

Planning Application F/24/97376

CHERRY COURT, SALTERNS LANE, BURSLEDON, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 8DH

Representative	Address	Comments
Jeffery Mannion	MERRY ROOST BRIDGE ROAD BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8AL	I wish to object to this planning application because this area of Bursledon is a conservation area and as such buildings of this size, and style are completely at odds to the meaning of conservation. Conservation should mean keeping structures and buildings within their original style. This proposal does not fit this description at all. With regard to the minimal impact from the so called sunken lane which is Muddy Lane, it would not be minimal, Muddy Lane offers a clear view even before getting to the railway bridge. Overall, the impact on local views will be far greater than stated. The view from the river and saltings will also be impacted in a detrimental way.
David Gorrod	LITTLE RIDGE HIGH STREET BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DJ	This proposal is for a massive increase in the size of this building. It is highly visible from the road and the public footpath along the east side of the river. The present building is in good condition and should not be demolished.
Richard Martin	SHOAL HAVEN SALTERNS LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DH	My key reasons for objection are as follows 1. The Design is Inappropriate and Highly Visible. For such a beautiful and visible location the design style proposed is grossly inappropriate. It does not in any way complement or match any other publicly visible property in the village and will be visually intrusive . The proposed building will be very visible from Salterns Lane and the eastern bank of the river. The submission suggests otherwise , incorporating much greenery in its artists impressions and includes photographs that suggest near invisibility. The developer has already removed many trees and shrubs to improve the view of the river from the house such that the house is now very visible from the eastern bank of the river. The top of this box will be very visible from Salterns Lane , especially when walking up from the creek. 2. It Sets a Significant Design Precedence . The only reason this major redevelopment proposal is for a "box " design is to maximise the internal living space for maximised commercial return for the developer. It is not because it actually fits or belongs in this landscape or that anybody actually wants this style of house in this beautiful location.As such this proposal is contrary to the spirit and intent of local conservation guidelines. It is also an inappropriate manipulation of the oft quoted allowable volume increase , which surely never envisaged unusable loft space being incorporated. - If this proposal goes through it will set a precedence whereby properties will be targeted by developers with an assumption that they can do away with a pitched roof and a flat box will be acceptable , thus adding approximately 30% to the floor area each time. We will then face a series of "box" developments to the gross detriment of the conservation area. 3. Justification for Demolition. There does not appear to be a clear justification for complete demolition of a habitable property. The threshold for this needs to be set in case other developers seek to exploit this. This property was inhabited up until the failure of the previous submission which also identified a need for new windows as an apparent justification for demolition. 4. Conditions. Should ,for some eccentric reason, this proposal be approved then serious consideration should be given to the following. A. Conditions placed to provide for particular care for and repair of the

