

[REDACTED]

Sent: 13 August 2023 13:55
To: Havant Planning and Development Mailbox New
Subject: APP/23/00518

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

To Miss S Donophy APP/23/00518

I fully Support this lovely property

How many amendments are there going to be before this single residency is big enough. The approved plans are already enormous in ratio to the plot size and adjacent building to add more balconies and further extend would create a huge property that would be out of character due it's additional mass and bulk it will dominate all elevations in the vicinity and tower over the neighbouring property.

(Number 4 has had several amendments but no one mentions

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Does number 4 not dominate number 6 or am I looking at different building to everyone else.)

Why are more balconies on the North elevation necessary when there is no view. The South/West and East elevations all have public areas and walkways leading to the beach further enlarging this property would have an overwhelming impact.

South Elevation - If both balconies are to be in line which each other (APP/23/00120) there will be a glare from the excessive amount of glass - so many windows and balconies from the beach or walking on public pathway in sunlight will dazzle the publics eyes and create a glare for boats. If approval is unfortunately granted these should be tinted the same as the neighbours and matching obscured side panels 1.8m high.

(Don't forget the glare for planes as well. Maybe cruise ships should remove all windows so they don't create a glare for other boats. These objections are laughable.)

An extension to the seafront elevation bringing it in line with the adjacent property is out of character, excluding Semi-detached/terrace houses ALL properties on the seafront are staggered which is easier/softer on the eye and reduces mass/bulk. This property is situated right on the corner of two public walkways and the beach if the properties are in line with each other, at the same height all elevations will be dominated by brick and glass creating a real eyesore, out of character in the immediate vicinity. The approved plans for the house already look a lot larger than the large adjacent property and all properties in the area, which are considerably smaller.

(Not sure how bringing it in line with the adjacent property will be out of character. It will be the same. If they are the same hight and length then how will it dominated the other property. It's the same. You did not say one word about No 4 being 25 feet further forward than the old bungalow to the north with church looking appearance with lots of windows.)

The two properties are situated very close together and balconies will virtually be touching each other it doesn't even look like the boundary line is a metre apart either side and it would be difficult to see a break between the two buildings creating even more of a mass. With the added extension the property will loom over the adjacent property, East, West and south elevations.

(Not sure how number 2 will loom over the adjacent property on all elevations is laughable but to say West elevation is extremely laughable. Number 4 is higher, further north and south than number 2 and 6 Bembridge Drive. Does number 4 not loom over 2 and 6. No.4 being 3 storeys high, and No.6 being 1 Storey, have you not seen the Fence on the south east side of No 4, they have just taken away No.6 View. you did not say one word. When No 4 put in for planning I didn't see one comment about virtually be touching when the over size roof was applied for. No comments on No 4 looming over No.2 and No.6.)

The design and access statement states that a loss of view will arise from the neighbouring property building an external balcony, how can that be possible when the granted application APP/22/00965 will enjoy two very large balconies on the south elevations one on the west and north elevation which is excessive for any single dwelling property on Hayling Island. The property has always been set back which is aesthetically more pleasing but now there is an expectation for it to be in line creating an eyesore for the general public. It is a public area that should be enjoyed by everyone.

(The property at number 4 had always been a bungalow which was aesthetically more pleasing than the Church that has now been built. Number 4 is 10ft south of number 2 and with the balcony 2.5m south, that's 18 feet further south than number 2. You stated "doesn't even look like the boundary line is a metre apart either side" being 18ft further on the south elevation and being 1m from boundary line, do you not think that this is a loss of view for number 2???. You did not say one word about No 4 being 25 feet further forward. Also the 2 garages that were taken down at Number 4 had ASBESTOS in the roof, I didn't see any concerns.)

I frequently go here to sunbathe, listen to music at the bandstand and walk my dog at least twice a day, building this house even bigger than the approved plans will be harmful and damaging to the area, enormous, overwhelming and dominant.

(This is nothing more than a pathetic attempt to stop people getting on in life [REDACTED])

Your comments for objection to me are very childish and looks very much the same as the other objections just copy and paste.

You stated "I walk my dog at least twice a day" have you not been DAZZLED by sunlight from the church windows at No.4 north and south.

Have you not informed the H.B.C. about the RIDICULOUS wall that goes across the payment north of No 2 (entrance to Bembridge Drive) that was built without planning, you have to walk on the road to get past.)

This property is perfectly architecturally designed for a beach house