

Please find my objection to the above planning detailed below.

Reference document " **Design and Access Statement 140 Southwood road Hayling Island PO119QH**"

A previous similar but less ostentatious design was refused under application Number APP/21/00710 for the following reasons:

1. 1 The proposed development by reason of its two storey scale, bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous addition to the host bungalow and its attached neighbour, detracting from the appearance of the premises and harmful to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed development would result in an overbearing and excessive building bulk adjacent to the neighbouring residential properties (Nos. 138 and 144 Southwood Road), detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties, as well as giving rise to direct overlooking of the attached neighbour (No.138). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

In response to the two points above, there are no changes in the current application that substantially address any of the noted issues. This extension would still be bulky, prominent, incongruous and overbearing and thus contravene Policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

The previous application APP/21/00710 did not include a rear balcony. If it did, then this is not visible through the plans available online. Therefore we are now looking at a significantly greater development and potential overlooking issue. The sun comes up to the east and so the addition of a forward standing balcony and its support structure will make a huge reduction in light entering the main living area of 138 Southwood Road.

The addition of 1.7 metre frosted glass to the balcony does not substantially reduce the overlook of my garden and in particular the northern end of the garden of 138 Southwood road that can be screened from the promenade view by putting up a windbreak.

The Balcony structure breaks the 45 degree rule by obscuring light to the main window to the south of 138 Southwood road. Light is also blocked to the adjacent flats.

The planning process being progressive in nature, should not account for the proliferation of balconies along the seafront allowed through previous planning applications to be the basis for subsequent applications. The proposed development by reason of its two storey scale, bulk and prominent location would be an incongruous addition to the host bungalow and its attached neighbour, detracting from the appearance of the premises and harmful to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The plans remain detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupiers of these properties, as well as giving rise to direct overlooking of the attached neighbour (No.138). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011,

Existing street scene and building

The document states "The existing building is divided into two semi detached dwellings. The front elevation of both dwellings is dealt with in different ways with random extensions having been added to both properties. Again at the rear both properties have been extended with flat roof structures and different roof treatments.

The overall effect is a building of poor quality that appears ramshackle from both the viewable elevations (North and South)".

The extensions are not random, they are the result of successful planning applications. I find this statement subjective, inflammatory and disrespectful of the planning process.

In an attempt to sway opinion the application makes a deliberate disparaging and highly subjective statement. The building is neither of poor quality or ramshackle appearance. Both are highly desirable properties in their current condition and appearance.

The applicant wishes to portray the street scene as ramshackle due to mixed styles of building in order to justify such an overbearing design. They suggest the buildings are of poor quality and then wish to build on top of this which is completely contradictory.

The document states "Whilst we respect the planning officers opinion, we strongly disagree with the comments and believe that this addition, whilst not conventional does improve an existing building of poor quality . In addition it greatly improves the retained elements of the existing building creating an improved relationship with its neighbouring building".

Highlighted in red above is the opinion of the applicant and their agent. This opinion is not shared by myself. It does not improve the relationship with its neighbouring building whatsoever!

Design approach

The document states "Obviously this is a somewhat challenging design brief as the neighbour does not wish to make changes to their property".

This statement is untrue. I have never been approached by anyone to query whether I would consider making changes to my property. As with the previous planning application, the design brief is based on a lie.

The document states" The rear extension also aims to work with the roofline of both the existing dwellings as if they were one and create a building that is substantially improved and bought together within the context of the eclectic street scene, especially the rear street scene as seen from the water and public footpath".

"As you face the building in north and south elevation the roofline takes its pitches from the existing roof structure to create an offset pitch which pulls the building together as one".

The proposed plan changes the roofline and highlights the two properties as separate. It does not make them as one. They are not brought together within the context of the eclectic street scene from any aspect at which the adjoining properties are viewed.

Alternative solutions

This entire section of the design brief (copied below) is poorly written, contradictory and confusing.

The document states: "We feel the design offers a much better solution to the clients requirements that the potential Class AA permitted development solution that would involve adding a storey to the existing original pitched roof part of the building and then replicating the partial pitched roof structure at second floor level. This would create a higher structure with a poor quality (but compliant) roofline and would have significantly more impact on the street scene due to the original part of the building being further forward on the plot".

This seems to suggest that while the design is of higher quality than a Class AA permitted development solution, its roofline is non-compliant and should therefore not be allowed. If the enlargement is not a Class AA permitted development with the addition of a storey, it must be a loft conversion and that being such contravenes planning rules on the following points:

- Greater than 50 cubic metres
- Exceeds height of existing roof
- Includes balcony
- Original roof eaves are not maintained or reinstated
- Enlargement not set back from original eaves by at least 20cm
- Roof enlargement overhangs wall of original property.

The western portion of the roof overhangs 138 Southwood road. (see A102 FIG 2) This is a direct infringement and expansion of the boundary of 140.

The proposed works would require extensive access across my property and a significant chance of causing damage to 138 Southwood road during construction. I do not believe that the foundations or dividing wall were built to accommodate construction above. The wall between the two properties is of single skin construction and therefore major structural works would be required in order to support another storey extension. Ref floorplans A102 Figure 2, The construction of the west elevation would require breaking into my south facing sloped roof to make a join to their structure.

[Redacted text]

To conclude, I urge you not to accept this planning application. I do not accept [redacted text] 140 are of ramshackle appearance and of poor quality. The huge overbearing design of this application will dramatically affect the light to the main living area of 138. The balcony and loft extension will provide huge overlooking potential and remove all of the potential privacy within the garden of 138. This proposal in no way improves the street scene or creates anything positive for its neighbour 138 or surrounding properties. For all the points raised above this is not a viable application.