		lanes. This major project would involve the movement of high volumes of heavy plant over a considerable period to demolish and remove , excavate and remove and bring in the concrete and glass required. B. There should be conditions set which ensure that the elevation of the building is kept strictly in accordance with any approvals . The proposal involves significant expensive excavation work.
Mr Graham Fisher	ARNE KEW LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DG	I wish to object to this planning application as a development of this size and style is not at all suitable in a conservation area. It will tower above neighbouring property's Taking away thier privacy and have a huge visual impact. There is no need to demolish the existing property.
Tim Stokes	CLOUDS HILL SALTERNS LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DH	The size of the building in the new planning application is considerably bigger than before and is very much unwanted. It is suspected that this is part of a development plan in this conservation area and should be stopped. If allowed to happen it will seriously upset all the surrounding group of neighbours of which I am one. I must ask for this application to be refused.
Peter Falconer	WESTWARD SALTERNS LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DH	I wish to object to this application. I believe that it does not support Policy BU7 in the Eastleigh Local Plan which stipulates that the volume of the house should not be more than 25% of the original when the Conservation Area was defined and not be disproportionately larger than that being extended or replaced. Also it should not contribute to the cumulative urbanisation of the area. The design would not be in keeping with our Conservation Area, particularly overlooking a SSSI. A dwelling over three levels is vastly too high, especially as it would be extremely visible from the River Hamble. Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 paragraph 6.2.38 states that the Old Bursledon Conservation Area lies in the countryside and is particularly vulnerable to the visual impacts of large-scale extensions and replacement dwellings. Paragraph 6.2.36 highlights that there have been a number of instances in recent years where extensions and replacements have been built that increase the floor area of the original dwelling very substantially. While the normal policies controlling development in the countryside and in conservation areas would obviously be used to assess any such proposals, there are fears amongst the local community that these are insufficient, and that further development will seriously erode the valued character of the area. The Borough Council therefore proposes the introduction of a stricter policy to control the size of extensions. This application is yet another example of the potential erosion of the controls intended to protect the Conservation area and should be denied.
Chris Orton	SALTERNS LODGE SALTERNS LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DH	I'm writing to object to the planned demolition and development of Cherry Court. The design would not be in keeping with our Conservation Area and the adopted local plan 2016-2036 policy BU7, particularly two of the clauses i.e. subservient to and in proportion to the existing building in form, scale and design; and, are not otherwise detrimental to the character of the area as viewed from the River Hamble. The current building could easily be developed and improved without unnecessary demolition and excavation with the consequential creation of huge amounts of waste. The seven bedroom detached dwelling over three levels" does not have a similar scale or form in proportion to the existing building, and it would be extremely visible from the River Hamble, particularly since they have cleared a huge number of trees from the garden.
Diane Andrewes	ORCHARD HILL SALTERNS LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DH	I wish to OBJECT to the proposed replacement dwelling at Cherry Court. The proposed layout and overall design of the replacement dwelling does not accord with the EBC local plan adopted 25 April 2022 Policy BU7 or the Old Bursledon Supplementary Planning Document requirements as follows:-

		BU7 a - the dwelling appears to exceed the maximum volume of 25 % (as pointed out in OBAG's submission). BU7b - the proposed dwelling is wider than existing and impacts on space between buildings. The document suggests that the excavations and retaining walls will not impact on trees along the boundary, but I am very concerned about impacts on Trees T3C and T4C with such intrusion into root protection areas along the boundary, also potential loss of tree canopies. BU7c - I feel the new dwelling is disproportionately larger in mass with the 3 floors height at rear and mass of glazing compared to existing property or others in OBCA. BU7d - The new dwelling is not subservient or proportionate to the existing building in form and scale. BU7e - The proposed dwelling by way of massing/ appearance represents an increased urbanisation in character of the area. BU7f - In particular the proposed building with flat roof and three floors with large areas of glazing at the rear is definitely detrimental to the overall character of the area and in particular when viewed from River Hamble. Some other dwellings and extensions permitted in Fareham borough on the other side of river between Swanwick and Warsash are more in keeping with smaller windows and pitched roof designs, are more appropriate to OBCA and would be less visually intrusive when viewed from river Hamble . As regards the OBCA SPD, the following paragraph requirements would be compromised:- 4.31- the character between buildings would be diminished and not conserved or enhanced . 4.35 - the mass of the building at the rear when viewed appears disproportionately larger and so should not be permitted 4.41- The development proposals are detrimental in adding to the urbanisation of the area; detrimental to the character of area as viewed from River Hamble so should not be permitted. 4.155 - the proposed large replacement dwelling would be visually intrusive from front and back compared to the current 2 storey with pitched roof dwelling and therefore have a negative urbanising affect. 4.163 - The proposed dwelling's overall volume and appearance with changed levels creates a dwelling disproportionately larger than the one being replaced. CONCLUSION While accepting the present building is ageing and not up to modern standards in terms of energy and insulation, it is far less imposing in scale to that proposed. It is also, of course, relatively straightforward to 'retrofit' a poorly insulated building in order to achieve a significant improvement in its energy performance. The proposed dwelling is not considered to be in character with its setting in OBCA and definitely would not enhance the area therefore is contrary to planning policies. As one of the residents most likely to be affected by this proposal, I am concerned about the potential overlooking into my garden from the proposed dwelling. It is very disappointing that the applicant did not consult me at an early stage of this process. I am also concerned that, unlike the original application, the revised application does not show clear comparisons between the footprints, heights and widths of the existing and proposed dwellings, which would facilitate a proper assessment of the proposal's scale and impact.
David Dunn	WOODBINE COTTAGE HIGH STREET BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DL	See documents tab.
Patrick Lyons	Richard Buxton Solicitors	See documents tab.

