

Support APP/23/00518

I have lived at 2 Bembridge Drive for the last 52 years, for 50 years my adjoining property was a three-bedroom bungalow but today it is a six-bedroom, 3 storey big roofed house. Over the years it has been extended some 8/9m out to the North and a balcony extending by 2.5m to the South. No. 4 is already some 3/4m in front of my house to the South and now they have been granted an extra 2.5m, and even with my permission for a third floor, their roof would still be higher than No 2. I have a 360-roof garden view now overlooked by No 4. Velux windows.

4 Bembridge Drive planning.

APP/19/00355 - APP/19/01259 - APP/20/00395 - APP/19/01259 APP/20/00396 -
APP/20/01088 - APP/20/00395 APP/23/00120 Proposed first floor rear projecting balcony.

2 Bembridge Drive planning.

- i. APP/22/00965 06 Oct 2022 Addition of new second floor with balconies to first and second floor, three storey front extension, new double garage and general remodelling. Granted
- ii. APP/23/00518

Regarding my planning for 2 Bembridge Drive I already have planning (See (i) above), No. 4 Bembridge Drive have been granted permission for a 2.5m South facing balcony extending from the back of their house, this is the reason I have applied for planning to put the same balcony on the back of my property, which will be in line with No. 4.

The difference between APP/22/00965 and APP/23/00518 is the extended balcony to the South keeping in line with No. 4 (APP/23/00120) and extending the First Floor out to be in line with No. 4. The Second Floor to be extended out by 2.5m and to be staggered back with 4 addition balconies added to the front. 20 balconies in Bembridge Drive face the road.

Notes HBC regarding the planning for the balcony of No 4, 2.5Metres

Email to Miss Donophy 04/09/2023

C/Officer: Denise Sheath.

The comments below highlighted in yellow seem to apply to the proposals for No. 4 there cannot be a rule for one and not for another. **Planning permission has been granted even though it didn't comply with the 45-degree angle rule.**

7.6 The foreshore is located to the south. Therefore, consideration has only been taken into how the proposals would impact the occupiers of the properties to the east and west.

7.11 Having regard to the existing level of overlooking, it is considered, on balance, that the proposal would not lead to a significantly greater level of overlooking over that currently being experienced, which would be mitigated to an acceptable degree by the proposed screening. Therefore, having due regard to the representations received, **it is considered that the proposal would have a limited and acceptable impact upon this neighbouring property.**

7.12 At present there may be a slight reduction in natural light to this window in the morning it would not be significant enough to warrant a refusal of the application as the afternoon and evening light would not be impacted.

7.16 It is not considered that this small section would create an overlooking concern so great as to warrant a refusal of the application.

7.19 Having regard to the existing level of overlooking, it is not considered, on balance, that the proposal would lead to a significantly greater level of overlooking than that current being experienced.

8.1 The scale, siting and design of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours and the locality and is therefore considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.

Email from Miss Donophy 4/9/2023

Hi Nick,

We assess everything the same way so there will be no discrepancy surrounding the impact on light when deciding your application and how it was decided with next doors.

Email from Miss Donophy

I also wondered if you'd be happy to agree to an extension of time on this one for an extra couple of weeks as I've received 5+ objections we have to consult with Councillors for 7 days and give them the option to call this to committee. I was thinking the 18th of September. My recommendation is to permit at this time although as always, it's subject to review from a Principal Planner.

Thanks,

Selina Donophy

The view from No 2 should be the same as No 4, **the view to the Solent is for everybody**, there is **no** overlooking and **no** loss of light on APP/23/00518.

Officer Report.

RECOMMENDATION:

9. That the Executive Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/23/00518

N Ferguson