' [sic] which aims to raise the standard of design across the Borough".

- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1) as it does not respond to, draw inspiration from and respect the local context. The design and use of non-vernacular materials are both out of character in terms of their appearance.
- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1a) as it does not respond positively to existing features of the Edwardian villa or to neighbouring properties.
- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1b) as it does not apply characteristics of the local area into the design.
- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1c) as it does not use the characteristics of the locality with regards to its height, existing buildings lines, materials and proportions of existing windows.
- The rear extension has breached Policy CS16 criterion (1e) because:
 - It is overbearing, out-of-scale and out-of-character. The size and design of the rear extension causes unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its dominant visual impact and through the loss of privacy, outlook and overlooking including the loss of privacy caused by the new northern glazed panel.
 - The chimney flue will cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property through smell/smoke nuisance/products of combustion.
 - I will suffer continual overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and intrusion due to the very close proximity of the extension (especially the snug which forms part of the north boundary wall) to my property by maintenance personnel working at first floor level on the extension's sedum roof. Personnel will be required to carry out regular and constant maintenance which is required for the sedum plants to thrive and survive. This will occur regularly at least every 2 weeks

8.4 "The extension itself is limited [sic] to single storey and is clad in natural timber, all to reinforce its subservient relationship with the existing dwelling. (5.41 of Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document)".

- Paragraph 5.41 states that the development should be both "sympathetic and subservient" to the original design of the Edwardian villa. The design meets neither of these requirements.
- The development does not incorporate matching materials and roof pitch which would make it sympathetic. The proposed materials are non-vernacular and the proposed design of the rear extension has a flat roof.
- The rear extension overwhelms the Edwardian villa in its proportion and style. There are no references to the Edwardian style by using similar palette of materials or similar constructions methods. The proposed changes do not look like an integral and subservient part of the existing building but appear as something that has been 'tacked on' as a later addition – which it is. Therefore it is not subservient to the original design.

- Additionally, the height and length (running parallel to the northern boundary wall) of the proposed extension will cause an adverse effect on my property and my established vegetation through overshadowing.

8.5 "The amount and scale of the extension has been carefully considered in relation to the existing house. [sic] neighbouring developments and the streetscene".

- From the north elevation, the proposed single storey rear extension is ugly and not well proportioned for the proposed setting. It is overbearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of appearance, including the proposed non-vernacular materials, compared with existing developments in the vicinity.
- It is too dominant, unattractive and will have a very enclosing effect when viewed from my property and my habitable rooms.
- The rear extension is visually oppressive.
- It will also cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its visual impact and very close proximity to my property.
- Paragraph 5.43 of the *Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* states that the design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours. Without a doubt, the rear extension will have an adverse effect through overcasting and overshadowing not only to my property but also to my vegetation.
- Developments should not degrade the authentic historic detail of the area.
- The character of the proposed development should be in keeping with the character of the Edwardian property.

8.6 "The proposed extension is limited to single storey and set back from the boundary to ensure it is not overbearing in nature and maintains privacy between neighbours".

- The amended proposed plan now positions the extension 1.895m from the shared northern boundary.
- However, the proposed single storey rear extension is ugly and not well proportioned for its proposed setting.
- It is still overbearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance, including the proposed non-vernacular materials, compared with existing developments in the vicinity.
- It is too dominant, unattractive and will have a very enclosing effect when viewed from my property and my habitable rooms. The extension is visually oppressive.
- It will also cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its visual impact and very close proximity to my property.
- I will suffer continual overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and intrusion. This is due to the very close proximity of the extension to my property by maintenance personnel working at first floor level on the extension's sedum roof, through the regular and constant maintenance programme that is required for the sedum plants to thrive and survive. This will occur regularly at least every 2 weeks.
- Working at first floor level, especially near the northern boundary, maintenance personnel will have a clear and direct line of view into my two living areas, my master bedroom and my bathroom (when the bathroom window is open). This will be intrusive.
- Currently, I do not have this noise and invasive overlooking issue therefore this regular and continual intrusion at first floor level into my privacy at least every 2 weeks is unacceptable.
- With regard to the new chimney flue, Environmental Health have stated (30/08/18): "Based on the current proposed positioning and height of the flue, there is a possibility for smoke nuisance to applicants own property and to neighbouring properties, linked to wind direction and operator efficiency".
- With regard to the new chimney flue, in its proposed position (NB: its position and height have not been altered on the amended proposed plan) neither the flue

manufacturer nor AR Design Studio nor the Applicant nor Environmental Health can guarantee that the products of combustion (from, for example, solid fuel) will not enter my property which my family and I will breathe.

