

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/W1715/W/24/3353355

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/W1715/W/24/3353355

Appeal By MR PATRICK REILLY

Site Address
Cherry Court Salterns Lane
Bursledon
SOUTHAMPTON
SO31 8DH

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR RICHARD MARTIN

Address
Shoal Haven Salterns Lane
Bursledon
SOUTHAMPTON
SO31 8DH

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I attended the planning meeting on 5th September and have the following comments.

1.The case officer in his presentation and the applicants in theirs maintain that this property is hidden or difficult to see. This is complete nonsense. I am a regular user of the River Hamble footpath and can assure all interested parties that this property is highly visible to the many hundreds of people that use that beautiful footpath every day.The developers have cleared a considerable amount of vegetation (refer to previous planning applications for an indication of the extent) to ensure that the property will have uninterrupted views of the river and thus improve its value. So of course it is clearly visible. The declarations that it is otherwise are simply not credible and must call into question whether any appreciation of context , location, or landscaping was ever properly addressed in making the recommendation.If there is any doubt on this then people must go for a walk on that path.

There is also the question of the view from Salterns Lane.Again it is implied that this building would be hidden behind a very high laural hedge. My understanding is that there is no obligation on the owner to maintain the height of the hedge , neither do they even need to keep it. So we are faced with a prospect of a contemporary box structure on the apex of a medieval sunken lane.

This structure has to be considered as being highly visible from both the river path and from the lane.It does not belong in either landscape.

2.I am in complete agreement with the planning committee who unanimously denied this application. From so many perspectives it simply does not belong in this location.The developers have purchased a property in a conservation area , along a sunken lane , on the banks of a beautiful river with lots of trees and buildings with pitched roofs. How can a contemporary building of such scale and angular structure be thought of as blending in or complementing the conservation area. The building may well have all the architects and consultants involved excited and tick many technical boxes but it does not belong in a highly visible location in the Bursledon conservation area. This building will be a jarring addition . The developers could quite easily come up with a far more sympathetic design of an appropriate scale.

3.The question of demolition is very important to many neighbours. A key concern being that if the threshold for demolition is too low then the size and nature of the plots in the Bursledon conservation area make them prime targets for development companies such as P Reilly.In this case after two extensive submissions there has been no clear justification for demolition and no attempt at remodelling (other houses in the conservation area have been remodelled even with similar issues to those identified by this developer). If this development is allowed to go ahead then it will set a dangerous precedence for the conservation area, encouraging others to buy and speculate that they too can demolish. Todate it has been understood that a building must be uninhabitable before it can be demolished.

4. The only reason this development is for a contemporary box design is because the planning rules allow the volumes of the existing building to be 'gamed' to dramatically increase the living space and hence the value of the property.In this case the volumes of the pitched roof (which all the other visible buildings in the conservation area have) , a double garage and even the shadow cast by the open front porch have been sucked into the calculation , then 20% is added and the number reversed into the biggest box possible (with no double garage). This gives the developers at least a 60% increase in living space to sell.If they went for a pitched roof (to help blend in with and complement the conservation area) and included a garage they couldn't achieve the dramatic increase in living space and thus value.The developer has stated that he could go to 25% by which they suggest restraint ! But there is no garage for the executive cars of which they plan parking for 6 !
Allowing this contemporary box design to be built in such a prominent position will set a difficult and negative precedent for the conservation area .

Summary :This building does not belong in this location for so many reasons and the local planning committee members quite rightly denied the application not on one or two technical points but because

its just wrong in this conservation area.