

Planning Application
63 UNDERWOOD ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 6FX

Representative	Address	Comments
Chris Broyd	194 ALBERT ROAD SOUTHSEA PORTSMOUTH, PORTSMOUTH, PO4 0JT	Dear Sirs. In a previous application (F/22/93394) the applicant claimed that the site was brownfield. For the record, the brownfield use is not lawful for a number of reasons. Firstly, the use has not been an unchallenged use for greater than ten years so a certificate of lawful use could not be obtained. Secondly, there are restricted covenants on the land contained in the conveyance dated 11th February 1930 and referred to in the charges register of which Eastleigh Council are also named within further registration. The restrictions refer to building on the land, location and a limit to extent of terrace. But to returning to the claim of brownfield, the restrictions state no noisome or offensive trade or business shall at any time be carried out on the property. Whereas, no application for any commercial use has been applied or approved by the LPA, then the lawful use of the land is understood to be C3 (dwelling). Looking closer at the application, it is noted that the remaining garden and relaxation space provided will be significantly reduced to that even of any modern new build development and not in keeping with the surrounding design and layout. It is noted within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) section 71 that "plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area." I move on to section 124 of the NPPF where it states within sub section d) "the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and e) the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places." Not only is the remaining garden of the proposed four bedroom dwelling (as shown in applicants drawing 400_08) not in keeping with section 124 of the NPPF noted above, I believe this to have an impact on the local amenity and a conflict with section 5.5 of the adopted local plan which states- 5.5 New development will be assessed to consider its impact on residential amenity. This covers the amenity of existing residents living at or near the development and also the amenity of new residents. Residential amenity covers a variety of issues including overlooking, loss of daylight, loss of outlook, noise, fumes and dust and the impact of floodlighting and security lighting. It includes the design of garden space and parking arrangements in addition to building design. I would like to move on to your Quality Places Supplementary Planning Documentation. The head of the council when this was written (Mr Keith House) stated within the preface "Attractive homes and places of work or leisure that are a pleasure to live in, visit or work in with beautiful streets, gardens and open spaces should be created" The documentation continues within section of residential

		amenity, “Back gardens facing within 30 degrees of north should be a minimum length when measured from the house of 12m for 2 storey house and 14m for 3 storey houses to compensate for excessive shade from the house.” Whereas the longest point of the garden (the apex of the triangle shown in the applicants drawing 400_08) does not exceed the 12m required, the overall reduction of the expected area caused by the shape would be detrimental to its amenity. As for the shape of the garden, the assessment of the design is not suitable according to the documentation Building For Life 12 (supported and referred to within the Quality Places SPD) where it states “Thinking carefully about the size and shape of outside amenity space. It is a good idea to ensure that rear gardens are at least equal to the ground floor footprint of the dwelling. Triangular shaped gardens rarely offer a practical, usable space.” The site will be over developed creating concerns outlined within 5.5 of your newly adopted plan where a conventional house with private rear gardens, the front of one house should not face the rear windows of another, for reasons of privacy and informal surveillance. Exceptions to this rule will require a combination of increased separation distance (above the accepted back to back minimum) and privacy screening. The property proposed within the applicants’ plan 400_08 would have an overbearing impact on the privacy of the neighbouring property. The applicant states that the shadow that will be cast by the proposed dwelling falls upon the shed mitigating any concerns, the shed is a removable structure and cannot be assumed that this or future occupiers would wish to keep it in this location thus adopting unrequired loss of light. It was noted within the applicants design and access statement that the LPA pre application meeting encouraged an extension to the terrace, this proposal is a clear over development from that advice and does not meet the core strategy of Eastleigh Borough Council, Quality Places SPD, Building for Life 12 instructions or the National Planning Policy Framework. Moving onto the location to the woodland itself, I welcome the recommendation for refusal based on ecology after their consultation. For the reasons outlined above, I wish this application to be refused. Yours Sincerely Chris Broyd
Heather & Nicholas Marshall	55 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	Reference proposed two storey 4 bed addition to end of terrace of 63 Underwood Road with parking for 6 cars for both properties which would be totally inappropriate for the area which is already congested with parking. It would also create problems for utility services accessing the road who already have difficulty with refuse vehicles, delivery services and any emergency services. Another property would be crammed into a very small space thus encroaching on the woodland adjoined to the property and the wildlife. Additional amenity services would cause problems on already stretched drainage and energy services to the road. Surely when construction of the initial build the council would have felt it was inappropriate for any extension to the terrace block because of the space and the woodland.

