

44 Hartley Road,
Bishopstoke,
Eastleigh,
Hants.
SO50 8JB

08/05/2025

Planning application no: H/25/99157

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please see below our comments and objections to the Planning Application for 42 Hartley Road, Bishopstoke.

We have no objections to the actual extension of number 42, our concerns are with the rear garden changes that they want to do, as the two properties (ours and theirs) are at different levels on a hill, the height difference is approximately 900mm. Since we moved into the property, alongside the boundary fence has always been a dug out path with varying widths, at some places just over a metre at others 3 to 4 metres wide. This dug out path has meant the garden immediately their side of the fence has been the same level as our property giving us ultimate privacy. Their higher level lawn has been retained by a substantial dry wall, allowing natural drainage during winter months into the ground on the side of no 42.

The plan drawings incorrectly show an 'Existing' sleeper retaining wall along the boundary length of the garden. There is no existing sleeper wall here except for a very short distance by the side of our house, less than 3 metres, which stops before the end of our property. The existing plan drawing also shows the dry wall finishing before it actually does. The dry wall holding back the higher level lawn of number 42 actually continues at a wide arc down to where the tree and bushes are stated (on the left hand side), level with the summer house in our garden. The grass as labelled on the existing plan does not continue to the boundary fence as the plan leads us to believe, the lawn actually stops at the dry wall.

They have also already started installing a new sleeper wall as a proposed retaining wall, immediately next to the dividing fence. Our primary concern is that these sleepers will be insufficient as they are softwood and will only last a short amount of time before rotting away. They are just laid onto dry wall stone without steels or stakes to stop them moving or toppling, wedges have also been used on the concrete fence posts to keep the new sleepers upright, this will subsequently in time push the posts into our garden at an angle. We request that if they level their garden to the boundary fence, that a proper brick built retaining wall is mandatory with drainage to the drain system. This will help stop our property flooding during the heavy winter downpours, which are increasingly more common these days than previous years.

By having no brick built retaining wall along the entire length of the garden, with the lawn being higher and now immediately next to the dividing fence, whilst they gain their privacy we will lose ours. By levelling the lawn up roughly a metre, the now 1.8 metre fence will become a 800/900mm fence, allowing no privacy into our garden. Their proposed higher lawn makes a standard height fence no longer satisfactory (the laurels intended will take a long time to grow). The boundary hedge between no 42 and no 40 is roughly 2.8m along the entire length of the garden and both these gardens are the same level. Nowhere on the plans does it state that the lawn is to be levelled, as according to the 'existing' plans, the lawn is already level - this is incorrect. In addition, from researching ourselves we believe that if levelling a lawn requires more than 30cm it requires planning permission for this alone.

I have attached a photo of the garden and it clearly shows the vast area that is to be filled without a proper retaining wall against the fence.

Yours faithfully,

Laura and Richard Andrew



