

Make a Comment

Any comments you make will be published online. Your name and address will not be shown but the details provided will be recorded in our system and used by Planning Services officers only.

For data protection purposes, please do not include your name or address within or at the end of your comment.

You have 30 minutes to complete your representation. At the end of 30 minutes, the page will time out and you will not be able to complete your submission.

Application Reference:	APP/19/00767
Address:	5 St Georges Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0BS
Proposal:	Alterations to existing garage to create garage/workshop
Case Officer:	Ross Leal

Commenter Type: *

Stance: * ☐ Object ☒ Support ☐ Neutral

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for your kind correspondence to the above-mentioned Application Reference APP/19/00767.

Introduction

1. At first one would not think this would be a large task, however on reading (1.1) initially the application form and the comments within said document by Ms Denise Sheath “ Concern was expressed over the height of the original proposal as this, it was considered, would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area and upon the street scene and would create an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property to the north (No7). This has been addressed with this new proposal whereby the height has been reduced by 850mm so that it limits the height to less than 1 metre above No.7's boundary leylandii hedge and is not significantly changing the street scene as seen from St Georges Road or the Sea Front.” (1.2) While reading, digesting and assimilating the information in the Proposed site location & photographs made me consider if I was looking at plans for a garage/workshop or a possible granny annex.

List of Main Concerns

2. (2.1) Breach of (Schedule of restrictive Covenants dated 11 January 1928), (2.2) Privacy / Daylight, (2.3) Noise /Smells / Fumes, (2.4) Design / Appearance & Layout and (2.5) Hedgerow.

Detailed Objections to Main Concerns

3. (3.1) We feel there is a breach of (Schedule of restrictive Covenants dated 11 January 1928). It is felt that a workshop due to close proximity of boundary to north will cause noise / smells / fumes, and which has the potential to cause nuisance or annoyance.
(3.2) With the limited knowledge I have to hand six or more properties are affected by this covenant which leads me to my next area of concern design, appearance and layout. That these said properties have all maintained flat roofs to their garages and are maintained at ground level which ensures appearance and layout are maintained to that laid out in the covenants. As stated in (1.1) above would create an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property to the north (No7). (3.3) The covenant also ensures that any said property will not be used as a business at any time as in any form of hotel or such living accommodation now or at any time in the future.
4. (4.1) We are very concerned with privacy which I pointed out in (1.1) above and regardless of the height being reduced will still have access to view from east elevation into our garden and more to the point direct view into our bedroom windows which is not really acceptable.
5. (5.1) I am not in a position due to lack of skills and knowledge how to determine how daytime light from the sun and sky, as opposed to light from artificial sources will affect my property due to the height of intended extension. I will have to rely upon our local planning departments experts in this field to make such a decision as they are the professionals in this area. I will explain later the concerns I have to our hedgerow and wild life due to daylight.
6. (6.1) I have raised my concerns at (3.1) above, workshop is this business or pleasure we do not know, business is out of the question (covenant) therefore we need to know what is the intention of use of workshop, so that it does not have the potential to cause nuisance or annoyance due to Noise /Smells / Fumes, this needs to be transparent. I am not aware of any other workshop around me or in close proximity.
7. (7.1) As Ms Denise Sheath pointed out Concern was expressed over the height would create an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property to the north. May I also point out I do feel other properties to the north might also be affected with line of sight i.e. number 9 and 11 St Georges Road, I would like to think that they have been informed of this proposal. As mentioned in (1.1) and (3.1) above to allow the height of this proposed plan to exceed the height of the hedge we feel would have a detrimental effect to Design / Appearance & Layout.
8. (8.1) The hedgerow has been in place as far as I can establish since mid-1970, long before I purchased property. Hedgerows are important to the environment and wild life which are part of our eco system and we feel should be maintained for the wellbeing of future generations. At (5.1) I highlighted daylight what I cannot say is what affect this proposed plan will have on the hedge and wild life, I do need to leave this to the professionals in the planning department.

Conclusion

9. (9.1) If it be that an option should arise, we may not have any objections “but must see any amended plans first before consideration can be given” to that of a ground only extension.
10. (10.1) We do feel very strongly to the points we have laid before you as laid out above with all the right and proper intensions to maintain the “Schedule of restrictive Covenants dated 11 January 1928”.