

Eastleigh Borough Council Eastleigh
House Upper Market Street,
Eastleigh
Hants
SO50 9YN

Planning application: H/24/97624

Dear Claire Campbell-Best

We note the response to our objections and concerns, and therefore respond as follows:

Objection 1:

Our understanding of local planning requirements is that the design of new building work, including extensions, should be compatible with the character of good quality adjacent properties and should fit well into the overall street-scene. The new cladding is fundamentally out-of-character to other properties in the close.

Before any planning decision is made, we would request that an on-site inspection/consultation is made.

Objection 2:

Whilst we have no objection to the requirement for additional accommodation our primary concern remains the design and character. Whilst we agree that there is sometimes the need to expand existing dwellings, we would point out that a very large portion of the property is occupied with a substantial indoor swimming pool/entertainment/gym area which could easily be converted into appropriate accommodation with very limited impact.

Objection 3:

We refer to the primary statement in objection 2 above.

Objection 4:

We would disagree since the local parish council have already highlighted this with the proposed overdevelopment of 1 Merdon Close.

Objection 5:

We understand the technicalities of a Juliet Balcony. However, this incorporates large opening windows which would directly overlook our front drive, garden and front door and thus we would lose a great deal of privacy. This is something we strongly object to.

We have not given permission to publish a photograph of our house on-line and require this to be removed.

Furthermore, this picture appears to be referencing ground floor garage windows (not living accommodation) that were part of the original build in the 1960s. These are frosted glass windows to further ensure privacy to our neighbours.

Objection 6:

06.01 The existing gate is a very recent addition by the previous owners. It is very low profile kept open most of the time and was only closed on occasions when their dog was in the garden to keep it safe from traffic. The gates would undoubtedly cause a restriction to vehicle movements at this end of the close which is regularly used as a turning point. In addition, vehicles waiting would prevent access to our own property.

Objection 9:

Our understanding is that these will be in 2 banks which would be even more unsightly than the existing ones and which we believe may not have any planning permission.

Objections raised by 4 and 7 Merdon Close which are also pertinent.

01.01

This statement is incorrect. The houses were built at the same time in a harmonious architectural style by the same builder who lived in number 1 for a period of time. Some subtle and deliberate differences were incorporated into the houses.

The references and photographs provided seem to be completely contradictory to the statement made. The extensions clearly maintain the original design of brick and tile, therefore maintaining the integrity of the original design. There are no Juliet balconies, and the windows closely mirror the existing ones.

We remain deeply concerned that this proposal sets a clear precedent for the close moving forward resulting in the architectural and environmental scenery being permanently lost.

In addition, we request that any building work is carried out in consideration of the neighbours' right to enjoyment of the close, and any vehicles are parked within the boundaries of number 5 avoiding any parking on the surrounding pavements. Consideration must be given to access for the neighbouring properties, refuse collection vehicles who already struggle to turn and emergency access.

David Lee/Diane Kneebone 6 Merdon Close.