

16 EPSOM CLOSE, HORTON HEATH,
EASTLEIGH - PLANNING APPLICATION.
H/22/93048

With reference to Planning Application H/22/93048 for 16 Epsom Close, Horton Heath, Eastleigh we would like to make it known that we are "OPPOSING" the Application due to the points 1 to 12 listed below.

The present houses in Epsom Close were built 29 years ago, laid out in a manner to afford each of them maximum natural light and privacy to each property as possible, none has undergone such drastic modifications as shown on the drawings submitted for this 'Planning Application.

1. The proposed changes are not sympathetic or in keeping with the properties in the Close as DM1 states

for example. "The need to respect amenity of neighbours and the character of the area."

2. I have read in my HM Land Registry deeds Title Number HP 349885 dated 27th August 1993 and Title Number HP 468990 dated the 17th April 2000, which are legally binding documents, the following extracted statements are taken from the First Part (1) Not to erect anything between any dwelling and any roadway which abuts the property. (ii) Not to erect any further building of any description on the property (a) so as to be visible from any roadway forming part of the Estate or (b) on any part thereof (if any) shown broad hatched black on the plan. (iv) Not to alter the exterior appearance of the property without the consent of the Transferor. (b) Not to park (1) Any

Commercial vehicle, boat, caravan or mobile dwelling of any kind whatsoever on the property or any part thereof except in the rear garden behind properly maintained screen, fences or walls.

(c) (i) Not to use the property except as a single dwelling.

(ii) Not to use any garage on the property except for garaging a private car and storage of common domestic chattels.

If those statements are in my deeds then all the properties in the Close must have similar in their deeds. The perpetuity period applicable hereto is 50 years from the 1st day of April 1990. This is still in place so on a matter of LAW none of the proposals should be accepted by Eastleigh BC as legal challenges could be made. I will make my Deeds available if required to clarify any of previous statements.

Eastleigh BC should call in the deeds for the property to clarify the status of change asked for on the property.

3. At present the property is a 3 bedroom house 1 double and 2 single. The new Floor Plans show it still remains a 3 bed house, so technically parking requirements should remain the same, but due to the proposed enlargement of those 3 bedrooms to doubles is the parking enough. See DM14 policy and parking

4. The proposed extension now incorporates building up the side of the two detached garages, one of which is mine so the integrity of the build is of concern. At present the existing walls are single skin brick and as they are obviously want to use this as one of their accesses from front to back, as door from kitchen

into the garage shows, then the internal dividing wall needs upgrading. If additional foundations, 4ft deep and 600mm wide, are put in along the garage for the proposed extension near my property the 3 metre or 6 metre rule may apply with a Notice of Section 6 needing to be served.

5. In the all the new Plans and Drawings submitted it only shows a single garage which is totally, totally incorrect and possibly drawn that way to mislead the Planners.

6. Looking at the drawings they show some drainage but fail to show the other two utilities electric and gas meters. As the existing gas meter will be enclosed within the area shown for the new front elevation modification will that now be

resighted. Building over a Natural Gas input pipe to an existing meter is illegal, I believe.

7. The new proposed rear extension will now drastically reduce our natural light, which we have had for the past 29 years. Also we now have a loss of privacy due the new additional window in the rear extension elevation which will be nearer our property than on the windows in the original build.

8. Footings for the rear extension will have to be dug deeper due to the closeness of the two trees with TPO's on. Those footings being dug deeper would disrupt the root system and would have a severe detrimental effect on the stability of the substantial trees.

9. The question of drainage from my garage must be answered as the downpipe from the rear gutter will be built over possibly.

10. If this work is carried out, my driveway shown clearly in my deeds will be possibly compromised. I will not be allowing access over it and my car will be parked on it at all times when I am requiring to use it.

11. The Eastleigh BC representative, who visited the site on the last Planning Application, stated quite categorically that as the footings required for the rear elevation would encroach the boundary of the property of No15 it was a non starter. This statement proved right as the Application was withdrawn. As the change of design still requires footings along the same boundary that statement made must

stand again.

12. The noise, dirt, lost of privacy and extreme inconvenience that this Application, if approved, would be unthinkable. I will be looking for Proof of Builders Liability and Health and Safety Plan if approved.

In summary the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages refusal of poor design, which we feel this Application falls in to as listed 1 to 12.

Lastly at no stage have we been approached or consulted by the Planning Applicant on any possible development aspects regarding No 16.

[REDACTED]
17 Epsom Close
Horton Heath.