

Michelle Houghton

From: Cecily Hughes - [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 October 2017 08:33
To: Planning and Development Shared Mailbox
Cc: Havant Auto-Reply
Subject: APP'17/90028/9

13/ 14 Langstone High Street

Havant PO9 1RY

[REDACTED]

10 October 2017

Ref: APP/17/00928/9

Dear Mrs Hayward

Re: Proposed Garden room extension with roof terrace above

This small cottage has already had the benefit of a large two-storey extension, allowed by Development Control and to allow this new proposal would constitute over-development of the property on this very small site.

A large expanse of glass which is planned for this extension is totally out-of-keeping with the old cottages which make up the historic core of Langstone Village, none of which has large windows. One knows they are dark when one buys them I would refer you to the Langstone Village Design Statement (2008) which has the status of material consideration for builders and architects, advises the use of vernacular materials when extending or altering existing properties.

I believe the owners of No 16 Langstone High Street to have been badly advised by their architect in putting forward this application for an extension with a flat roof to a Grade II listed building, which also closes the gap between the oldest terrace (Nos 16-18 High Street) and No 15. The historic settlement pattern (LVDS Guidance) consists of terraces with gaps between, through which views of trees can be seen.

Nor does a flat-roofed extension as planned for No 16, "respect the existing roofline" as the LVDS Guidance advises on Page 17.

To quote from the Langstone Village Design Statement: "On the waterfront particular care is needed to ensure that the new development harmonises with the neighbourhood Listed buildings". The extension planned in this application patently does not harmonise with any of the old buildings in the core of the village.

I also find myself puzzled by the changing standards against which proposed extensions and alterations are judged by Development Control:

In recent years Mrs Rogers, the owner of No 15, was refused permission to have a window in her bathroom (in the wall facing No 16);

I had strict conditions imposed both on the materials used and the method of 'laying on' the thatch when I had Nos 13 and 14 re-thatched,

and Mr Spencer of No 11 had very strict style and dimension rules laid down for a window to the rear of No 11.

It now seems that no standards at all are to be applied to a large and very visible extension to the side of No 16.

I was shown by Mr Oliver that the roof of the ground floor 'garden room' would be in line with the top of his existing front door. I stood outside the 'Winkle Market' opposite No 16, and saw that, contrary to Mr Oliver's assurances, a strip between 9" and 12" deep will be visible above the exterior wall from the public realm *ie* from the pavement outside the cottage and from the start of the footpath to the "Ship Inn."

Finally, this view consisting of Langstone Old Mill, the "Royal Oak", and the terrace of three cottages Nos 16, 17 and 18. is the defining view of the Borough of Havant, used on all its publicity material. it is the most photographed and painted group of buildings along the South Coast and for miles around.

Allowing this planning application would alter it forever. I doubt we would ever be forgiven for letting this happen.

In view of the above observations, I believe that this application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

Cecily Hughes



Virus-free. www.avg.com