

Planning Application H/22/94226
13 SATCHELL LANE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 4HF

Representative	Address	Comments
Jeffrey Sirl	11 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Dear Sir, I wish to object to the Planning Application No: H/22/94226 to make substantial alterations and extensions to 13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-le-Rice, SO31 4HF. It should be noted that my objections to this application are similar to those I made in respect of the previous Planning Application (No. H/21/91232) submitted by the applicant in 2021 which was subsequently withdrawn, as many of the issues are similar in both. My grounds for objecting to the current application are as follows: I strongly object to the proposed addition of a first floor terrace at the front of No.13 which would be adjoined to the south elevation. It would adversely impact the privacy and amenity I currently enjoy in my home as, despite the inclusion of a frosted glass privacy screen, anyone standing at the front of the terrace at the south-east corner (or further towards the living room) would still be able to look straight into my main bedroom through the traditional bay window on the front of my property which is less than 2.5m from it on the 1st floor. Noise from the proposed terrace would also be heard in my main bedroom and in my lounge below, whether windows were open or closed. (For reference, it should be noted that the neighbouring property on the other side of No.11, (No.9) was allowed to include a front balcony in its remodelling but this balcony is significantly set back from the front elevation of No.11 so that all of it is at least 1m behind the front elevation of No.11. No matter where anyone stands on the balcony of No.9 they cannot see into the living spaces in my house. The gap between the two properties at their front elevations is over 3m, bigger than that between No.13 and No.11 which is only 1.25m. In addition, there is only a very small double glazed utility room window on the side elevation of No.11 at the rear on that side so there is no scope for conversations to be heard in my property from use of the balcony. Therefore, that balcony does not adversely affect the privacy or amenity I possess inside my property and so should not be used as a precedent for the inclusion of the terrace on No.13 which, if it were allowed, would.) I object to the proposed extension of the rear elevation of No.13 outwards at the first floor. In keeping with planning norms, the existing rear elevations of No.11 and No.13 are in exact alignment at the 1st floor upwards so such a change would be visually intrusive. Also, the enlargement would significantly reduce the light accessed by the occupants of No.15 which is on the north side of No.13. Refusing the rear elevation extension would still leave the occupants of No.13 with a very large 1st floor space for two bedrooms and bathroom(s), especially with the proposed additional side-extension floor space. I object to the proposed inclusion of a completely new third storey. None of the neighbouring houses has three storeys (including mine). They all have traditional tiled pyramidal or ridged roofs. Where owners have wanted to use roof space they have built dormers into the existing roof to retain the look of the property and reduce the visual impact on neighbours and the street scene. The inclusion of this additional third storey floor will significantly increase the built volume at this height. The plans indicate the proposed floor would also protrude beyond the original rear elevation of No.13 further exacerbating its negative visual impact. In the application as whole, the applicant is applying for extensions that would virtually double the existing floor space. (Careful measurement of the plans shows that the ground floor extensions alone add at least 42% to the existing internal floor space, so refusing the third storey element of the application still allows for significant enlargement of the existing property elsewhere in the application.)

		I would like to draw to the Planning Officer's attention the comments of the Planning Inspector who ruled on the Planning Appeal for the planning application at No.9, on the opposite side of my property to No.13, which also included a flat-roofed ground floor rear extension. He stated (Condition 22) "Finally, in order to ensure that overlooking does not occur at the rear of the property from use of the roof of the single storey extension, the use of this as a balcony or other outdoor space needs to be prevented." I would hope that the same condition be put on the flat rooves in the application for No.13, for even though the application states that access to the rooves would be for maintenance only, such a condition would underline this. I object to the proposal to excavate the front garden and convert it into a car park on the basis of overdevelopment. The full-width excavation of the site, especially when combined with the proposal to add extensions and alterations over three storeys of the property on three elevations to substantially increase the floor space, as well as changing the shape of the roof and increase its size, surely constitutes overdevelopment. It should be noted that the existing drive has space for three cars to park one behind the other. Even if the proposed side extension was granted, two cars would be able to park on the remaining drive. Therefore, a simple widening of the existing drive to allow two cars to park side by side would allow a total of four cars to park without the unnecessary and drastic excavation of the whole front garden. It should also be noted that there are a number of residents parking bays along this section of Satchell Lane on the opposite side of the road, which are usually available. In summary my grounds for objection are: Impact on residential amenity including overlooking / Loss of privacy Overdevelopment Visual intrusiveness Finally, I would be happy for the Planning Officer overseeing this application to carry out a site visit to verify my measurements and observations should he wish. Yours faithfully, Mr J Sirl, 11 Satchell Lane, Hamble-le-Rice. SO31 4HF.
Rilka Sirl	11 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Dear Sir, I wish to object to the Planning Application No: H/22/94226 to make substantial alterations and extensions to 13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-le-Rice, SO31 4HF. It should be noted that my objections to this application are similar to those I made in respect of the previous Planning Application (No. H/21/91232) submitted by the applicant in 2021 which was subsequently withdrawn, as many of the issues are similar in both. My grounds for objecting to the current application are as follows: I object to the proposal to excavate the front garden to convert it into a car park on the basis of overdevelopment. The full-width excavation of the site would require the removal of many tons of soil and the building of