pieter donnelly	80 STOKE PARK ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6BX	This is the second time my wife and I have had to object to 63 Underwood Road planning and once again I have to explain why we purchased our home. We feel very strongly against another property being built within reach of our very private garden. Our privacy and the idyllic location of our house and garden are the main reason we purchased our home we feel it would be a breach of our privacy if the property was to go ahead not only for our garden but also we feel uncomfortable our windows and large patio doors Would be visible to the new occupants. Therefore we would lose our privacy inside and outside our home which is causing great stress to my wife and I.
Sandra McCoye	65 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	For the second time in 6 months, we find ourselves experiencing much distress and anxiety as a result of a Planning Permission Application from 63 Underwood Road. We object to the proposed Planning Application as follows: 1. We reiterate ALL the objections lodged by Mr Chris Broyd. 2. We also register our concern and challenge regarding the earlier referral by the applicant that the rear garden of the site is classed as brownfield, as per Chris Broyd's comments. 3. We also reiterate the objections lodged by the Ecologist, Lisa Malter, in particular "Extending the building closer to the SINC boundary is contrary to Local Plan policy DM11 and must not be considered". 4. The proposals would result in overdevelopment of the site. The proposal to further extend an already extended property to contain 5 bedrooms, as well as the addition of the new property with its 4 bedrooms, is a disproportionate increase and an oversaturation of new residents. This has a huge effect on mass and scale and forms an unacceptable relationship with neighbouring properties. It also has effects on the neighbouring amenity, contrary to local plan policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the National Planning Policy Framework. 5. The proposed new 4-bedroom property's front bedroom windows would diagonally overlook into our back garden and into our back bedroom window. This would have an overbearing impact on our privacy. 6. Whilst each of the proposed properties has three parking spaces marked on the plan, we feel these are inadequate in terms of their practical usage. The vehicles would block each other in, and we strongly believe the spaces will not be used to full effect by future occupiers. We believe that future residents will prefer to create a front garden area for themselves (particularly as the proposed new 4-bedroomed property has no adequate back garden) and park their vehicles on the road, exactly as the current residents do. This will cause huge congestion all around the green, which is already very congested by on-road parking from neighbouring properties. Thank you for considering our comments of objection. Sandra and Andy McCoye
Sarah Keenan	59 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	I would like to object to this planning application, as before the issue with parking will still exist, by dropping the kerb we are losing two public parking spaces. I live at 59 and I have a drive, however 61 next to me doesn't have a drive, I appreciate the owner does not drive currently, however if he did or ever sold the property, this would result in him having no parking space available on the road as this will encroach on the entry to 63

