



Flat 3
192 Southwood Road
Hayling Island
Hants
PO11 9QJ

Dear Mrs Crawford

Re APP/18/00400 Site Address 194 Southwood Road

Please find below our comments and objections to certain aspects of the above planning application. As an immediate neighbour to the site we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living. Our specific objections are as follows:

Of particular concern is the so called secondary sea wall defences which state on plans to existing heights but we fear the applicant has a desire to make at least the main wall at the rear of the property much higher than it is currently. The rear wall, onto the beach, is part of the costal defence scheme and should not contravene any future proposals the Eastern Solent Costal Partnership may employ. It must remain at the same height as current as indicated in CS16 c, of the District Wide Local Plan/Core Strategy

Our main living room and garden face eastwards and will be greatly impacted by the development of the undercroft. We are very concerned that the boundary wall between our property and the applicants must remain at the same height as it is currently set at 1.0 metre, otherwise we will again be impacted in the living room and garden

If the secondary wall height is increased it could cause water to escape into our property, should a flood occur. The increase in wall heights may well not be in line with future plans and policies of the Eastern Solent Costal Partnership (ESCP) thus causing future conflict of interest for us and other neighbours with any defences enhancements to be carried out by the ESCP

A fully independent flood risk assessment should be carried out involving neighbours the ESCP and any other interested party before the applicant is given permission that could allow wall heights to increase and cause detrimental effects to neighbouring properties. No other property has a so called "secondary sea defence" arrangement records show there has been no flooding since the 1960's. There are no other secondary sea defence walls at other properties in the area as per Policy CS15.3 of the District Wide Local Plan/Core Strategy

The proposed site of development is at such an angle that the primary amenity area of our garden, a terrace with seating, and living room would be severely overlooked from the new balcony, resulting in a serious invasion of our privacy. The balcony, based on currently available plans, will be projected out over the footprint of the buildings and does not show how far the projection of the balcony will be. This is unlike other properties in the vicinity which all are within their building footprint.

We believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of Policy CS16 points c and e of the District Wide Local Plan/Core Strategy. The design of the proposed development does not afford adequate privacy for the occupants of the building or of adjacent residential properties, particularly with regard to their right to the quiet enjoyment of garden amenities. We would urge you to

consider the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land. We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings.

In conclusion we would also like to request that, should the application be approved, the council consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable and not allowing works to take place a weekends or bank holidays. The proposed site of development is very small and contained, with no road frontage, so we would ask that consideration be made about how and where construction vehicles and staff would gain access to the site for unloading and parking without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours. For example, we have already had an incident where a contractor blocked our car park entrance while he carried out tasks in the applicants' property. This caused disruption to all the residents of 192 Southwood Road.

We would be grateful if the council would take our objections into consideration when deciding this application. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our home to illustrate our objections at first hand.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
P & J A Byrne
[REDACTED]