		a large retaining wall along the boundary with No.11. It should be noted that a mains drain runs from the rear of No.11 in a straight line next to that boundary with No.13 (the manhole is 30cm from it) and along its entire length to the road at the front. The planning application shows on the 'Site Plan Existing' that there is an existing electricity cable pole (with additional telephone cable) approximately 30cm from that boundary, in the garden of No.13, which supplies electricity to a number of properties along Satchell Lane, including my own. Excavations so close to the boundary could affect these services, which need protecting. The planning application on the 'Site Plan Proposed' for No.13, does not however, show this electricity cable pole but merely the cables serving my property and others but not at No.13. Lowering the front garden would also make the proposed development look even taller from the street therefore impacting on the street scene giving the impression of overdevelopment. In terms of car parking, currently there is provision for three cars to park in a line up the drive. Even if the house were extended at the side, there is still space for two cars on the drive as well as additional on-street parking in the residents permit bays opposite where spaces are often available. Although the Site Plan Proposed does not include a scale, the existing front garden/plot at No.13 measures approximately 12m (from the existing front elevation of the house) by approximately 15m (at the road-side). The size of the existing front garden/plot offers a number of design opportunities for parking several cars and for green/planted landscaping. Currently, the landscaping of the front garden at No.13 includes a large, planted green space in keeping with the vast majority of gardens along the length of Satchell Lane where there is a balance of driveway parking and planted green spaces. Therefore, I object to the proposal on the grounds of external design, layout and appearance of the plot. The proposed landscaping would be visually intrusive with little regard for green space and be out of keeping with the area. I also object to the proposed parking and landscaping of the front garden on the basis of impact on residential amenity including loss of privacy / overlooking. For example, at No.13 a meaningful planting space with shrubs / hedging along the boundary with No.11 would reduce the loss of privacy for the front lounge windows and garden of No.11. I object to the proposed addition of a first-floor terrace at the front/east elevation of No.13 which would wrap around to adjoin the side/south elevation providing space for an outdoor seating area at first-floor level of approximately 3m depth by 2.2m width at this corner of the property. This first-floor level terrace would also be accessed from a living room and be situated about 2.5m away from my first-floor bedroom bay window. I object to this on the basis of amenity as it would result in a loss of privacy with overlooking and possible noise ingress whether the windows are open or closed in my bedroom or the lounge below it. I object to the proposed extension of the rear elevation of No.13 outwards at the first floor. Given that the existing rear elevations of No.13 and No.11 are in exact alignment at the first floor upwards, this extension would therefore be visually intrusive and would also significantly reduce the light available to No.15 on the north side of this substantial bump-out. I also object to the proposed extension of the rear elevation of No.13 outwards at the first floor on the basis of overdevelopment. A careful comparison of the floor plans of the existing property with those proposed shows that the planning application seeks to virtually double the floor space of No.13 adding extensions over three storeys on three elevations.
--	--	---

