

2nd December 2021

Attention: Julie Terzoudis , New case officer reference APP/21/01205

Site Address: 22 Haslemere Gardens, Hayling Island, PO11S

Objection: Retrospective application for single hipped and pitched roof garage to rear of property

Dear Ms Terzoudis

We understand that you have **NOW** received an application retrospectively brought about solely through concerned citizens objections rather than guilt of the builders for ignoring the rules.

You have asked for opinions, but this application being denied comes down to fact.

References: Havant Borough Council Planning Guide and Supplementary Planning Documents

Fact 1, that in the Planning Portal the maximum allowed height is 2.5 metres.

In your Planning Guide and SPDs, part 5.03 states 'consider the impact of the development on existing residents'.

It is a Fact that none of the residents in the local area want to see such a large structure being permitted at such a height so close to the boundary.

There is a Precedent being set permitting this garage in its present form, in that there is not a single other development like it anywhere locally on Hayling ! This contradicts the guidelines regarding 'Regular Rhythm layout (table 4.1) and ' being in character'.

Once again in (table 4.1) Height ' new developments should follow the typical pattern of existing properties'

In planning permission portal

Section 1: Outbuildings including garages, 'Maximum height of 2.5 metres in the case of a building, enclosure or container within two metres of a boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.'

This garage was constructed in a similar position to the original garage it replaces, the original garage having a corrugated flat roof and a maximum height around 2.25 metres.

The new garage wall is marginally **within** 1 metre of my rear boundary and its Fascia and tiling protrudes the wall by approximately 200mm. it is therefore around 800mm on plan from my boundary which is 'Not Permitted' under your planning regulations. (numerous also 5.42 of SPDs)

Below taken from Miniguide for outbuildings on the planning portal

'If the outbuilding is within 2 metres of the property boundary the whole building should not exceed 2.5 metres in height.'

5.42, although referring to rear extensions (this garage could be a small house) states that a single storey building must not be within 1 metre of the boundary and a 2 storey building at 2 metres from the boundary. This garage is somewhere between the 1 and 2 storey's tall at over 3.5 metres high, and through interpolation should be sighted at least 1.5 metres from the boundary ?

I am sure if we dived deeper, we could find other anomalies with this garage and the current Planning Policies, however the simple facts stated are adequate to highlight it's lack of conformity.

An acceptable resolution would be to leave the garage in position and reduce its height to the allowed maximum of 2.5 metres

In reaching your conclusion, please bear in mind the following:

Our house and that of our neighbours are original Hayling upside down houses and therefore most of our daylight hours are spent upstairs looking out over this diminishing landscape. Planning advice states Existing residents opinions are to be taken into account.

Your design guidelines say that a structure this tall cannot be this close to our boundary as noted in the points above.

A Precedent will be set allowing the rules to be ignored and all rear gardens will face the possibility of being overshadowed by Outbuildings of unnecessary scale.

(Attached various pictures showing the scale of this garage, consider that I stand at 1.8 metres tall on the flowerbed that is at 250mm tall. My bamboo screen is cut at 3 metres tall [usually 2.4m] as you can see the brickwork alone is taller the original garage)





Julie we are not against people earning a living and I'm sure the garage looks fantastic and will wow potential buyers of this home. However it is not appropriate in that position at that scale.

I think it will make no difference to the profit made by the developer if the roof is lowered nor will it put off potential buyers. It's a shame they finished building it after they were told to stop.

The Developers have now left, We in the neighbourhood however have to put up with an eyesore for life !

We would invite you to visit our property to view our concerns on-site, please email me to arrange a time/date.

Many thanks, [REDACTED]

PS,

Whilst on the subject of Precedents, the House itself was given Planning Permission for a 'Chalet Bungalow'. I have recently shown the building to a number of qualified Designers/Builders/Architects and not one of them thinks this design fits that description, at the very least the house should have dormer windows and the rear elevation be made with a pitched roof rather than a vertical wall. So a precedent has been inadvertently (?) set allowing this building in the first place. It is again unique and if you walk the local area you will see there are NO other buildings like it.