Mary Woodhouse	KEW HOUSE KEW LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DG	I am writing to object to the planning Application F/24/977376 to demolish and rebuild Cherry Court by over 50%. Adopted Eastleigh Local Plan - 2016 to 2036 Policy BU7. The adopted Eastleigh Local Plan - 2016 to 2036 Policy BU7 must be taken into consideration, when considering the above planning application, especially with regard to (a) do not increase the volume of the original dwelling (as existing when the conservation area was first designated in 1982) by no more than 25%, b. Have regard to the impact of the development on the space between buildings and the openness of the area, ensuring that the character of the undeveloped landscape between buildings is conserved and enhanced, c. Do not create a dwelling disproportionately larger than the one that is being extended or replaced, d. Are subservient to and in proportion to the existing building in form, scale and design, e. Do not contribute to the cumulative urbanisation of the area, and f. Are not otherwise detrimental to the character of the area as viewed from the River Hamble. To enlarge the present Cherry Court house, by over 50%, does not take into account the above Policy BU7. The Adopted Eastleigh Local Plan - 2016 to 2036 Policy BU7 must be taken seriously within the Old Bursledon Conservation Area and upheld.
Charlotte Scorer	DRIFTWOOD COTTAGE SALTERNS LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DH	Apologies for missing the deadline for commenting but I hope my comments of SUPPORT for this application will still be read. As stated in my correspondence of support for the previous proposal I am one of the nearest neighbours and our house overlooks Cherry Court. The current Cherry Court is not in good condition. I know this from visiting the previous owners and seeing supports in place around the back of the property. As Cherry Court stands right now, it is not in my opinion a vision of architectural beauty. Salterns Lane does not have a uniform style of house. The proposed dwelling will be seen as a two storey house from Salterns Lane. This is exactly what is seen now and as such will have little to no detrimental impact on the Streetscene. Similarly, there is no typical house to view from the river and as such it is difficult to see why this proposed dwelling will have anymore impact than the current dwelling. One house is being replaced by one house. I struggle to see why this leads to increased urbanisation. My comments on conservation from my previous letter of support still stand.
Diane Andrewes	ORCHARD HILL SALTERNS LANE BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8DH	I am grateful that the applicant has now provided Comparison Site Sections for the proposal at Cherry Court. In the light of these additional documents, and in particular the NW-SE Site Section, I would like to submit the following observations: The building profile outline of the proposed replacement dwelling, shown in the NW-SE Site Section, shows a considerable increase in the massing of the building, when compared with the existing house. This confirms my previous objection that the proposal is not consistent with either policy BU7c – ie that the replacement dwelling should 'not create a dwelling disproportionately larger than the one that is being extended or replaced'; or policy BU7d – ie that it should be 'subservient to and in proportion to the existing building in form, scale and design'. As an adjacent neighbour of Cherry Court, I am also concerned that the proposal will cause a significant increase in overlooking into my property. The existing house is aligned with my own (Orchard Hill), with a boundary line of trees that screens both houses from each other. The proposal, however, would project the building a considerable distance into Cherry Court's back garden, with balconies at both first and second floor levels. In effect, new viewing platforms would be created at a considerable height that would cause increased overlooking into my garden as well as overlooking into some rooms of my house. Thus I would suffer from a

		significant loss of privacy. I would be very grateful if you could take these comments into account in the course of determining this planning application. You would of course be most welcome to visit Orchard Hill in order to see these issues at first hand.
Jeffery Mannion	MERRY ROOST BRIDGE ROAD BURSLEDON SOUTHAMPTON SO31 8AL	The existing property should stay and be refurbished with replacement windows, improved insulation and the roof repaired.
Jenny Leeves	FLAT THE OLD POST OFFICE HIGH STREET HAMBLE-LE-RICE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4HA	I wish to object to this proposed demolition and construction. The existing dwelling could be improved without the unnecessary demolition and excavation with all the consequential waste, The proposed new building is out of keeping with the Conservation Area and is very large and will dominate all the neighbouring buildings. This is against BU7 of the local plan which states that all replacement buildings should be no more than 25% greater than the previous dwelling and the proposed replacement is almost 50% larger.