		I object to the proposal to erect a completely new third storey on the basis of overdevelopment. None of the houses in this part of Satchell Lane has a purpose-built third storey. They are either two storeys only, as in the art deco style houses of Crowsport, or they have loft conversions built within the existing roof-space with additional dormer windows. The proposed third storey would bump-out beyond the original first-floor rear elevation of no.13 so the built volume of the third storey would be visually intrusive. In summary, my grounds for objection are: Impact on residential amenity including overlooking / loss of privacy / Noise Overdevelopment Visual Intrusiveness Impact on the street scene External design, layout and appearance Yours faithfully, Mrs Rilka Sirl 11 Satchell Lane, Hamble-le-Rice, SO31 4HF.
Robert Thomas	19 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	I wish to object to this application for the following reasons: 1. The overall size of the proposed development is way out of proportion to it's surroundings and the extended footprint and height present issues of privacy, noise, and visual impact for neighbours. 2. In particular, the revised plan for the first floor balcony/terrace on the front elevation appears to make no improvement on that of the previous application H/21/91232. The left side will look directly into the neighbouring bedroom window. 3. None of the houses in this part of Hamble have three storeys and there is no reason why this development should be any different nor should it set a precedent. The proposed third storey together with extensions to the rear contribute to the sense of overdevelopment and visual intrusion as well as reduction in light for neighbouring houses. 4. I object to what appears to be the large scale excavation at the front of the house to provide car parking. A more modest plan would provide extra parking and preserve a front garden in keeping 5. The close proximity of the south and north aspects to the neighbouring houses in particular will impinge on privacy and create noise issues. The proposed plan for the second floor balcony to the front elevation appears to be no improvement on that of the previous planning application H/21/91232. It is unacceptably close to the upstairs bay window of Number 11.
Keith Hughes	17 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Dear Sir ,Madam re application H/22/ 94226 I would like to object to the new plan for the following reasons. 1. The new building would be twice the size of the original property and too large for the plot. Due to the close proximity give rise to maintenance problems in the future for itself and neighbors. 2. Why Art deco ? already there is a hotch potch of buildings and nowhere art deco.

		3. As in number 1 overdevelopment 3 storeys this will set a new precedent to Satchell Lane and will encourage further oversized development applications should it be approved. 4, Parking this will be if as per proposed plan a further reduction in parking and put more pressure for parking in the village. 5 Most of Satchell Lane has pleasant front gardens giving flora and fauna and opportunity to thrive . Digging out the garden and paving it will cause yet more rain run off and encourage others to pave over their gardens.
Mark Farwell	15 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Dear Sir/Madam, I wish to object to planning application H/22/94226 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice. SO31 3HF) on the following grounds: Objection One: Land Stability and Subsidence (13 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane) i. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/22/94226 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice. SO31 3HF) forthwith, and for no other reason than the scale of the proposed excavation will lead to ground instability - causing serious structural damage to 15 Satchell Lane. The application was submitted without an assessment of the likely consequences of a proposed single storey development of 2.5m x 7.2m adjacent to south elevation (extending 40cm over the boundary onto 15 Satchell) where subsidence and ground compression is already known and documented (Cunningham & Lyndsay, 2002). Furthermore, there are no measures identified in the application to protect the structural integrity of 15 Satchell Lane. ii. That the applicant failed to provide an impact risk assessment for the proposed scale of the excavation by way of a ground stability survey, or even a preconstruction survey that includes photographs and a geotechnical report. Furthermore, the applicants did not consult with the owner occupiers of 15 Satchell Lane prior to submitting planning applications H/21/91232 (withdrawn) and H/22/94226). iii. That the proposed 10m x 10m x 170cm site excavation for the carpark ("alterations to site frontage to enlarge parking area") involves the removal 150 tonnes of soil which will result in ground instability. This will exacerbate the pre-existing subsidence and possibly precipitate ground heave. The excavation will also alter the angle of repose (slope stability) on the east/south elevations (corner) of 15 Satchell Lane - the area most affected by subsidence (see Annex 1 in the full report sent by email). iv. That the footing for the north elevation (13 Satchell Lane) for the proposed 7.2m x 2.5m ground floor single storey extension; and the 1.5m (d) x 9m (w) x 10m (h) three-storey extension (ground floor rear entrance, first floor stairwell and second floor ensuite) is located on the diagonal fault line (subsidence) between the south elevation of 13 Satchell Lane (visible cracking) and the north elevation of 15 Satchell Lane. Furthermore, the footing for the loadbearing dividing wall (south/north elevations at 15 Satchell Lane is located on top of the diagonal fault line and has been the subject of two interventions (remedial works), including 13 Satchell Lane, for subsidence since 2002. Although now reinforced below the dampproof course level, a 3.5cm gap remains at the bottom of the loadbearing dividing wall and the inner cavity wall (90o). The disturbance caused by excavating the front garden (parking area enlargement) and excavating beyond the edge of the footing (15 Satchell Lane) for the foundations (single storey extension and the three-storey extension (north elevation) will compromise the ground stability and correspondingly the structural integrity of the south and east elevations of 15 Satchell Lane. And, v. That the footing (1m x 600mm) for the north elevation 7.2m (w)

