

[REDACTED]

37 North Shore Road
Hayling Island
HANTS.
PO11 0HN

2nd August 2016

Attention: Mrs B Crawford

Dear Mrs Crawford,

Planning Application APP/16/00670 – 35 North Shore Road, Hayling Island

My natural sympathies are favourably disposed towards well-designed, good quality housing developments and Mr & Mrs Ormsby's submitted plans generally seem to sit well within this category. I had not had any prior sight of the plans before receiving the formal notice but, in my opinion, the finished form of the design will, in all probability, contribute an attractive enhancement to the local street scene.

That said, one cannot fail to observe that their proposal, as shown, does involve a very substantial increase in height, size and mass over the existing quite modest building that exists there today. As a result of these concerns about the height and bulk and the likely ensuing detrimental effect on my amenity and the street scene more generally, there are a few important points that I would like to bring to your attention for careful consideration and modification where appropriate please:-

1. En-suite Bathroom Window

This is just a minor detail point but I understand that the window to the en-suite bathroom on the first-floor level on the north-east elevation (i.e. immediately adjacent to my property) would likely comply with the following normal requirements:-

7. Any upper-floor window in a wall or roof slope in a side elevation must be obscure-glazed and non-opening unless the parts which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed.

Just for the avoidance of doubt, would it be possible to have this, or a similar, specification formalised as a condition in perpetuity of any planning approval rather than being perhaps a mere intention or illustration on the architect's submitted plan please?

2. Outlook

Please refer to the photos below illustrating the current outlook from my three impacted windows and a shaded representation of the adverse effects of the proposed new development:-

- a) The outlook from my adjacent ground-floor dining-room and first-floor bedroom at the south-east corner of my south-east elevation would be unneighbourly. My sense of outlook from the mid-point of both of these windows would be diminished to a

substantial degree by the increased bulk and, especially on the first floor level, by the extended height of the gable.

- b) Similarly, the outlook from my adjacent first-floor bedroom window at the south-west end of my north-west elevation (i.e. facing the harbour and above my ground-floor extension) would also be materially impaired by the increased bulk and particularly by the towering gable height of some 2.2m above the existing building's ridge height.

I am given to understand that a well-established reference to this outlook criteria is found in the following planning guideline:-

Most planning departments will protect your neighbours rights to light in habitable rooms and garden areas. They often apply what is called the 45 degree rule which is included in most Councils Residential Design guidelines. Basically an imaginary line is drawn at 45 degrees from the mid point of your neighbours nearest windows across the boundary and no part of your proposed extension should cross this line. However this rule, dependant on the site can be flexible and is not applied in all cases. The direction of sunlight and shadow fall over your neighbours property as a result of an extension is also a planning consideration.

In all the above instances the impact is heightened due to the new development restricting the natural light coming from its southerly aspect.

3. Ridge Height/s

Much of the difficulty with the proposed design arises from the height, as well as the increased bulk, of the new building. A street scene would reveal that the existing property's ridge height is the same as the two pairs of adjacent houses both to the north-east and to the south-west i.e. a contiguous run of some five houses.

The existing ridge height could be retained in the new design without any loss to the accommodation they are seeking to achieve. It is difficult to understand any good or necessary reason for an increase in the existing ridge height of more than about 1.0 metre.

Moreover, the gable height of 2.20 metres above the existing ridge height would appear to be highly intrusive when viewed from almost any perspective as well as being manifestly unnecessary. Houses 39 and 31 (the latter being another substantial property) both have gable roofs but these have been accommodated within the existing ridge heights, with much shallower gables - consistent with several adjacent properties on both sides of the road.

I would ask that the otherwise excellent design be modified to retain the existing ridge height and thereby lessen the impact on my property.

Yours sincerely,

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Martin W Ward.

Martin W Ward

SW Outlook from 37NSR Rear First Floor Bedroom



SE Outlook from 37NSR Front First Floor Bedroom



SE Outlook from 37NSR Front Dining Room

