

186 SEA FRONT, HAYLING ISLAND

I have been instructed by my clients, (redacted) to critically assess the proposed redevelopment of the abovementioned property to provide ten flats within a 3-storey building.

In the context of the recent redevelopment of 188-190 Sea Front it is accepted that the redevelopment of the application site would be considered acceptable in principle. However, unlike the design solution applied to 188-190 Sea Front, the scheme submitted on behalf of Mr & Mrs Smith has a number of serious shortcomings. On the basis of those shortcomings it is necessary to lodge a formal objection to the proposal. The grounds for that objection relate to the following issues.

Design/Townscape

This part of Sea Front is largely characterised by two-storey detached buildings with either flat or pitched roofs, some with accommodation in the roof structure served by dormer windows or rooflights. Three-storey buildings do not become the norm until west of Reading House, some distance away from the application site. Those buildings fronting Sea Front within a reasonable distance of the application site are characteristically set within spacious grounds and are set back from the road frontage. Despite comprising a significantly higher density the redevelopment of 188-190 did manage to respect its surroundings in terms of built form. Even the overtly modern element on the adjoining site was limited to a scale that complemented its neighbour [now the application site].

Even though the top floor of the proposed building is set back from the main facades, it would nevertheless be read as a three-storey building which amounts to an uncharacteristic feature in the street scene. In addition, the front façade is set forward relative to the adjoining building (contrary to Table 4.1 of the SPD – Borough Design Guide); and the proposed building would take up a significant proportion of the site frontage to Sea Front. Furthermore, the three-storey scale, which uncharacteristically dominates the Alexandra Avenue frontage, and building footprint also gives rise to unacceptable visual intrusion and a loss of spaciousness around the building.

In short, the proposal would amount to an unsympathetic form of development and erode the pleasant character of the immediate locality in which it is read. That shortcoming is compounded by the extent of hardsurfacing to provide car parking, and with a lack of 2

meaningful soft landscaping (robbing the site of its potential to enhance bio-diversity), it would increase surface water run-off to the drainage system.

In townscape/street scene terms the proposed redevelopment would fail to add to the overall quality of the area by virtue of its scale, lack of space around the building, and the prominence of within curtilage car parking. It would not therefore be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. With no benefits to outweigh that harm, the proposal would conflict with the design objectives of both the NPPF and the Council's Core Strategy at policy CS16.

Impact on living conditions

It is an accepted tenet of the planning system that the local planning authority controls development in the public interest. But it is also accepted that, in the public interest, development should not have a harmful impact on the living conditions of residents who would abut or live nearby to new development. This is reflected in Policy CS16 of the Council's Core Strategy and the associated Supplementary Planning Document. However, whilst the latter sets out design principles it is only prescriptive in relation to back-to-back separation where a minimum distance of 20m is stipulated, it does not directly address impacts arising from the redevelopment of corner sites.

The rear (north) elevation of the proposed development places habitable room windows at the rear at first floor level, and a terrace at second floor level some 18.7m from the first floor dormer bedroom windows to 26 Alexandra Avenue. This arrangement would give rise to a significant loss of privacy, loss of outlook and overlooking which Policy CS16 1.e) specifically seeks to avoid.

Similarly, by virtue of the scale of the proposed building and the spatial relationship between the rear garden of 182 Sea Front and habitable room windows at first floor level, together with the terrace and habitable room windows at second floor level, the proposed development would give rise to an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy which the occupiers of that property would reasonably expect to be maintained.

In these circumstances the proposed redevelopment would therefore conflict with policy CS16 of the Core Strategy in that it would significantly harm the amenity of the occupiers of 26 Alexandra Avenue and 182 Sea Front by virtue of increased overlooking and a loss of privacy.

Other matters

Having identified visual harm to the established character and nature of the locality, and that by virtue of its scale it would cause harm to the living conditions of the adjoining and nearby occupiers, it is clear that the applicants have been driven by profit rather than achieving a form of development that respects its surroundings and is policy compliant. 3

This view is supported by the fact that the level of on-site car parking provision falls short of the standard set out in the Council's SPD "Parking" and does not include dedicated visitor parking. The shortfall of some 5 spaces is indicative that the scheme would amount to an unacceptable over-development of the site. The SPD states "It will not necessarily be appropriate to lower parking standards simply because there is capacity for parking on the immediate road network. This approach can individually or cumulatively alter and detrimentally affect the character and visual amenity of an area and may be considered unacceptable." Given the life of the redevelopment, provision should also have been made for electrical vehicle charging points to contribute to its sustainability objectives. It is regrettable that disabled parking bays are not in close proximity to the entrance to the building, while the configuration of the bays 13 – 16 is likely to give rise to difficulties in manoeuvring to allow vehicles leave the site in a forward gear. It is also suggested that the access to that parking area would adversely affect highway safety.

My clients trust that you will have due regard to the issues raised above and recommend that planning permission is refused as a step towards achieving a policy compliant redevelopment.

Yours sincerely,

I R Parkinson MRTPI