		x 2.5m (d) and 3.2m (h) ground floor single storey extension (13 Satchell Lane) at the narrowest point (west) will not only extend 40cm beyond the boundary, but 7cm under the south elevation flank wall of 15 Satchell Lane. Objection Two: Overdevelopment i. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/22/94226 forthwith, and for no other reason than the proposal is opaque, 'not to scale', and without perspective or sightline (Visual Impact Assessment) in relation to the adjoining properties and the street scene. Furthermore, the planning application has clear disregard for the landscape resource (applicants have already cleared the site of all trees, shrubbery, and foliage; and subject to approval from Hampshire County Council, the applicants intend to excavate the front garden to enlarge the parking area) or sensitivity towards the value attached to aspects of the visual landscape and street scene. Moreover, the sheer magnitude, extent, and scale of this proposal to increase the total habitable floorspace by 91% (benchmark norm is no more than an increase of 30%) is unacceptable given the 'magnitude of effect' on residential amenity, privacy, and outlook. Hence, planning application H/22/94226 is an exemplar of overdevelopment to the detriment of the character of Satchell Lane and neighbouring residents. ii. That the proposed development on the north elevation by way of a 2.5m (d) x 7.2m (w) x 3.2m (h) ground floor single storey extension with a flat roof; and the 1.5m (d) x 9m (w) x 10m (h) three storey extension (ground floor rear entrance, first floor stairwell and second floor ensuite) is unacceptable for the following reasons: (1) Property Boundary: That the proposed development on the north elevation by way of a 2.5m (d) x 7.2m (w) x 3.2m (h) ground floor single storey extension at the narrowest point will trespass onto the property boundary of 15 Satchell Lane by 40cm. We commissioned specialist boundary surveyors report in 2020 (when purchasing the property in 2020); and we are currently in legal correspondence with the applicants over the removal of a carport which is partly situated on our property. The specialist boundary surveyors report confirmed that the applicants' carport is built partly on our land. Similarly, the proposed single storey rear extension (9m (w) x 8m (d) x 3.5m (h) at the narrowest point (west) terminates 65cm from the boundary with 15 Satchell Lane. (2) Maintenance of South Elevation (15 Satchell Lane): That the proposed development on the north elevation by way of a 2.5m (d) x 7m (w) x 3.2m (h) ground floor single storey extension with a flat roof (built-out beyond the boundary by 40cm, and 22cm from the flank wall) will prevent access for maintenance of the south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane. We will be effectively 'bricked-in'. (3) The Right to Light (including Sunlight) and Privacy: The right to sunlight, other than hospitals and educational establishments, is a qualitatively different entity than that of the 'right to light'. However, given the scale and magnitude of the proposal a Sunlight and Daylight Assessment should have been conducted at the beginning of planning and submitted along with the planning application. To that end, the three-storey extension on the north elevation (1.5m (d) x 9m (w) x 9m (h); first floor west elevation (rear) extension (3.5m (d) x 8m (w) x 3.5m (h); and the third-storey extension (roof reconfiguration) of 8m (d) x 8m (w) x 3.5m (h) are proposed constructions that extend 1.5m beyond the footprint on the west and north elevations and will therefore have a detrimental impact upon residential amenities, privacy (overlooking) and overshadowing (loss of light) (4) Loss of Amenity by Extending Beyond the Footprint: The east (single storey with terrace), north and west elevation extensions (three storeys; and including a second storey 3.5m (d) x 4m (w) x 3.5m (h) on the south/west elevation (bump-out); and a third storey extension (roof
--	--	--

