

Planning Inspectorate
3D Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Wessex Planning Ltd
Meadowsweet Cottage
Morleys Lane
Ampfield
Romsey
SO51 9BJ
louisecutts@wessexplanning.com
Tel: 07940 033645

13 January 2024

Dear Sir/Madam

Appeal Reference APP/W1715/W/23/3329598

Construction of a first floor extension and 4-bedroom, two storey end-of-terrace dwelling with associated parking provision.

63 Underwood Road, Bishopstoke, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 6FX.

In response to the Local Planning Authority's appeal statement, I would request that the following comments are taken into account.

At Paragraph 7.3 and 7.4, the LPA state that it is the close proximity of the dwelling to its rear boundary that is of concern as the land to the east is a designated Site of Interest for Nature Conservation due to its Ancient Woodland status. They state that general domestic activities would be 'forced up' against the woodland edge, resulting in additional disturbance, and the likelihood of such disturbance is lessened with a larger garden. In response, it is evident that such general domestic activities already take place immediately adjacent to the rear boundary, with the keeping of poultry and placement of a large poultry shed and mobile home in this area. Additionally, such activity is also evident in the gardens of neighbouring properties with brick built sheds built immediately adjacent to this boundary, patio areas, and other hard surfaces. As such, the new dwelling would not bring any additional general domestic activity to this area, that is not already taking place. Indeed, the impact upon the SINC on this plot is negligible compared with neighbouring plots as the only trees adjacent to the rear boundary are coppiced hazel stools managed by the Forestry Commission, rather than any larger variety of tree. Hazels are commonly known to suffer least from any root disturbance and have historically been valued for this characteristic.

At Paragraph 7.5, the LPA state that the impact from light from the rear windows upon the woodland canopy will be far greater because of the closer proximity of the dwelling to the rear boundary. Even without the (very likely) use of curtains and blinds, the light emanating from these

windows will be no worse than the light emanating from the rooflights of the existing single storey extension, which are less likely to have blinds attached. Additionally, there are existing security lights on many of the rear elevations of the dwellings facing the SINC in this area. With a condition to ensure that no such external lighting is utilised for the new dwelling, the impact would be reduced rather than increased.

The concerns with regard to shading impacts considered in Paragraph 7.6 of the LPA's statement have been addressed in the appellant's statement. The LPA have produced no evidence to substantiate their assertions in terms of overshadowing or shading of the woodland edge. With a mobile home and large poultry shed already in this location, plus the 1.8m high rear boundary fence atop the steep slope down into the woodland, there would not be any additional shading impact that would be materially detrimental to the woodland in this regard.

Likewise, the LPA have produced no evidence to suggest that the area between No 63 and 65 is an important flightpath for bats, as is asserted in Paragraph 7.7. In comparison with the large area of woodland available to bats to the east, it is extremely unlikely that bats would consider this comparable slither of space as an important flightpath. In any case, it is difficult to understand any need for bats to cross over from a dark wooded area to a well-lit established residential area. The woodland edge would remain intact as a result of the appeal proposal, as the location of the dwelling retains the rear building line of the existing dwellings in the area, and does not physically interrupt the woodland edge feature.

The ecological report, submitted with the conjoined appeal (as the LPA had agreed to, but did not, wait for its submission), together with the arboricultural report submitted with the appeal proposal, clearly demonstrate that, in line with NPPF requirement (at paragraph 186), there would be no loss or deterioration of ancient woodland in this location as a result of the appeal proposal. The LPA have submitted no evidence to suggest otherwise.

In paragraph 7.11, it is noted that the LPA accept that the garden space exceeds the 60% minimum area requirement as set out in the Quality Places SPD, by a significant margin. The LPA suggest that this percentage should increase where excessive shading occurs. However, there is no excessive shading of the rear garden on this site. As above, the nearest trees are coppiced hazels, which are lower than the rear boundary fence.

Paragraph 7.12 and 7.13 relates to 'typical' garden sizes on the wider estate suggesting that the appeal proposal's garden is not comparable with any of the identified gardens in terms of size or proportion. From a cursory bird's eye view of Google mapping, this is simply not the case. Whilst there may be 'typical' sized gardens, there are very many others that do not conform to this typicality and are more constrained in terms of access to private amenity space, than the appeal proposal. For the appeal proposal, what the rear amenity space lacks in depth, is made up for in width. The variety of spaces within the wider garden area is also of benefit to the future occupiers. In addition, corner plots typically tend to make more use of their frontage amenity spaces, which can be made private due to their orientation in relation to other dwellings, much as the existing dwelling has done. At 88 square metres, amenity space is more than sufficient, and significantly more than some others in the vicinity. Therefore the garden is not out of keeping with the existing pattern of development in the locality and provides an appropriate level and variety of spaces for private amenity purposes.

Paragraph 8.2 refers to the mitigation of water quality impacts from the new dwelling. A Unilateral Undertaking is being prepared and will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate shortly. This will secure the necessary mitigation.

The final paragraph of the LPA statement makes reference to a list of conditions to be imposed should the Inspector allow the appeal. In response, the appellant is willing to agree to these conditions, along with any others the Inspector considers necessary.

Yours faithfully



Louise Cutts BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Director
Wessex Planning Ltd