- Nobody can control the nature of wind.
- I do not want to breathe products of combustion through my open bathroom window and master bedroom windows both rooms which are situated very close to the new flue.

8.7 "We have taken care to ensure we are compliant with paragraph 5.41 of Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document".

- Paragraph 5.41 states that the development should be both "sympathetic and subservient" to the original design of the Edwardian villa. The rear extension meets neither of these requirements.
- The rear extension does not incorporate matching materials and roof pitch which would make it sympathetic. The proposed materials are non-vernacular and the proposed design of the rear extension has a flat roof.
- The rear extension overwhelms the Edwardian villa in its proportion and style. There are no references to the Edwardian style by using similar palette of materials or similar constructions methods. The proposed changes do not look like an integral and subservient part of the existing building but appear as something that has been 'tacked on' as a later addition – which it is. Therefore it is not subservient to the original design.
- Additionally, the height and length (running parallel to the Northern boundary wall) of the proposed extension will cause an adverse effect on my property and my established vegetation through overshadowing.

8.8 "The visual impact of the extension from the upper rear neighbouring windows is significantly reduced through the use of a green roof".

- Therefore, AR Design Studio acknowledges and confirms that it knows that I will suffer a negative "visual impact" from my property.
- Moving the rear extension nominally by 1.295m from the shared border does not negate the impact that the extension will still have on my property.
- Additionally, no amount of sedum matting will significantly reduce the harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its visual impact which is too dominant and oppressive and overbearing.
- Throughout the year, I will suffer continual overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and intrusion. This is due to the very close proximity of the extension to my property by maintenance personnel working on the extension's roof, through the regular and constant maintenance programme that is required for the sedum plants to thrive and survive and for cleaning the drainage runs, frameless glass link and rooflights.

7.9 "To conclude the design has been carefully considered and responds to relevant planning policy/guidance as well as the requirements of the client".

- The various points that I have made in this document show that the AR Design's statement is not accurate with regard to being considerate and respectful to neighbours and adhering to applicable planning policies and guidance.

Section 3: North Elevation – Removal of existing north chimney

Both the north and south chimneys are clearly visible from my property and provide a visually balanced view from the northern elevation. Removing the north chimney will have a negative impact on the character of the Edwardian property.

Having reviewed the plans, I feel that the proposed removal of the north chimney has breached planning criteria, design guidance and design expectations because of the reasons in sections 1–3 below:

1. **Havant Borough Core Strategy, March 2011 – Policy CS16 High Quality Design**
 - 1.1. **Criterion 1** – Removal of the chimney will not respond to, draw inspiration from and respect the local context. The removal of the chimney will be out of character in terms of its resulting unbalanced appearance. The Edwardian villa will suffer a loss of local character.
 - 1.2. **Criterion 1a** – Removal of the chimney will not respond positively to the existing features of the Edwardian villa and the roofline will become unbalanced.

The graceful and balanced Edwardian villa will suffer a loss of character because of the removal of the original chimney and the roofline will become unbalanced and forever altered.
2. **Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, December 2011**
 - 2.1 **Table 4.1 - Detail and Materials, Rhythm and patterns, key features and detailing** – removal of the chimney will have a negative impact on the rhythm and pattern on the skyline through the roof shape and articulation, repetition of elements and patterns provided by both chimneys and the finer level of the Edwardian craftsmanship, building techniques, decoration and styles of an Edwardian building.
3. **Havant Borough Urban Context and Character Appraisals, Appendix 1 Area 4: Emsworth**
 - 3.1 There are some fine detached Edwardian villas and a uniform row of smaller Gothic styled villas at the southern end of Westbourne Avenue.
 - 3.2 Measures should be taken to control the further piecemeal alteration of uniformly balanced properties.
 - 3.3 Preservation and enhancement of the quality of period properties in Emsworth should be maintained.