		reconfiguration) is a development that 'forward' of the two adjacent properties (extends beyond the existing footprint at the east, west and north elevations. This is out of character, so too the design, with other two storey properties from 9 Satchell Lane to 19 Satchell Lane. Moreover, the proposed first-floor terrace and the first-floor rear extension constitutes an unacceptable intrusion resulting in a loss of privacy and the legal right to light for residents of 11 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane in particular. (5) Third Storey Extension: The third-storey extension (roof reconfiguration) is unacceptable. Other than the concerns about extending beyond the existing footprint by 1.5m (side and rear) and the loss of light (overshadowing), amenity and visual intrusiveness; a third-storey extension would facilitate all-pervasive overlooking (panoramic) of living spaces of neighbouring properties (both inside and outside the house) as well the front/rear gardens from 7 Satchell Lane to 21 Satchell Lane; Lukes Close, Farm Close and Marina Drive - all symptomatic of unacceptable over-development. iii. That Eastleigh Borough Council reject planning application H/22/94226 forthwith for reasons of land stability, subsidence and overdevelopment resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook, privacy (no proposals to safeguard an appropriate level of privacy) and the amenity of neighbouring properties (particularly 11 Satchell Lane and 15 Satchell Lane) - contrary to the Local Plan and Residential Amenity Design Guidance. Summary of objections to planning application H/22/94226 are as follows 1. Land stability and subsidence. 2. Negative effects on amenity (neighbours and community) due to overlooking loss of privacy. 3. Overshadowing and loss of daylight. 4. Overdevelopment: Over-bearing, out-of-scale (91% increase habitable floorspace) and character in terms of appearance. 5. Adverse visual impact (intrusive) of the development on the landscape and locality. Dr Mark Farwell Owner Occupier 15 Satchell Lane Hamble-Le-Rice SO31 4HF
Leanne Gibson	15 SATCHELL LANE HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HF	Dear Sir/Madam, Objections to planning application: H/22/94226 (13 Satchell Lane) Re: Planning Application Number: H/22/94226 (13 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice. SO31 4HF) I am writing to object to Planning Application Number: H/22/94226. The application comprises of "Single storey front; two/three storey side; and single and two storey rear extensions; removal of roof and provision of second floor accommodation; together with alterations to site frontage to enlarge parking area." I am the joint owner occupier of 15 Satchell Lane (next-door neighbour) and moved into the property on Wednesday, 16 December 2015. After carefully researching and reviewing planning application H/22/94226 (13 Satchell Lane) I wish to bring to your attention important matters sufficiently serious in themselves to warrant determination by planning committee (elected members), rather than delegated powers. To that end, I wish to object to planning application: H/22/94226 (13 Satchell Lane) for the following reasons and material considerations: i. Objection 1: That the design (computer-generated architectural visualisation is not to scale) proposes single storey front; two/three storey

		side; and single and two storey rear extensions; removal of roof and provision of second floor accommodation; together with alterations to site frontage to enlarge parking area. Firstly, I object to the bulk and scale of this development because it will dwarf the adjacent properties – resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and privacy; as well as adversely affecting the amenity of neighbouring properties. ii. Objection 2: That the proposed single storey front; two/three storey side; and single and two storey rear extensions; removal of roof and provision of second floor accommodation is forward of the two adjacent properties is unacceptable in amenity terms because the pattern of overlooking is completely at variance with the existing. The proposal would precipitate an all-pervasive invasion of privacy (panoramic overlooking from the second and third floors) at the front and rear gardens of 9 to 21 Satchell Lane; rear elevations of 11 and 15 Satchell Lane; as well as the living spaces of neighbouring properties (both inside and outside the house) at Lukes Close, Farm Close and Marina Drive - all symptomatic of unacceptable over-development. iii. Objection 3: That the lack of meaningful front garden and the predominance of hard surfaces, resulting from site clearance already undertaken in October 2021 (trees, shrubbery, foliage, hedging and other vegetation) and excavation would/has resulted in the loss of habitat in both front and rear gardens. Even prior to planning approval, the natural existing contours have been desecrated by site clearance and exacerbated by the creation of an unduly harsh environment that is out of character with the street scene/visual landscape. An exemplar of thoughtless instrumentalism; and as such is indicative of unacceptable overdevelopment. iv. Objection 4: That the ground disturbance (instability) caused by excavating beyond the edge of the footing (south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane) and the car park (10m x 10m x 1.70cm excavation) will compromise ground stability and the structural integrity of the south elevation of 15 Satchell Lane (assured). i. Objection 5: That the design (art deco exterior/interior) proposes the use of the first floor as a living space with terrace; and that the pervasive use of glass would create a space where overlooking and noise would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, amenity, and will impact negatively on the quality of life in my own surroundings and the residents of 11 Satchell Lane (immediate and direct). And, ii. Objection 6: That the proposed development and design (bulk and scale) is not just visually intrusive and overbearing but would impact negatively (affect) on the heritage assets of Satchell Lane. In summary, I am objecting to planning application: H/22/94226 on the following grounds and material considerations: (1) External/internal design (layout) and appearance (2) Land stability (3) Overdevelopment (4) Loss of privacy and amenity, and the negative impact on the heritage assets of Satchell Lane. Ms Gibson Owner Occupier 15 Satchell Lane Hamble-Le-Rice SO31 4HF
--	--	--

Dr M Farwell	15 Satchell Lane Hamble SO31 4HF	See also separate letter
Eva Tomlinson	20 Satchell Lane Hamble SO31 4HE	See separate email
Rick Tomlinson	20 Satchell Lane Hamble SO31 4HE	See separate email