

Planning Application

BRIGHSTONE, BOTLEY ROAD, HORTON HEATH, EASTLEIGH, SO50 7DT

Representee	Address	Comments
David Lange	17 MEADOW GROVE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 3AT	Over development Poor design Unsustainable
Jonathan Kirk	CERISE 14 CHERRY DROVE HORTON HEATH EASTLEIGH SO50 7DS	Planning Application F/23/95549 Objection I live in the property adjoining the proposed development. Address: Cerise, 14 Cherry Drove, Horton Heath, SO507DS. OBJECTION 1. Loss of privacy / overlooked – Plot 3 Objections to four Velux-type windows in first-floor front bedrooms that will overlook my home. My home has a first-floor bedroom full-length window (floor to ceiling) within close proximity to the Plot 3 dwelling. Plot 3, x4 Velux-type windows will overlook my bedroom window creating a loss of privacy. Note: Even if these windows were opaque glass when opened, they will overlook my bedroom and privacy totally lost. Note: Both Plot 3 front bedrooms have wall casement windows within the planning application providing ample light. Therefore, no need for four additional Velux-type windows. OBJECTION 2. Visually Intrusive height of Plot 3 dwelling. Significantly higher than my home/local area. In Conflict with a very close development application on Botley Road, Horton Heath No: F/19/85624 given planning consent in 2019. Plot 3 design height is visually intrusive and out on the local character of two adjacent properties. The two adjacent/closest properties to Plot 3 on Cherry Drove (Cerise & Hideaway) are both chalet bungalows. The height of Plot 3 is significantly higher than my home (Cerise) and, therefore, visually intrusive, inappropriate, and out of character with adjacent property. In the case application No: F/19/85624, the adjacent, existing properties were chalet bungalows/bungalows. Planning application/consent to develop the site included building height considerations resulting in a lower/in-keeping development planning consent. OBJECTION 3. Car exhaust air pollution as a result of seven car parking spaces located close to my home. Seven car parking spaces within the planning application are located very close to my home, windows and garden. Car parking can be dispersed to numerous other locations within the planning application. No need for concentration of parking in one area, creating a 'carpark' The concentration of seven car parking spaces and associated toxic emissions close to my home is a significant toxic air pollution health risk. OBJECTION 4. No planning requirement for electric car charging points. Charging points should be included OBJECTION 5. Incorrect plan location of boundary hedge between the development and my home Cerise, 14 Chery Drove. The planning application shows the boundary hedge growing fully on the development side of the land boundary - incorrect. The said land boundary lies within the centre/width of the hedge.

		Shared ownership of said hedge exists - to date, the hedge has been managed by both current parties with a mutual agreement to height and cutting. OBJECTION 6. Lack of boundary hedge protection between the development and my home Cerise, 14 Chery Drove. Boundary hedge of holly and hawthorn requires protection within the planning application. Loss of the hedge/changes to the hedge will result in:- a) Potential: Loss of Privacy - to ground floor dining room & lounge windows and garden. b) Potential: Loss of protection from toxic car emissions. Cars within the development application, including six parking spaces are very close to my home and garden. c) Potential: Loss of sound barrier between my home and new development. d) Potential: Threat to the environment and wildlife habitat. For example, current wildlife includes; nesting blackbirds, robins, wren, sparrows & song thrush. Holly berries and haws provide food for birds. Also, provides a hibernation habitat for numerous hedgehogs. e) Potential: Loss of CO2 absorption/photosynthesis. Threat to air quality/atmosphere f) Potential: Negative effect on land drainage and soil stability.
Peter Denney	MEADOW VIEW BOTLEY ROAD HORTON HEATH EASTLEIGH SO50 7DT	Planning application number: F/23/95549 Site: Brighstone, Botley Road, Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 7DT. I live with my family in the property adjoining the proposed development at Meadow View, Botley Road, Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire, SO50 7DT, and have objections to the proposed development as follows: Objection 1. The existing property, which is being demolished to allow for the development of 5 new properties within the same boundary of the existing property, is one single storey bungalow. It seems impossible and impractical to attempt to squeeze 5 substantial two storey properties into the space occupied previously by one single storey bungalow. This clearly amounts to overdevelopment. Objection 2. Loss of privacy/overlooked plot. There are currently no windows at the back of the existing property which, partly because of the existing height of the bungalow, are able to see into our garden. The proposed development has two storeys and the rear windows will clearly be able to oversee directly into the whole of our rear garden. We will lose the benefit of complete privacy that we enjoy at the moment. Objection 3. The height of the proposed plot 1 and 2 are not in keeping with the existing property and will be visually intrusive. Objection 4. The properties will be of a more modern design than the existing property and will also be out of character with most other properties in the local vicinity. Objection 5. Increased air pollution. There are proposed marked parking spaces for eleven cars in the new development which are all located fairly close to our home in the space where there is normally one car. There are also likely to be additional family and visitor vehicles parking on the unmarked spaces. In particular, the parking bay for plot 1 will be extremely close to my property, and will cause particular noise and air pollution. The impact will be even more so if the car in the front parking bay parks in reverse, so that the exhaust fumes will add significantly to the local air pollution and pose even more of a health risk. Objection 6. Additional noise pollution arising from the significant lorry and van movements across a fairly narrow entrance to the existing land next to our property, which will be