Section 4: North Elevation – Single storey rear extension

I feel that the proposed single storey rear extension is ugly and not well proportioned for its proposed setting. It is overbearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance, including the proposed non-vernacular materials, compared with existing developments in the vicinity.

It is too dominant, unattractive and has a very enclosing effect when viewed from my property (by way of its height and length running parallel to the northern boundary wall) and its very close proximity to my property and my habitable rooms. It is visually oppressive.

It also causes unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its visual impact. Additionally, the design is inappropriate for its proposed setting and has an adverse impact on my property in respect of its visual impact and very close proximity to my property and my habitable areas. The character of the proposed extension should be in keeping with the character of the Edwardian property.

Having reviewed the plans, I feel that the proposed development has breached planning criteria, design guidance and design expectations because of the reasons in sections 1–3 below:

1. Havant Borough Core Strategy, March 2011 – Policy CS16 High Quality Design

- 1.1 **Criterion 1** – It does not respond to, draw inspiration from and respect the local context. The design and use of non-vernacular materials (e.g. aluminium coping stones, timber cladding, green sedum roof) are both out of character in terms of appearance. In such close proximity to my property it is visually oppressive. The Edwardian villa will suffer a loss of local character.
- 1.2 **Criterion 1a** – It does not respond positively to existing features of the Edwardian villa or to neighbouring properties.
- 1.3 **Criterion 1b** – It does not apply characteristics of the local area into the design.
- 1.4 **Criterion 1c** – It does not use the characteristics of the locality with regards to its height, existing buildings lines, materials (e.g. the proposed materials include timber cladding aluminium coping stones and a green sedum roof) and proportions of existing windows.
- 1.5 **Criterion 1e** – The overbearing, out-of-scale and out-of-character size and design causes unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its dominant visual impact and through the outlook from my property.

Additionally:

Smells / Fumes / Products of combustion – chimney flue on the flat roof above the snug

I am objecting to the height and position of the new flue and not to the use of a flue itself. The position and size of the flue on the plan has not been altered since the original plan was submitted.

Environmental Health have stated (30/08/18): "Based on the current proposed positioning and height of the flue, there is a possibility for smoke nuisance to applicants own property and to neighbouring properties, linked to wind direction and operator efficiency".

Neither the flue manufacturer nor AR Design Studio nor the Applicant nor Environmental Health can guarantee that the products of combustion will not enter my property. Nobody can control the nature of wind.

- The flue on the flat roof above the snug sits forward from my first floor windows.
- It is too close to both my bathroom window and my master bedroom windows. I constantly open my windows throughout the year. I like fresh air.
- Without a doubt, I believe that products of combustion (from, for example, solid fuel) will penetrate my rooms whatever the wind conditions but especially during the usual south westerly winds.
- The Applicant will know when they will be using their chimney in their snug and will close any rear bedroom windows accordingly. However, I will not know when the Applicant decides to use their new chimney in order for me to close my windows.
- I do not want to breathe products of combustion (from, for example, solid fuel) through my open bathroom window and master bedroom windows both rooms of which are situated close to the new flue.

Also, I feel that the chimney flue on the single storey flat roof, protruding and positioned so very close to my property, is out-of-character and unattractive in respect of its visual impact. It is very unsightly protruding from the flat roof.

I am not aware of any other period property with a single storey flat roof in the vicinity that has a flue protruding from its flat roof in such close proximity to a neighbouring property and its habitable rooms.

Noise and loss of privacy and overlooking – green sedum roof and glazing

The maintenance of the green sedum roof, the frameless glass link and the rooflights has been detailed in pages 5–7 above (Section 2: Summary of concerns).

