

Ian Murray speaking in support of APP/ 23/00518 2 Bembridge Drive Hayling Island

This application is a revision of a previously (very similar) approved application App/22/00965 granted permission on 6th December 22

I believe this application was recommended for approval by the planning officer but bought to committee by councillor turner at request of the owners of the neighbouring property due to concerns regarding overlooking and thus policy CS16.

The previously approved design also had two balconies to the rear which enjoyed an open sea view.

The design was careful to ensure that the building and balcony line of no 2 and no 4 Bembridge drive were in line so that both properties could enjoy the sea view equally.

Following this approval, in February of this year No 4 Bembridge drive submitted an application to extend further with a balcony to the rear of their property APP/23/00120

The impact this rear balcony was to cause an imbalance between the two rear elevations and impact on the view from no 2s proposed and approved balcony.

This is why the applicant submitted the revised application.

The aim of the revised application is to put both elevations back in line and to again allow them to have an equal shared view of the seafront.

both properties would be in line and have 1.7m frosted glass screening to the sides of their balconies to reduce overlooking.

It should also be noted that due to low boundaries and a public right of way both gardens are significantly overlooked by the public.

In evaluating the relationship of the two properties I ask that you to take note of the comments made by the planning officer when approving the application of the rear balcony for No 4.

She stated in her officers report

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.**

Surely if this is the case for No 4 it must also apply to no 2

In terms of the front balconies

The balconies would be added to the walls of the existing building which is set back more than 1m from the existing stepped elevation of no 4 and 3m from the front elevation of no 4. The balconies are only 1.5m deep and due to the eaves of no 4 there would not be views into the front windows of no 4.

The balconies would look forward over public space and front gardens and as such would have very limited impact in terms of overlooking.

To conclude.

The proposal creates a building similar in footprint and height to its neighbour and retains a relationship in terms of rear elevation line and balcony treatment that has been found acceptable in previous approved applications at the location. The front balconies overlook public space and therefore, we do not believe the proposal increases overlooking of private space or creates any additional overlooking issues.

We therefore do not believe it is contrary to policy CS16 and would ask the application be approved.

Ian Murray