

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/W1715/W/23/3329598

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/W1715/W/23/3329598

Appeal By DR GARY CHAFFEY

Site Address
63 Underwood Road
Bishopstoke
SO50 6FX

SENDER DETAILS

Name CLLR KEITH HOUSE

Address
2A Freegrounds Road
Hedge End
SOUTHAMPTON
SO30 0HH

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I write as Leader of the Local Planning Authority having been contacted by the Applicant seeking a review of the decision of Local Area Committee of the Local Planning Authority given the planning officer recommendation to permit the application. The planning officer in making a recommendation on the application carefully considered the planning issues.

The Local Area Committee gave just two reasons for refusal:

1 - Impact on Stoke Park Woods SINC. Paragraphs 49-50 of the officer report address these issues in the context of expert advice and find that "further biodiversity are proposed and are considered to be a suitable compensation strategy" and that "the benefit of the proposed enhancements. removal of the existing mobile home and the potential fall-back position in terms of extensions to the existing dwelling that could be constructed under permitted development rights also provide unique circumstances in this case". These officer recommendations withstand scrutiny, as concluded in paragraph 52.

2 - Garden provision of the new dwelling. This is highly subjective and not supported by a wider view of the pattern of development across this estate or referenced as a concern in the officer report.

The Borough Council takes its NPPF and Local Plan responsibilities seriously, including making the best use of urban land to achieve more sustainable development. I urge that the original officer recommendation to permit with the conditions attached be reinstated.

Cllr Keith House, MRTPI(Hon)