		required over an estimated year or so which could be necessary to build out the development, . Objection 7. There is an existing hedge and tree boundary between my property and the existing bungalow, which provides a natural sound protection barrier along the vast majority of the boundary. Based on the property development plans provided by the developer to us, there does not appear to be any provision for trees along the boundary to continue to provide this sound barrier. Objection 8. The size of the proposed tree at the front south corner of plot 1 is likely to cause root damage to our property in due course. A previous tree in a similar position was required to be demolished a number of years ago due to significant encroachment into our plot, which affected our foundations.
Andrea Sankey	NEEROME BOTLEY ROAD HORTON HEATH EASTLEIGH SO50 7DT	It looks like an independent entrance to the new development but I have not been approached by the developer regarding what will happen to the existing section of shared drive that falls outside the proposed development. Our deeds would need amending with any new proposal. There seems to be a lack of detail on landscaping, road finishes, boundary finishes along side and at the front of the property adjacent to Neerome, would this affect the sight-lines for accessing/exiting Neerome. This development appears to overlook our garden and will therefore be a loss of privacy. We would prefer to have a hard surface on the roadway running to the properties (not loose gravel) as this would reduce noise and dust affecting our property. Also a wall to reduce noise and general upkeep. There is a lack of individual house plot plans showing position of the bins, bike sheds and landscaping. The transport report seems misleading in that currently only one car is using Brightstone, where if developed its more likely to be 2-5 cars per property or even more. These vehicles could be accessing a couple of times a day. This doesn't take into consideration deliveries or visitors. If property owners run any kind of business from home this will likely increase. If and when Brightstone is demolished and the work begins its not clear if the new entrance will be established or my shared drive will be used for access. I have concerns regarding the noise, dust and use of heavy vehicles running along side the entire length of my garden and accessing/exiting the shared drive which to my knowledge is exceeding our current day to day. The third house along Cherry Drove doesn't appear on the drawings.
Frances Everett	Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP 1 Whitehall Riverside Leeds LS1 4BN	See documents tab.
Gary Cooper	HIDEAWAY 12 CHERRY DROVE HORTON HEATH EASTLEIGH SO50 7DS	I am writing to formally express my vehement objection to the planning application F/23/95549 for the construction of houses adjacent to our property, Hideaway. My family and I are deeply concerned about the potential negative consequences this development will have on our property, quality of life, and our previously approved planning application. Our primary reasons for opposing this application are as follows: 1. Impact on View and Privacy: Our property enjoys a unique and cherished view of open fields, which played a significant role in our decision to invest in this location. The proposed construction would not only obstruct this cherished view but also impede our privacy. The proximity of the new houses poses an unwelcome intrusion on our personal space and tranquillity. 2. Approved Planning Application F/15/76067: We have

