

Objection to : Planning Portal Reference PP-11273268

Rear extension, addition of second floor and general remodeling at 10A North Shore Road, Hayling Island

We object to the proposed development of above dwelling for the following reasons:

1. Loss of daylight and sunlight due to the proximity, height and volume of the second floor extension causing substantial reduction in daylight and sunlight in lounge of adjacent property as well as reduction of daylight and sunlight in dining room and front bedroom. In addition the garden and driveway will be further overshadowed beyond that caused by the existing overgrown hedges (currently 12-13 feet in height increasing every year).

The site plan submitted is erroneous and inaccurate in regards to the indicated position of trees implying that the lounge window of [redacted] is already completely blocked by trees which is not the case (see photo).

The volume of the extension (estimated to be an increase from approximately 75 m³ to 230m³) along with a height increase will significantly reduce the amount of sunlight (and daylight) as the development is to the South of [redacted] North Shore Road (see attached diagrams showing suns winter azimuth and elevation plus site plan showing arc of blockage and photograph showing the view from the lounge of adjacent property with proposed extension indicated). It should be noted that the distance between the two properties is only approximately six metres at the closest point and hence the light reduction caused by such a large addition is significant. This is obviously exacerbated during the autumn and winter months when the suns altitude is reduced.

Whilst loss of light issues to the neighbouring properties are mentioned in the Design and Access statement, this is only in terms of a different design which was rejected and hence irrelevant.

There appears to be no calculations or other evidence to show that the reduction in light to adjacent properties has been calculated (has a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment been carried out ?) and considered for this proposal but just a rather bland statement “the proposal aims to create one consistent style and feel to the building whilst being aware of the buildings height volume and potential impact on neighbouring dwellings”. It is unclear as to what “being aware” means or implies, or how this design has been determined to be acceptable.

2. The design of the additional floor with an open wrap around balcony at the front of the property with half wall to the North elevation results in loss of privacy to the front bedroom of North Shore Road (see copy of annotated site plan and graphic). It is stated within the Design

and Access document that no windows were put into the side elevation to avoid overlooking other properties which is totally defeated by then placing a balcony on that elevation.

3. The design statement states “no glassing has been put in the side elevations and minimal to the rear to avoid overlooking the neighbouring dwellings”. It is unclear how putting minimal windows in the rear eliminates the overlooking of neighbouring dwellings as any window in that elevation will overlook neighbouring dwellings.
4. The design statement ‘Background’ paragraph states “North Shore Road is made up of a number of different styles and sizes of property ranging from single storey to three storeys” – this is correct however it should be noted that of the 65 houses only two have a third storey and one of those is a loft conversion. The proposed development appears totally out of character with the adjacent properties.
5. The comment in the design statement that care has been taken whilst designing the project to “pull together the somewhat disjointed elements and styles of the existing building” is misleading as the existing elements appear to be cohesive with the whole property rendered in white with matching windows. Perhaps this is referring to the roof garden/terrace area on top of the garage?
6. No consultation or informal discussion of any type was held with neighbours at any time during the design stage, and verbal notification of the submission of the proposal was only given on a Thursday evening, three days before they were published on the planning portal on the following Monday. It is unclear why a household of three persons (a couple and one young adult) would require a six bedroom house over three storeys which clearly negatively impacts on neighbouring properties and their quality of life.
7. The design statement conclusion that the design “takes note of its surroundings in terms of privacy and height” is somewhat confusing – what exactly does “takes note of” mean and why are only privacy and height mentioned?

As shown above, privacy may well have been taken “note of” but loss of privacy still exists (see 2 above and supplied drawings and plan).

Whilst height may have been taken “note of”, the increase in the height and volume of the proposed second floor extension and its impact on the loss of daylight and sunlight to close neighbours appears not to have been calculated and established or even ‘taken note of’.

The terminology used throughout the Design and Access statement document is vague, “whilst being aware of” and “takes note of”, as examples, would seem to acknowledge the impact of the design on adjacent properties, this impact has not been quantified and so, effectively, has

been disregarded. The wording could be said to be misleading in places, for example, the comment that “a two storey rear extension was also considered at the design stage but was rejected to avoid creating loss of light issues to the neighbouring dwellings” is totally irrelevant to this application but I suspect included to show that the impact on the neighbours was considered – however there is no indication that loss of daylight and sunlight of **this** design has been truly considered and calculated to adjacent properties.

Noting that I do not have access to CAD or other software and computer programs so all measurements are estimates from the provided plans.

In summary the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of the neighbours by reason of (among other factors) loss of daylight/sunlight, overlooking, loss of privacy and overshadowing.

I would therefore kindly ask the planning officer to reject the proposed application.