		parking bays. My other next door neighbour doesn't have a drive either so there are many properties that rely on the public road parking. The close is very busy and I often experience people parking over my drive, people park on the grass verges etc too, there is often limited parking for visitors. I also still believe the plot is oversized and now very close to the woods.
Rebecca Freeman	47 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	I object to the proposed Planning Application as follows: I reiterate ALL the objections lodged by Mr Chris Broyd and some of my previous objections on the refused detached planning application: Parking This is a very present and growing issue, with households having 2 or more cars, not every property has off road parking so consequently people are parking cars, vans and trailers on the road and grass verges regularly! Because of the heavy congestion there is limited parking for visitors and in our case we often have to move our car off our own drive to allow our visiting relatives to park with ease. Both properties have 3 x spaces marked on the plan but in reality in terms of their practicality, surely there would be vehicle access issues on this corner plot? The parking shown on the plan may not necessarily be used to full effect by future occupiers, we also have concerns that future residents will utilise the front garden area for recreational use (Due to the lack of space in there back garden or sunlight - The back garden will be in the shade all day and the front will have sun all afternoon and evening) Resulting in parking their vehicles on the road or grass verges, exactly as the current residents do only adding to the problem! 1. Proportion and Undesirable The proposed property will be situated extremely close to the existing houses at 65 Underwood Road appearing squeezed in and out of proportion and would result in overdevelopment of the site. I echo other neighbors' concerns, the proposal to further extend an already extended property to contain 5 bedrooms, as well as the addition of the new property with its 4 bedrooms, is a disproportionate increase and an overpopulation of new residents and will result in an unacceptable relationship with neighboring properties. This would not only cause a negative impact on neighborhood morale, but the desirability of the area, not only to home owners like ourselves but to potential buyers/sellers. 3. Landscape and Environmental impact on local trees/woods and wildlife At the moment because of the current landscape and layout Stoke Park Wood is visible via the road and to the neighboring houses, this is definitely a bonus and selling point, it goes without saying. By building a 2 storey end of terrace house situated in-between the existing properties would be encroaching on the woodland adjoined to the property and the wildlife, changing the landscape and blocking the forest view thus causing a negative effect not only to us but the area and neighbours/home owners.

		We see an array of wildlife as a result of living so close to the woods entering our garden and onto the green which is directly outside of our property as well as 63/65 Underwood Road, I can list a few: Birds, Squirrels, Slow Worms, Bats during dusk/night feeding on fly's and insects swooping around the houses and open spaces. The consequence of building a semi 2 Storey property in-between the two existing houses will undoubtedly disturb them. I would like to bring to your attention that Bats are a protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and the Conservation Regulations 1994. Pipistrelles (Another specie of Bat) are also protected under Annex IV of the European Communities Council Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats. In addition, slow worms and other reptiles whose habitats are close to the property and woods are all species Protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 and the proposed new house would impact their habitat. Finally we would like to reiterate that we both strongly object to this planning permission application. Yours sincerely Rebecca Freeman & Che Allen
Karen Brooks	67 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	We would like to object to this planning application as per the earlier comments and objections lodged by Mr Chris Broyd. We would also like to draw to the Planning Officer's attention that the photograph showing our house and driveway (photo on page 3 of the Planning Design and Access Statement dated 21/12.22) is not at all indicative of the reality. We have sacrificed the whole of our front garden to accommodate our vehicles to keep them off the road and minimise congestion. There are normally 7 cars and a caravan present. The photograph in the report is therefore misleading. The proposed planning application would be a huge overdevelopment of the site and would lead to overcrowding. Yours sincerely Mr and Mrs G Brooks
Dan Wareham	78 STOKE PARK ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6BX	For a second instance we once again strongly object the proposed development at this property on the same grounds as before. The most significant contributing factor is the loss of privacy we will experience from the rear of our property, privacy we enjoy with our young children. Additionally, the proposed development is totally out of keeping with other properties in the parish and serves to provide more overcrowding to a already congested area.
David Wheal	BISHOPSTOKE PARISH OFFICE RIVERSIDE BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6LQ	Bishopstoke Parish Council objects to this application on the grounds that there is not a sufficient buffer provided for the ancient woodland.
Sandra McCoye	65 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	We would like to reiterate and emphasise an objection as follows: As the existing property has already been extended to the side and the rear, the proposals to further extend to create a 5 bedroom dwelling squashed into a terrace will clearly raise concerns regarding Scale and Mass, and is surely an issue

		regarding town cramming. All of our previously logged objections still stand. Mr and Mrs McCoye and Mr and Mrs Brooks
Justine Lovegrove		See separate email.
Mr E J Lata	61 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	See separate email.