

Planning Services,
Civic Offices,
Guildhall Square,
Portsmouth,
PO1 2AU

24th August 2017

For the attention of Ms **Katherine Alger**.

Dear Madam,

PLANNING APPLICATION NO 17/01192/HOU – 22 Exeter Road

Construction of first floor extension to rear elevation to include installation of flat roof to remaining section of ground floor rear projection (17/01192/HOU).

In this Application the Applicant makes reference to the Pre-application Advice given in respect of an earlier Application (17/00486/HOU – “Construction of first floor extension to rear elevation to include installation of flat roof to remaining section of ground floor projection”) which was subsequently withdrawn. We have been advised by the Planning Department (15th Aug 17) that every Application must stand alone and cannot be supported by previous Applications and therefore the references from an earlier Application would appear to be invalid.

We wish to object to the current Application for the following reasons:

The Planning Application.

Paragraph 3. Description of Proposed Works.

The description is wrong. The work is to provide another (2nd) Bathroom and to recover some of the size of bedroom 1, lost through the addition of the new bathroom, by a first floor half rear extension to the northern side.

Paragraph 6. Pre-application Advice.

We understand that there has NOT been any Pre-application Advice in respect of THIS application.

We note the Pre-application Advice on Application No 17/00486/HOU (amended to

read “construction of a two storey extension to front/side elevation”) included the statement that the Planning Officer thought this (the rear extension) inappropriate and too large. There was **NO** mention that the Planning Officer thought the rear extension could potentially restrict light to Neighbour (24) and a suggestion that a half extension as an alternative, would not be an issue.

We are not aware of any evidence that the Planning Officer gave such advice, but if so we consider that the Planning Officer may not have realized that the roof to the rear extension at number 24 is tiled, with no windows. Also the Planning Officer may not have been aware of our kitchen/diner window (South side of our property) which provides light and some solar heating to our kitchen/diner.

On a site visit by the Planning Officer at 1500 on 7th August 2017 details of our kitchen/diner window were taken and concern was expressed over our right to light and that this would need further research (see enclosed copy of photograph, of sunlight onto our kitchen/diner window).

3. Paragraph 11. Materials.

Roof – description. The existing roof is not Slate, it is concrete roof tiles. The proposed material of slate would be at odds with the rest of the roof.

Walls – description. The existing bricks are Common Burnt Clay Bricks. The proposed material should be clarified as Common Burnt Clay Bricks.

Windows – description. The use of Anthracite grey PVCu would, we consider, be out of keeping with the remainder of the property, especially at the front. There is no mention whether the new Bathroom window glass will be obscure?

If it is obscure this will be an adverse aspect of the front elevation, as was highlighted by Mr. and Mrs. Watkinson’s objection to Application 17/00486/HOU, the paragraphs headed “Size, Function and Appearance of First Floor Window” all of which we strongly support.

We also note that additional drawings box question has the “no” box ticked yet there are drawings submitted.

4. Drawings.

The following errors and omissions are drawn to the Planning Departments attention:

Drawing 33/2016 – 1 (Existing).

Our kitchen window is actually located further east than shown.

Front Elevation/Street Scene (East) - there is no chimney on the south side of our property.

Section A.A. South does not show the existing bathroom.

The Side Elevation North view does not show the attic windows (2).

Drawing 33/2016-2 – (Proposed)

The cross section lines in red A to A on the Ground Floor and First Floor Plans are NOT level and as such make reading the drawing impossible without some guesswork!

The Ground Floor Plan.

Our kitchen window is actually located further east than shown.

First Floor Plan.

Why is the measurement “4500.0” approximate? This is a key measurement!

Side Elevation North.

The solid line between the existing roof and the proposed new roof (below the lightly shown Chimney Breast) is not understood as the application implies that these two roofs will merge?

The application of “White Pro-rend finish to extension” would be inappropriate to the existing North wall.

The dotted line shown at where the existing structure exists is not understood; surely the new extension would blend into the existing structure?

Attic windows (2) not shown.

Section A.A.

Due to the cross section lines in red A to A on the Ground Floor and First Floor Plans not being level it is very difficult to understand this view.

There are no details of the attic bedroom shown.

Other concerns.

As mentioned in our objections to Application 17/00486/HOU we still have concerns that there is recent relevant history to the property, the construction of a single storey extension to the rear which encompassed the then existing conservatory. This resulted in

Building Control visiting and requiring considerable reworking of the extension prior to being purchased by the present occupants.

It remains a major concern to us that the footings of the Northern wall are extremely close to the main sewer pipe (about 1 meter diameter), we understand that Building Control eventually just accepted the footings for the conservatory extension but that Southern Water have NOT accepted these footings as being acceptable. The sewer runs right along the very edge of the proposed extension and it remains a major concern to us as we have recently had to have extensive damp proofing work carried out along our entire wall north of the proposed extension.

Will the proposed extension have adequate footings under the north wall to support the new extension?

The extension WILL be an obstruction, limiting the amount of sunlight/daylight coming through our Kitchen/Diner window, in the south wall, drastically reducing our quality of living environment which has been enjoyed since 1989, to an unacceptable level, requiring the constant use of electric lighting throughout the day, also reducing our passive solar heating, thus increasing our need for heating.

Applying the Building Research Establishment 25 and 45 degree light tests show that the proposed extension would fail both tests. Both the 45 degree test and the 25 degree test would result in an obstruction angle greater than 65 degrees for which the Building Research Establishment advice is "it is often impossible to achieve reasonable daylight".

We consider this proposal to be overdevelopment, oppressive and overbearing. We would suffer a greater sense of enclosure and being hemmed in particularly in our Kitchen/Diner where we currently entertain both family and friends, due to both the close proximity and height which would result from the extension, reducing our quality of living environment.

Should this Application be referred to the Planning Committee we would welcome the opportunity to speak.

Yours faithfully

Enclosure: Copy of photograph of sunlight onto our Kitchen/Diner window.