

Links Cottage
384 Seafront
Hayling Island
Hampshire
PO11 0BD

10 June 2017

Planning Application: 380, Sea Front, Hayling Island; your ref APP/17/00529

I am writing to strongly **OBJECT** to the above Application both on General terms in relation to the effect on the environment locally and on details as to how the proposed new extremely large construction affects the individual houses in the vicinity.

It is clear that there has been prior consultation with Havant Planning as there also been with local residents. It does not seem that there has been much consideration of these residents' objections and comments so I would urge that the application should be dealt with by **Full Planning Committee** not by delegated powers.

Generally

Although recent developments along this part of Seafront have been apartments, there still remains a significant proportion of individual housing. This proposal will add a very significantly sized new block of flats. The Council should consider whether they wish to allow developments which lead the Hayling Seafront to become entirely apartment block oriented like Brighton, Worthing, or indeed Portsmouth. This is, of course, completely different to that at present which gives an extremely pleasant semi-rural effect.

The proposed new block is ugly, overbearing and out of character with its immediate neighbours.

Details

- The **additional "footfall"** will add to the already stretched Hayling resources of schools, doctors, dentists and of course the roads including the bridge. It only takes a minor incident such as a broken-down caravan on the bridge or day-time non-scheduled road works (which were not even on the bridge) to cause enormous jams. It is past belief what would happen if the bridge structure were to fail which seems a strong possibility when the traffic flow is already well over the bridge's designed expectation.
- It is realized that the **footprint** of the new building is bound to be larger than the original one. However the proposal is for one which is significantly larger.
- The **height** of the proposed building is considerably higher than the immediately adjoining 2 and 2.5 storey houses. It is even higher than the existing apartment blocks to the west. There is no justification (apart from avarice) for the height to exceed 3 storeys. It should be noted that there are **15 adjoining properties** of 2.5 storeys or less with line of sight to the new proposed block.
- There is **significant loss of privacy** to these nearby buildings despite the undertaking for certain windows to be of obscured glass. In particular most of the windows in the north-

facing aspect are shown as “clear”. These windows directly face existing houses to the north which, of course, similarly face into the new structure.

- The **position** of the new structure has been moved westwards from the pre-apt version. There seems no justification for this as the distance from the houses to the east was already much greater than from No 384. This has reduced the distance to 384 to the west to about 8.5 metres. It should be noted that, while the proposal states that “...it is completely out of sight from the main south facing living space in no 384”. However, it is **not** clear of east facing windows in the lounge and first floor of 384. This would give sight from these windows of a close and extremely imposing 3 storey brick wall higher than the roof line of 384.
- This **change in position** also brings the new building to a more obstructive position for both 384a and 384b.
- It is essential that **tree screening** is maintained and improved. It is noted that tree T19 (on the border near 384 and vital to screening) is covered in ivy and likely to be stressed). The ivy should be removed. Moreover the 4 **proposed** trees to the north of this along the boundary should be made **immediately compulsory** and of an effective screening height of say 4 metres.

Conclusion

One does not wish to be driven by NIMBYism. It is also accepted that the Council has a requirement to increase the supply of housing. However, it is submitted that the proposed apartment block does nothing to improve the existing lovely character of the Seafront (in fact very much the reverse). It is also extremely detrimental to the living environment of the neighbouring houses.

Mike Tong BSc, FIA