

OBJECTION TO H/25/98931 & H/25/98934

Submitted by owner/occupier of 107 Satchell Lane

26th March 2025

1. I am the owner and occupier of 107 Satchell Lane, located to the south of the application site at 109 Satchell Lane. I was not on the list of consultees for H/25/98934 until requested. My assessment and representations on the two schemes currently before the local planning authority, references 25/98931 and 25/98934, follow.
2. Contrary to the note on the current applications proposed elevation plans, planning permission H/21/92099 is no longer extant. It expired on 31/01/2025 and therefore carries no weight as a fall-back position. It should be noted that this expired consent, which was not implemented due to the limited internal floor to ceiling heights, also it did not propose a change to the overall height of the existing building which is consistently shown in all applications as 7.6m.
3. There were a number of inaccuracies in the case officer assessment of the 21/92009 application, these were provided in an objection submitted in response to the refused application 24/97402.
4. There is no topographic survey to accurately deal with the change in land levels across the site for either current application. This leads to uncertainty as to the baseline of the heights shown and how the scheme will be delivered.
5. Notwithstanding the local validation list of requirements for sloping sites it is noted there are no cross section plans for either application to show how the finished floor levels of the proposed schemes will work.
6. Notwithstanding the local validation list of requirements for sloping sites it is noted that the block plan is not compliant for either application in that it does not show the site proximity to The Close which the property overlooks. 109 Satchell Lane is 3m above the properties in The Close.
7. The following table provides a comparison of measurements between the existing house, the expired consent, the scheme that was refused last year, and the two current applications. These accurate measurements were taken using the adobe measuring tool based on the scales provided on the published plans.

Measurements	Existing	21/92009 (not extant)	24/97402 (refused)	25/98931	25/98934
Ground to max roof height At south elevation side view proposed	7.6m	7.6m	9m	7.87m	7.84m
Ground to max roof height on the front and	7.6m	7.6m	9.16m	8.15m	8.1m

rear elevations proposed					
Distance between boundary and highest part of the roof south elevation	3.62m (hipped roof)	1m (gable end)	1m (gable end)	1m (gable end)	1m (gable end)

8. The ridge height overlay (blue dashed line) on the proposed elevation plan for 25/98931 purporting to show the inaccurately described extant '2021' consent is inaccurate. The plan shows no change in ridge height from 2021, where clearly there is a proposed increase of 0.24m or 0.55m depending on whether the ground to ridge height measurement is taken from the proposed side elevations or the front and back elevations.
9. The ridge height overlay (blue dashed line) on the proposed elevation plan for 25/98934 purporting to show the inaccurately described 'extant' 2021 consent is inaccurate. The plan purports to demonstrate no change in ridge height from the 2021 scheme, where clearly there is a proposed increase of 0.24m, or 0.5m, depending on whether the measurement is taken from the side elevations or the front and back elevations.
10. Even allowing for some small tolerances in the use of measuring tools etc, the discrepancies are such that the plans are internally contradictory and cannot be relied upon to provide accurate details of what is proposed. The marked up plans are appended to this objection.
11. It seems the 2021 now expired permission, which did not alter the existing ridge height of the building but could not in any event be implemented due to the limitations of the internal floor to ceiling heights, is being cynically misrepresented to suggest that there is no proposed change in maximum ridge heights in either of the schemes currently before the Council. In fact the proposed plans (front and rear elevations) show a proposed increase of 0.5m or 0.55m in height. There is a clear intention to raise the roof height to provide the additional third floor accommodation.
12. This increase in height coupled with the replacement of the hipped roof with a gable end thereby increasing the overall scale, bulk and mass of the application property, will be at a distance of just 1m from the boundary with my home at 107 Satchell Lane and it will have an overbearing impact when viewed from my property.
13. In addition the increase height of the development and the replacement of the hipped roof with the gable end will increase the overshadowing and loss of daylight to a ground floor bedroom, a habitable room, which is served by a side facing window only. The developments as proposed will be oppressive when viewed from my property.
14. The increased height of the rear facing dormer and the full size windows, which will serve a home office and additional bedroom, will increase overlooking from this significantly elevated position to my private amenity space to an unacceptable degree.

15. Attention is also drawn to the Supplementary Planning Document Quality Places (SPD QP). In the site context section at page 12 it is advised that the massing of building relates to its scale, size and height, and that impacts on neighbours will often be exacerbated by issues of overlooking and shadowing.
16. The Guidance further states that the size of new building needs to respect the setting in which they are built and if the area is covered by a character appraisal (as in this case) it will include key elements such as predominant storey heights. This is defined in the SPD CAA as 1, 1.5 and 2 storeys. At three storeys the proposed schemes on this prominent elevated site are contrary to the character assessment for the local area and would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area and street scene.
17. In conclusion, the proposed schemes are (a) out of character with the local area and (b) would result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity. Both schemes are therefore contrary to the SPD guidance policy DM1 and the provisions of the NPPF and it is requested that both applications are refused.
18. Finally the previous decision included an ecology reason for refusal.
Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development will not cause adverse harm to the biodiversity interests of the site and species, including bats and reptiles which are protected by virtue of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981). The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the content of the National Planning Policy Framework.
19. There appears to be no preliminary bat roost assessment or other ecological information submitted. This is a significant lack of information, which due to uncertainty about likely impacts on a protected species could not be secured through a planning condition and is a further reason for refusal.
20. The case officer is invited to visit my property to enable a full and proper assessment of the applications.

Attachments:

1. Marked up plans – Appendix 1:
 - a) Existing elevations
 - b) Proposed elevations 25/98931
 - c) Proposed elevations 25/98934
2. Policy Extracts – Appendix 2
3. Appendix 3 - Photographs taken from 107 Satchell Lane and the street scene as existing.