NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Rainger, Angela

From: Jane Hitchman [redacted]
Sent: 08 March 2017 20:41
To: Birk, Jagdeep
Subject: Objection for retrospective permission F/17/79919
Attachments: FTAO Case Officer Jagdeep Birk.docx

Importance: High

Dear Jagdeep Birk

Please find my attached letter of objection regarding the applied retrospective planning consent for a vast metal building erect on 6 Wellbrook Gardens, SO53 1TN.

I look forward to hearing from yourself shortly, updating me as to the hearing in front of the Area Planning Team

With Regards
Jane Hitchman

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

FTAO Case Officer Jagdeep Birk Re: Application Number : F/17/79919

Retrospective: Breach of single story double garage 6 Wellbrook Gardens, SO53 1TN

I wish to make comment on yet another retrospective planning application made by Mr C Humphrey.

With reference to the listed planning matters I received in correspondence I wish to object as follows:

The structure has already been subject 'not permitted'. Why should Eastleigh Borough Council be blackmailed, yet again by this applicant, and pass this hideous construction as suitable for a domestic garage in the immediate housing estate? The ugly vast roof is totally visible from the road, only meters away from the footpaths and surrounding properties. One could hardly describe the building as one having 'Architectural Detail or of positive and distinctive character. The decision made on 21 June 2016 was given as change of vacant land to private garden. No garage /workshop extension was mentioned. How can a garage be classified as garden? The appearance is now out of character as to construction and materials used elsewhere in the immediate vicinity. There is no room for any hedge to grow along the boundary to replace the trees and hedges ripped out before the land was absorbed by the current owner. Valuable habit and public footpath was lost then and there is no possible sign of it being replaced. The rear fencing now has a gate for quick entry to the woodland and public footpath to the rear. Evidence shows that that access is used to dispose of garden waste into the adjoining woodland. Was planning permission sought and agreed for this gateway and fly tipping to take place? Natural woodland should not have garden refuse tipped on it.

In the submitted statement to support the planning application, the agent seeks to enquire as to what constitutes private garden as granted. I do not agree that includes a building as large as the one erected without consent. The area the building extends to questions its intended uses.

I would also point out that the single raft concrete flooring was laid many months previously. It was more than obvious that development was to take place. This occurred long before any attempt was made to apply for consent of any kind of building.

With reference to the following paragraph taken from the supporting statement:

'Of relevance to the proposed development is saved Policy 59.BE which encourages development to take full and proper account of the context of the site, including the character and appearance of the locality and to be appropriate in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. This general development policy addressing all forms of development within the built environment as seeks to ensure high standards of landscape design, the provision of a satisfactory means of access and ensure that layouts address the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. The policy also considers the provision of adequate refuse and recycling facilities and to ensure that new development does not unduly impact existing development and neighbouring uses through potential overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook and disturbance arising from noise and fumes.

Apparently the mechanical blowing of fallen leaves into the road and dumping waste in the woodland to the rear, all demonstrates the attitude of the applicant to the issues mentioned above. He has no regard for the environment, local needs of pedestrians, cyclists or vehicles.

I trust the points raised in my objection will be read and accepted as a strong objection to the ugly, unsightly, undesirable construction which has been erected, without prior application, knowing that Eastleigh Borough Council will just allow its presence to remain.

Jane Hitchman {Mrs}

10 Forest Close

Chandlers Ford

Eastleigh SO53 1NB

Mr & Mrs Hitchman
9 Swanton Gardens
Chandlers Ford
Hampshire
SO53 1TP

Case Officer: Jagdeep Birk
Eastleigh Borough Counil
Development Management
Eastleigh House
Upper Market Street
Eastleigh
Hamshire
SO50 9YN

8th March 2017

Dear Jagdeep,

I am writing to object to application F/17/79919 at 6 Wellbrooke Gardens, SO53 1TN for Retrospective: Breach of single storey double garage.

My objections to this application are;

- This development is an obstruction to a public right of way. I am aware that this point is addressed in an earlier planning application that was refused, but the right of way remains obstructed now so I think it needs to be considered in this application too.
- I feel the double garage is an over development – without incorporating the land that the right of way covered the couple living at the property would not have been able to fit this size garage. It is too big for their plot.
- External design – the garage is not an attractive structure, it is not in keeping with the local area – other garages are brick built/adjoining structures, this is not.
- Returning to the point about the footpath that has been removed/obstructed for the owners to make the changes to their property, I feel that they have jeopardised the safety/increased risk to the woodland path that runs behind the property by removing direct access to the fire hydrants that are located immediately across the road in Wellbrooke Gardens from where the footpath was. Until this garage was built, access could have been gained using the gate the property owners installed in the back fence of their garden (which coincidently is where the footpath used to meet the woodland path) but this new structure blocks all access.

