

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

Representative	Address	Comments
Sarah Keenan	59 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	Does the current occupier of 63 expect to keep all of his poultry in his garden of no. 63 as he is currently? I cant imagine anyone will want to move into a new build with that noise and smell next door? I know this as I live two doors up and the noise and smell from the ducks is very annoying and disrupts any peaceful time you may hope to have in your garden.
David Wheal	BISHOPSTOKE PARISH OFFICE RIVERSIDE BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6LQ	Bishopstoke Parish Council Planning Committee objects to this application on the grounds that it would constitute overdevelopment and is not in keeping with the local area.
Pieter Donnelly	80 STOKE PARK ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6BX	This is the third time my wife and myself have had to object to this build. We purchased our house due to falling in love with the garden and the privacy that the trees and surrounding forest gave to the property. We believe that if this build was to go ahead it would be visually intrusive so therefore my wife and I are objecting AGAIN.
Sandra McCoye	65 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	We object to the latest application as follows: Layout and density of buildings / scale and dominance: The proposals would result in overdevelopment of the site. The proposal to further extend an already extended property, as well as the addition of the new property with its 5 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. Overlooking/loss of privacy: On Drawing 400_21 the upstairs window on the Proposed Side Elevation will directly overlook the back garden of No. 65, and the 3 windows on the Proposed Front Elevation will diagonally overlook our back garden and will also be able to look into our back bedroom window. This is a considerable loss to our privacy. We disagree with the statement at 7.55 of the Planning Assessment document that there will be no overlooking from the windows of the new dwelling into our garden. Impact on Residential Amenity: Referring to statements 7.52 – 7.55 in the Planning Assessment: We vehemently disagree with the statement at 7.52 – this amended proposal continues to have the most distressing and detrimental impact upon No. 65 and the proposed new property will have a huge and negative impact upon us. We vehemently disagree with the statement at 7.53 – We do not consider that a 3-metre distance is more than

		sufficient separation to maintain residential amenity. We disagree with the statement at 7.54 – We consider that the new property would most definitely have an overbearing impact on No. 65 As per previous paragraph above, we disagree with statement 7.55 because the windows from the Proposed Front Elevation will diagonally overlook our back bedroom window and the upstairs window on the Proposed Side Elevation will directly overlook our back garden. The property proposed within the applicants' plan 400_22 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, however the shed is a removable structure and cannot be assumed that the current or future occupiers would wish to keep it in this location, thus adopting unrequited loss of light. Traffic and parking issues: Whilst the plans depict 3 off-street parking spaces for each dwelling, some of which would result in vehicles being blocked in, the reality is that the future occupants will very likely do exactly as the current occupants do, and park on the road in order to afford them a larger front garden space. We feel this is inevitable given the considerable loss of back garden space to both properties. This will lead to congestion, obstacles for bin lorries and the partial blocking of dropped kerb driveways, which is already a problem in this area and will cause huge congestion all around the green, which is already very congested by on-road parking from neighbouring properties. Effect on trees and wildlife/nature conservation: We once again welcome the recommendation for refusal based on ecology after the statutory Ecologist consultation report dated 23/10/23. We also reiterate concerns that were verbally raised at the last Planning Committee Hearing in June 2023 by one of the Councillors who stated that there were a lot of promises made by the applicant in relation to the preservation of wildlife and nature conservation that could not be monitored nor enforced. Proposals and Policies in the Local Plan: It was noted within the applicant's design and access statement that the LPA pre-application meeting encouraged an extension to the terrace, this proposal is a clear overdevelopment 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. Previous planning decisions: This is now the third application for an additional dwelling on the site. The first two have rightly been refused. 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. 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). We would also like to refer to the very detailed objections raised by Mr Chris Broyd to the previous application (F/22/94422). We consider that these objections remain valid to this current application and would like reiterate them. In conclusion, for all of the reasons outlined above, we wish this application to be refused. Sandra and Andy McCoye
Sarah Keenan	59 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	Objection AGAIN This would result in overdevelopment of the area and encroach on No 65 . These are old council house buildings with the luxury of space, a 3 metre distance between the new build and 65 is not in keeping with the layout of the houses along the side of the green. By making room for two driveways we loose two public car parking spaces. The plan reports that the poultry shed and caravan will be moved, where too??? the garden of no 63?? I would like clarification on this, the noise, smells are a cause for concern and have currently been ignored by the owner and the council What happens if the client runs out of money to finish the build?, this is on a public transport route and will look unsightly Wildlife at Stoke Park Woods must be considered, we are lucky enough to be surrounded by bats, slow worms, dormice, owls etc we also get the occasional Heron.
Karen Brooks	67 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	We object to the latest application as follows: The proposed additional 5 bedroomed property would result in overdevelopment of the site, will lead to overcrowding and is out of keeping with the area. It also has an unacceptable proximity to 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. We don't believe that the proposed 3 car-parking spaces per plot will be utilised by future residents who will prefer instead to enjoy a front garden area and this will lead to congestion in an already congested area with parked cars on the street all around the Green. We support the views of the Ecologist, who has once again confirmed that the proposed new property will be too close to the boundary with Stoke Park Wood, contrary to Local Plan policy DM11.

