

We refer to your letter of 16 April 2019. We have noted the hand written changes to the original design shown on the revised plans (page 4), namely installation of a hedge watering system only.

This application does not address any of the issues which we raised in our letter of objection dated 19 February 2019 (to the development APP/19/00081, your letter of 31 January 2019). This application repetitive and vexacious

We wish to object to this development for the following reasons

1. **Overshadowing & Loss of Light .**
2. **Loss of amenity due to 1. Size of building, 2. Appearance of building.**
3. **Non compliance with Design Guidelines issued by Chichester Harbour AOB.**

Loss of Light, Overshadowing & Loss of amenity.

We note that in the plan, the extension beyond 4 m has been stepped to ensure the survival of the hedge, but the rest on the wall has not been stepped. This means that the rest of the hedge will likely not survive. The existing hedge lies along the boundary between 28 and 30, and has been maintained jointly by us and Mr Gibson without dispute.

The development will destroy this hedge and leave us looking at a 3m high brick wall where at present there is a 2 to 3m high mature green hedge, which allows a lot of filtered light. The hedge will be killed by the groundworks; installation of a hedge watering system will be without purpose.

There may be implications re the Party Wall Act 1996.

The proposal will result in overshadowing and loss of light to our dining room, and to [REDACTED] on the ground floor, as well a part of our garden. This loss of light will be oppressive at all times, but especially in autumn and winter.

The view from our upstairs study and lounge overlooks greenery, Mr Gibson 's garden, the lagoon and beyond the sailing club towards Chichester Harbour entrance, and is totally unobstructed. The proposed development will adversely affect this and will be a loss of amenity which we currently enjoy.

The development will extend 8 m beyond the east flank of no.28. There is already a 4m extension, and this will make the building disproportionately large in relation to the plot and adjacent houses.

The 3m high brick wall along the boundary will be over 18m long in place of a green living hedge.

The proposal incompletely infills a very narrow triangular piece of land which currently serves as a foot path, on which there is a delapidated stair to the balcony and a lean-to shed, plus pipes and outlets for services.

No detail is given of how the proposed 'wildflower blanked' roof will be maintained. Nor are there any details of ventilation ducts for the bathrooms.

The site and roof plan on drawings A 101 and A105 are inaccurate and misleading, as they are not in the same orientation relative to North as the location plan. This gives a misleading impression of the sources of natural light.

Non compliance with Design Guidelines issued by Chichester Harbour AOB.

From our reading of the Design Guidelines issued by Chichester Harbour area of outstanding natural beauty, (2010), we believe that the proposal does not comply with the design guidelines. (see www.chichester.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=4530&p=)

We refer you to pages 12 and 13 of these guidelines which specifically reference developments on Hayling Is which are adjacent to No. 28 Wittering Rd.

We are not aware that this development has been brought to the attention of the Chichester Harbour Authority.