		diligently followed all necessary procedures to obtain approval for a balcony overlooking the open fields. This approved plan was a carefully considered enhancement that would allow us to enjoy our surroundings without detriment to others. If the proposed houses are constructed, we would be denied the opportunity to implement the approved plan, unjustly curbing our property rights. 3. Noise and Quality of Life: Our semi-rural location is prized for its peaceful environment and low noise levels. The introduction of a new housing development would inevitably bring about increased noise pollution and congestion, thereby eroding the very essence of our chosen way of life. The quietude we value so much would be jeopardized. 4. Property Value: The potential diminishment of our view, privacy, and overall quality of life due to the proximity of the new houses could have a detrimental impact on the value of our property. The existing studies show that the presence of adjacent properties can lead to a decrease in property values, undermining our investment. In light of the aforementioned concerns, I implore you to carefully consider the significant negative impacts this proposed development would inflict on our property and way of life. I kindly request that you prioritize the rights and interests of the current residents who have already made substantial commitments to the community. Additionally, I ask that you take into account the previously approved planning application for our balcony, F/15/76067, which was designed to enhance our property without infringing on others' rights. This approved plan represents a reasonable compromise that we are now at risk of losing due to the proposed development. I trust that you understand the gravity of the situation and will conduct a thorough evaluation of the potential consequences. Your careful consideration and fair decision-making process will play a pivotal role in determining the future quality of life for our family.
David Lange	17 MEADOW GROVE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 3AT	Same objection criteria as first application. Site has 5 houses, ones at entrance to highway compacted and likely to lead to congested parking A minimum of 17 vehicles would be entering/exiting this site. No allowance/provision for visitor parking or contractor parking. Refuse collection could become an issue. EBC could refuse to enter site with HGV's due to health & safety. This could result in wheelie bins being cluttered, left obstruction public footpath. Destruction of mature trees on site contrary to EBC environmental policies. Planting of proposed trees carries no statutory obligation to comply or protection. Over development Poor design Unsustainable
Alan & Mary Lamb	ST MARYS COTTAGE 8 CHERRY DROVE HORTON HEATH EASTLEIGH SO50 7DS	Over development. The size and shape of the site is not compatible with the submitted layout and design . By maximizing the built volume, the current proposal would result in significant loss of amenity for adjacent properties, net loss of biodiversity and an adverse impact on the natural environment. There are large mature oak trees located on the western boundary with significant canopy spread over the proposed plot 5. These are the subject of Tree protection orders and the root protection areas currently indicated are based on assumptions and may prove inadequate for the long term development of these significant trees. Furthermore, this development is unlikely to support full time management and supervision, with this being delegated to self employed subcontractors with little interest in maintaining tree protection. Plot 5 construction, access and scaffolding would pose significant risk to to root stuctures of

		these trees. Hedgerows surrounding the site would also be at risk. Trees in the north west corner of the site provide important screening and need not be scheduled for removal. Surface water drainage is shown, together with a soakaway, in the protected area. Any development proposal should allow for future movement and growth of the root system and canopies. The ground conditions are likely to consist of highly shrinkable clay. A soil assessment is needed to inform decisions on the Root protection and foundation design. We believe this development proposal requires significant amendment and further investigation to reduce the scale and to reduce the risks to the existing environment and amenity.
Andrea Sankey	NEEROME BOTLEY ROAD HORTON HEATH EASTLEIGH SO50 7DT	In regards to my previous comments. I feel strongly that a wall is needed to run the length of my garden, to combat the noise and pollution from all vehicles venturing up and down the road on the other side, this is currently a grassed garden area. I purchased my property in December 2022 having only 2 neighbours and sharing a drive with only one other vehicle. There was no road running the entire length of my garden, I feel that this devalues my property and would have seriously consider my purchase, This road will service 5 properties this could be a total of 20 cars or more at least twice a day and that doesn't include visitors and deliveries. The noise and pollutions will be affecting the whole length of my garden, this will have a detrimental effect on my family and our quality of outside space. A wall is proved to be the better noise and pollution barrier, a fence will require upkeep and is prone to high winds and excessive rain and less durable than brick. Four parking bays for plot 2 and 3 will be add to the flow of vehicles moving forward or reversing along side my garden, this will be added noise and pollution and can only support the need of a wall. I also have concerns of road surface water and if adequate drainage will be sufficient as the large garden area acts as natural drainage at present. I still have concerns regarding bins at the exit, some weeks could be 10 and how this will impact on the footpath, over spilling onto my entrance. Brighstone consists of a one storey property, the 5 proposed dwelling should be in keeping with the height of the current property.