		We would like this new application to be refused. Mr G and Mrs K Brooks
Edmunt Lata	61 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	I have known Richard and Natalie, for over 10 years I have no objection to their planning application. I know some of my neighbours have made comments regarding their animals. I live next door and I have no trouble with their animals. You barely hear them and I cannot detect any smells in my opinion, I think there's a vendetta with some of my neighbours against Richard and Natalie
Lucy Morgan	31 FONTWELL GARDENS HORTON HEATH EASTLEIGH SO50 7NL	I am writing to give my support for this application. I spent most of my childhood in Bishopstoke and subsequently have the majority of my family and friends living in the village. I am extremely keen to remain within Bishopstoke but have been forced to look elsewhere for accommodation due to the lack of suitable houses for young professionals and those looking to start families within the village. This house is just the type of property that is needed if people are to remain in the locality and support growing families within our community. Also, the design of the house is aesthetically appealing and will fit in well in the current street scene. It includes many desirable ecological benefits to the adjoining woodland with the removal of the existing caravan and hardstanding drastically increasing the green buffer between the trees and the building affording greater long term root protection. This protection is a great improvement over the current permitted development and very large outbuildings which other properties along Underwood Road have right next to the wood boundary. Furthermore, the carefully considered design will not be of detriment to the wildlife in the woodland as the level of light pollution will decrease due to the removal of existing lights and skylights. As somebody with a Master's degree in animal management I think this property, its location and design will have a positive impact on the local flora and fauna and strongly support this much needed application.
Connor Burnet	25 BEAUWORTH CLOSE EASTLEIGH SO50 5FU	I strongly support this application. As somebody who currently lives in a cramped flat in Eastleigh it is very hard to find properties to rent and buy in the area. My long term partner was born in Bishopstoke and would love to move back there with our family but we can't due to the lack of suitable housing. This design provides plenty of parking, lots of space and not too cramped next to the neighbours. The idea of being able to look onto the woods is great, and surely it will have less impact on the woods than the existing static on the site? I looked at the previous application and while I can't see why this was refused this application addresses the weak, unfounded concerns raised before. I really hope the council start allowing more single builds on existing ex council estates so they are more affordable for normal hard working people rather than these large overwhelming housing estates. Surely building on a bit of a garden which already has a static and large shed is much better than allowing building on pristine fields? Also, as somebody who walks in the woods regularly there is a very steep bank next to the site and then a wide path and ditch so how will this impact the proper woodland on the other side of the path. I also see loads of buildings some of which are huge with floodlights going into the woods right up against the fence so any wildlife nearby will be more put off by this than another house!
Jordan Webb	16 HUNTERS WAY	I support this new house application. We need to allow

	BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 8NN	people to have families, grow and expand without leaving Bishopstoke. It is not overwhelming and does not overlook anybody as the other comments claim. Loads of parking provided so this is good. Using a bit of a garden rather than building on a field so this is good. No sheds or caravans right next to the wood and a house no closer to the woods than the existing house so an improvement for the woods and wildlife. I understand we need to protect our green spaces and woodland but if anything this is an improvement and certainly not detrimental. One house might not make a huge impact to the housing availability but single infill builds like this really should be encouraged. There is one on East Drive which has been built and this is much less imposing than that one. So in summary a good, well proportioned house in a much needed area, an improvement to the woods and a house which fits into the council estate very well just like others around.
Danielle Battle	7 Grays Close, Colden Common, Winchester, SO21 1UG Winchester Hampshire SO21 1UG United Kingdom	This would be a lovely addition so that a local, growing family can remain in their home and make it their forever home.
Nicholas & Heather Marshall	55 UNDERWOOD ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6FX	We object to this extension mainly because of increased parking as it is congested already in the road and the occupants already have parking on property but still park in road so We can't see additional parking with dropped kerb would be used therefore adding to the problem . Extending the property would not be in character with existing properties in the road which could hinder future occupants being able to sell their properties.
Dan Wareham	78 STOKE PARK ROAD BISHOPSTOKE EASTLEIGH SO50 6BX	For a third instance, we once again strongly object the relentless proposed development at this property on the same grounds as the previous 2 instances. 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. On this basis, we fully oppose this application.