



For the attention of Planning Services

Site Address 10 The Strand Hayling Island PO11 9UB

Conversion and single storey extension to garage and rear infill extension APP/24/00702

I would like to put in a third objection to the above named planning proposal.

Having read the Delegated Report which was just prior to the new plans of the 7/4/2025 I have further comments.

I notice that the agent has suggested [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The properties in the Strand were built by Wilcon Homes some 35/36 years ago and presumably were signed off correct at that time. Looking at my original HM Land Registry deeds it shows no sign off this fact.

In point 7.6 of the report it is acknowledged that " paragraph 5.40 of Council's Design Guide SPD states " It is important to retain the gaps between building and a single storey extension should be in keeping with the local pattern of development looking to immediate neighbours first. Single story extensions should therefore be at least 1 metre from the boundary with adjacent properties"

In point 7.7 it states the proposal will provide a 0.1 m gap. Also admitting that it does not strictly accord with the guidance of the SPD. The distance of 0.1m is too small and will give the appearance of terracing. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] If the rule is 1 m distance then 0.1m falls far short of this. The one metre rule must be there for a reason but seems to be being ignored. To show the terracing effect see document 115 dated 7/4/25 and the depiction of the completed extension clearly shows how this will change the appearance and look of the gap [REDACTED] compared to how it looks now as depicted in document 105 Site Views dated 13/9/24. I would call this terracing.

In point 7.11 it states that no windows are proposed on the side elevation. Document 115 dated 7/4/25 shows a door on the first floor on the East West site section. While I note that under the heading Recommendation point 6 it stated that the flat roof area can not be used as a balcony, roof garden. Why is there a door in the plans on this side of the elevation implying that that is their intention?

With reference to the CEM Plan. Looking at document 118 dated 7/4/25 CEM Site Plan and CEM parking. It appears according to the red lines depicting where the fencing will go that they intend to put it through [REDACTED]. This is very unclear as to their

intensions. CEM Parking Plan has stated No 14 [REDACTED] have offered up two parking spaces for works vehicles that don't belong to them. The parking spaces indicated in red in the courtyard one belongs to No 11 property and the second space is not a parking space as it is a communal area and is a hatched black on the original development plans. Access is required at all times and not to be used for parking. No 21 who have offered up a parking space [REDACTED] only one space on their drive. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Where are these parking spaces coming from?

Once again these plans are inaccurate and misleading and it hard to determine what their true intensions are.

[REDACTED]