The noise and intrusion into the privacy of my property that will be caused from the regular and constant maintenance of the sedum plants at first storey level is unacceptable.

The Design and Access Statement states that:

- “The visual impact of the extension from the upper rear neighbouring windows is significantly reduced through the use of a green roof”.

Therefore, AR Design Studio acknowledges and confirms that it knows that I will suffer a negative “visual impact” from my property.

However, no amount of sedum matting will significantly reduce the harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its visual impact.

Throughout the year, I will suffer continual overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and intrusion at least every 2 weeks. This is due to the very close proximity of the rear extension to my property by maintenance personnel working on the extension’s roof, through the regular and constant maintenance programme that is required for the sedum plants to thrive and survive and for cleaning the drainage runs, frameless glass link and rooflights.

The graceful and balanced Edwardian villa will suffer a loss of character because of the overbearing, out-of-scale and out-of-character design of the rear extension.

2. **Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, December 2011**

- 2.1 **Table 4.1, 1. Layout and form, Height** – It has a negative impact on the view and vista from my property. It does not follow the typical pattern of existing properties in the area. The design causes unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property in respect of its visual impact from my property. It is visually oppressive.
- 2.2 **Paragraph 5.39** – Extensions should look to the existing building as the main reference point for appearance, materials and details such ridge, verge and eave finishes, head and cills, brick coursing, dressings and quoin work. The roof form and slope should also reflect that of the main building. The extension does not follow these guidelines.
- 2.1. **Paragraph 5.39** – It is too dominant. The roof of the extension does not mirror that of the main Edwardian villa. The proposed extension has a flat roof using green sedum as a roof covering. The sides will be clad in timber. The coping stones will be aluminium. These are all non-vernacular materials which are out-of-character for both the Edwardian villa and neighbouring properties.
- 2.3 **Paragraph 5.41** – The extension should be both sympathetic and subservient to the original design of the Edwardian villa. The design offers neither of these requirements.

Sympathetic design

- The design does not incorporate matching materials and roof pitch which would make it sympathetic.
- The proposed materials are non-vernacular.
- The proposed design has a flat roof.

Subservient design

- The design overwhelms the Edwardian villa both in its proportion and style.
 - There are no references to the Edwardian style by using similar palette of materials or similar constructions methods.
 - The proposed changes do not look like an integral and subservient part of the existing building but appear as something that has been 'tacked on' as a later addition – which it is.
 - Therefore, it is not subservient to the original design.
 - Additionally, the height and length (running parallel to the northern boundary wall) of the proposed extension will cause an adverse impact on my property and my established vegetation through overshadowing.
- 2.4 **Paragraph 5.43** – The design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours. Without a doubt, the rear extension will have an adverse effect through overcasting and overshadowing.

3. **Havant Borough Urban Context and Character Appraisals, Appendix 1 Area 4: Emsworth**

- 3.1 Any new development should be of a scale in keeping with the historic precedent.
- 3.2 New development, including extensions, should avoid the introduction of suburban styles and materials and respond to its landscape setting in scale, form and design, materials and colour.
- 3.3 Conversion of existing vernacular buildings should be carefully controlled to prevent loss of local character.

Section 5: North Elevation – Other considerations

1. Trees/bushes

Many houses on Westbourne Avenue have medium to large landscaped gardens with significant trees to front and back gardens. Mature trees and bushes should be preserved and maintained and not adversely affected by large extensions.

Having gone through the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement, I remain very concerned that the foundations for the rear extension will damage the roots of my trees/bushes on the northern boundary.

The proposed works are within 1.895m of our boundary. The Tree Protection Plan (TPP) submitted with the application shows one very large ash and one medium laurel tree located on our side of the boundary between the two properties. These are on the plan as potentially affected by the proposed works. Root Protection Areas (RPAs) are identified for these trees i.e. areas where the ground should not be disturbed, compacted or contaminated as the trees in question would be adversely affected.

The RPAs are represented as circles around the location of the trunks. Both trees are multi-stem (i.e. not single trunk) and we assume the RPAs will have been estimated using the size of each stem (usually measured at chest height) combined. This gives RPAs which are clear of or just touch the proposed area of work.

