



18 Summerhill Road
Cowplain
Waterlooville
Hampshire
PO8 8XE

Mrs. B. Crawford
Planning Officer
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

22nd February 2017

Dear Mrs Crawford

Re: Planning Application No. APP/17/00101
Proposed extension at 20 Summerhill Road, Cowplain. PO8 8XE

I am writing to register my objection to the above planning application.

I have lived next door to No 20 Summerhill Road since February 1987 and have seen the ownership of the property change many times. When built in 1931 both houses were of similar design, being approximately 20ft wide on identical plots that are 130ft long with a 40ft frontage. Summerhill Road is a quiet cul-de-sac just north of Cowplain village centre with a mixed development of 38 properties. Of these 33 are detached houses or bungalows, one is a house of multiple occupation and there are two pairs of semi-detached houses.

Whilst there have been many additions and developments to the property during my tenure I have never raised any objections until the application Ref: APP/16/01170, submitted on 10th November 2016. This application was withdrawn following the Planning Officer's concerns, possibly influenced by my objections submitted at that time. I also note that following my concerns raised in the objection to APP/16/01170 that the applicants have been required to make a formal application to Southern Water to address the issues of foul water and surface water drainage on to my property.

As this new application appears very similar to the earlier one I contacted Mr G Gard, the applicants architect, in order to clarify some confusion in the details of the new application. In reply I received an e-mail stating *"I have been asked by my client not to reply to any requests for any information or clarification relating to the current planning application"*. Through the good offices of Havant Planning Department. I was informed that the height of the proposed first floor (east) single side extension was now 2 metres high having been reduced by 60cms from the previous application. My own measurement of the height of the existing single storey side extension is that it is 2.75 metres, so the total height of the side wall of this development will be 4.75 metres.

My objections to the amended application are: -

- The planning application includes confusing and contradictory information in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and drawings submitted. On page 2 of DAS, the proposal is

that 'all the above accommodation will be provided over the existing flat roofed element and **within the footprint of the existing first floor cat slide extension**' whilst page 3 of DAS, states that 'the first floor extension **will finish flush with that of the existing ground floor element of the property**'. The drawings submitted on 27th January as 'Superseded Proposed Elevations' include a 'front elevation with cat slide alternative design, whilst the 'Amended Proposed Elevations' submitted on 3rd February include references to the current proposal and the 'alternative cat slide option'.

- The new proposals would create a wall 4.75 metres high and 12 metres long, (57 square metres), along my western boundary that would be overbearing and result in a substantial loss of daylight, sunlight and the amenities currently being enjoyed. It would also be unacceptable in terms of the visual impact and loss of light to my kitchen and landing. Also, the new gable roof line that runs the length of the proposed development is approximately 1.5 metres away from this side wall and will raise the total height even further.
- The proposals would create a building 12 metres (39 ft.) wide and over 5 metres high, starting on the eastern boundary line and finishing 30 cms (12 inches) from the western boundary line. This large structure on a plot with a 40ft frontage will be out of scale and have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the current street scene.
- The proposed first floor development on the eastern side of the property shows it being built upon a single storey 'false wall' that was added to an earlier ground floor extension. I was told by the applicants that this was done to gain Building Regulations approval and to enable the kitchen window to be installed nearer the corner of that room. Whilst I am not a structural engineer I have concerns that building an additional structure upon this 'wall' may not be safe.
- The window in the proposed bathroom would create significant overlooking and loss of privacy that I currently enjoy, unless any such window is obscure and with an opening for ventilation only, that will be at least 1.7 metres from the floor.
- If approved in its present form, the proposed development will create a situation where access for all future maintenance or repairs to the east side of the building will have to be from the neighbouring property (allowable under current legislation). This will subject the owner of the neighbouring property to a future of intrusion and inconvenience.

Finally, I firmly believe in the 'right' of a home owner to extend and develop their property within planning guidelines. However, together with that 'right' must be responsibility to ensure their ability to independently maintain and repair their property without interfering with the 'rights' of adjacent property owners.

Yours sincerely



Mrs. Christine Trafford