

Hi Lesley,

Sorry I must have missed this one. My comments are as follows.

1 Sea Front, Hayling Island, PO11 0AG

Change of use from commercial fair site to residential site for 55 flats in 5 No. 4 storey blocks with associated parking and landscaping

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments in relation to this application:

- Firstly the level of detail and quality of the submitted documents is fairly poor, which given the scale and prominence of the site is a concern. The submitted plans do not include a key and/or any accompanying text to provide clarity on what is being proposed. This creates a high level of ambiguity, which given this is a full application is not acceptable.
- HBC design guides state that In order to maintain a reasonable relationship between new dwellings and neighbouring properties, the following minimum distances should apply: Where windows of the new development and an existing dwelling occur, back-to-back there should be a minimum of 20 metres separation. Where a new dwelling or the development is more than two storeys in height an additional four metres per storey should be added to the separation distance e.g. a separation distance of 24 metres is required between the new three storey building and existing two storey dwelling. Given the proposed units are 4 story units the separation distance the minimum distance must be 28m between existing and proposed units. At present the design does not conform this the required back-to-back distances and is approx. 4m away from the Arcade to the north, 8m away from the proposed development to the west and internally the proposed units fall below the required back to back distancing.
- Planning policy CS16 states: Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design Responds to, draws inspiration from and respects local context

and a) Uses the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors;

We have concerns that the submitted design does not comply with policy CS16 as the development does not draw inspiration from neighbouring properties (1 - 1E Seafront, Funland arcade and Beachland Arcade). Furthermore, the applicant has provided visualisations of the proposed development for planning app APP/24/00968 which is demonstrates the juxtaposition between the two proposed designs. The proposed pitched roof and overall style of the Beachland development contrasts greatly to the proposed development south of Fun land, which is detrimental to the character of the area.

- We have concerns with the amount and quality of open space provided given the scale of the development. Refer to HBCs open space and Fields in Trust policies for guidance on provision and type required. At present the open space appears to be predominantly poorly connected remanent edges of the site save the pedestrian walk way dissecting the site. The applicant must provide detail on the amount and type of open space to ensure the proposals are compliant.
- The submitted planting plan does not provide any information on what is being proposed, save vague locations of planting area.
- We have concerns with the proximity of the proposed bin stores and proposed private balconies. We have concerns that smell from bin store (particularly in the summer months) will be an issue and have a detrimental impact units within close proximity

At present given the above comments we raise a landscape objection in relation to this application.

Kind regards,

Harry Mitchell CMLI

Chartered Landscape Architect