However the RPA can also be calculated using a single measurement around the base of the combined tree trunk nearer ground level. This approach gives a bigger RPA figure. In the case of our very large ash tree the RPA goes from a **7m circle (touching the work area)** to a **9m circle (well within the work area)**.

We also note that the RPA for the medium sized laurel **underestimates** the size of the individual stems in the tree which would make this RPA in the TPP too small. The laurel is only a few meters from the north wall of the proposed development so this RPA value is particularly important. Although the wall of the development is 1.895m from the boundary the builders will be disturbing the ground closer to the boundary than that during the building process.

Also **not on the plan** are other mature small trees and shrubs located next to the boundary on our side (northern boundary) and adjacent to where the works for the north-facing aspect of the development will take place. These are in the same bed as the laurel tree that is on the TPP but the TPP neglects to show the other plants and trees co-located in the same space.

We would therefore request that all construction activity associated with the north-facing aspect of the development be done "under arboricultural supervision only" and that the builders refer to the Arboricultural Method Statement associated with the works. These criteria are already attached to the proposed works on the south side of the property where there is another mature tree of comparable size to our ash tree. It would make sense to apply the same discipline to all trees on boundaries affected by the works.

Also, I am very concerned that overshadowing, caused by the close proximity of the overbearing and out-of-scale extension, will cause long term damage to my established vegetation on the northern boundary.

Paragraph 5.43 of the *HBC Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* states that the design of a rear extension should avoid the loss of light to neighbours. Without a doubt, the rear extension will have an adverse effect through overcasting and overshadowing not only to my property but also to my vegetation.

Section 6: East Elevation – Removal of existing north chimney

Both the north and south chimneys are clearly visible and provide a visually balanced view from the streetscene. Removing the north chimney will have a negative impact on the character of the Edwardian property.

Having reviewed the plans, I feel that the proposed removal of the north chimney has breached planning criteria, design guidance and design expectations because of the reasons in sections 1–3 below:

1. **Havant Borough Core Strategy, March 2011 – Policy CS16 High Quality Design**
 - 1.1 **Criterion 1** – Removal of the chimney will not respond to, draw inspiration from and respect the local context. The removal of the chimney will be out of character in terms of its resulting unbalanced appearance. The Edwardian villa will suffer a loss of local character.
 - 1.2 **Criterion 1a** – Removal of the chimney will not respond positively to the existing features of the Edwardian villa and the roofline will become unbalanced.

The graceful and balanced Edwardian villa will suffer a loss of character because of the removal of the original chimney and the roofline will become unbalanced and forever altered.
2. **Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, December 2011**
 - 2.1 **Table 4.1 - Detail and Materials, Rhythm and patterns, key features and detailing** – removal of the chimney will have a negative impact on the rhythm and pattern on the skyline through the roof shape and articulation, repetition of elements and patterns provided by both chimneys and the finer level of the Edwardian craftsmanship, building techniques, decoration and styles of an Edwardian building.
3. **Havant Borough Urban Context and Character Appraisals, Appendix 1 Area 4: Emsworth**
 - 3.1 There are some fine detached Edwardian villas and a uniform row of smaller Gothic styled villas at the southern end of Westbourne Avenue.
 - 3.2 Measures should be taken to control the further piecemeal alteration of uniformly balanced properties.
 - 3.3 Preservation and enhancement of the quality of period properties in Emsworth should be maintained.

Section 7: East Elevation – Single storey detached garage

Having reviewed the plans, I feel that the proposed development has breached planning design guidance because of the reason in section 1 below:

1. **Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, December 2011**
 - 1.1 **Paragraph 5.40** – Single storey extensions should have at least a **1m gap** from a shared boundary. Based on the plans, the garage will be built butting against the existing brick southern boundary wall. Additionally, from the streetscene, this lack of gap between the neighbouring building (No.17) is not in keeping with the local pattern of development. The *Borough Design Guide* states that it is important that gaps are retained between buildings as this helps form the pattern of development in an area which in turn influences local character.