Yours faithfully



Mr & Mrs Hitchman

Rainger, Angela

From: [redacted]
Sent: 09 March 2017 15:21
To: Planning @ Eastleigh Borough Council
Subject: Eastleigh Borough Council Online Planning - Comment

Application Number: F/17/79919
Site Address: 6 Wellbrooke Gardens Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 1TN
Officer: Jagdeep Birk
Name: southwell
Address: 6 Rusland Close
Chandlers Ford
Eastleigh
SO53 1SD
Comment Type: Object
Comment: Impact on trees - This land was an estate footpath (used on a regular basis) with substantial trees and hedge on the opposite side to the property. The public/estate land was then invaded and destroyed before the previous retrospective planning application was eventually made and refused.
Impact on residential amenity and overdevelopment - Loss of what was a public/estate space with substantial pathway access to woodland at rear of the property. This is now an overdevelopment in filling in the gap between the next property which was previously open land.
Visually intrusive - industrial looking construction is not in keeping with the rest of the estate. title deeds for houses on the estate are fairly restricted on visual look of properties even down to window frame colour.
Also have main services been diverted to provide access without the need for demolition of the garage if maintenance is required - main drainage/sewerage, mains electricity, water.
If in future a new dwelling was built on this land and then retrospective planning sought does the council have any powers to prevent further overdevelopment.
Is there any point in planning regulations and the planning application process which most members of the public follow if everyone goes down the route of demolish/build/apply later if spotted.

Rainger, Angela

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 February 2017 11:11
To: Planning @ Eastleigh Borough Council
Subject: Eastleigh Borough Council Online Planning - Comment

Application Number: F/17/79919
Site Address: 6 Wellbrooke Gardens Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 1TN
Officer: Jagdeep Birk
Name: Irene Litster
Address: 7 Wellbrooke Gardens , Chandler's Ford , Eastleigh , SO53 1TN Comment Type: Object
Comment: This structure overhangs my property , it is unattractive (there were woods there before) and would obviate the need to access my property for maintenance purposes. I have already stopped & objected to workman walking freely into my garden for this purpose. Mr Humphrey's original suggestion was to convert this wooded area into garden to (in his words) remove visiting cars from the highway. Mr Humphrey's business is (I believe) Customising People Carriers & Vans to a high standard. I have observed Vehicles such as this being brought into this unplanned structure ..... my other objection (currently conjecture) is considerable concern that it is intended to be used as a business premises with all the accompanying noise and disruption to the environment ..... I am a member of , and submit data on bird numbers to The BRITISH TRUST for ORNITHOLOGY (BTO) ..... numbers of rare birds have reduced by very considerably amounts since this work commenced. I am also concerned that this action could result in major house extensions to the existing house once this building could be established .... the foundations of the new structure match the foundation pattern of the existing house.

Rainger, Angela

From: [redacted]
Sent: 26 February 2017 09:52
To: Planning @ Eastleigh Borough Council
Subject: Eastleigh Borough Council Online Planning - Comment

Application Number: F/17/79919
Site Address: 6 Wellbrooke Gardens Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 1TN
Officer: Jagdeep Birk
Name: KAY HENDERSON
Address: 42 WELLBROOKE GARDENS
CHANDLERS FORD
SO53 1TN
Comment Type: Observation
Comment: No permission was sought to remove the original tree on this property, dig up the public footpath or erect this building. (I haven't seen any planning notices go up) Is it one rule for one and a different for another?

The owner sent a document around stating that the building was to house his mobile home:

The sloping approach to this 'garage' building makes it impossible to house this vehicle I would have thought, I don't think it will fit?

When the building was being built it was erected on a slab of concrete which has a damp proof membrane and I believe under floor heating? a bit over the top for a garage. This makes me think that it's use is for accommodation and not housing a vehicle.

Also, I believe that a building constructed on a boundary must be made of non-combustible materials? is this building made of plastic or steel?

Regards
Kay Henderson