

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/25/3366480

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/W1715/W/25/3366480

Appeal By COLTEN CARE LTD

Site Address
Land Adjoining 4 Brookfield
Providence Hill
Bursledon
SO31 8LP
Grid Ref Easting: 448306
Grid Ref Northing: 110621

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR JEFFREY MARTIN

Address
The Morellos Providence Hill
Bursledon
SOUTHAMPTON
SO31 8AU

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 wish to object to the development due to

1. Impact on highway safety, particularly from our driveway. This is due to displacement of existing residential parking and inadequate provision for care home staff, visitors and the new cottages. The limited (but long standing) parking for the Brookfield Cottages within the site's boundary serves as a pressure valve to reduce demand for parking in the A27 roadside layby. That layby is used intensively as overflow parking by Brookfield Cottages and the neighbours on the opposite side of the road, as well as commuters seeking a rest stop. Our property (Morellos) shares an entrance within that layby with the Bursledon Telephone Exchange. Due to the slope of the hill, speed and volume of traffic and poor sight lines, double yellow lines were installed around the entrance and in the downhill tapering end. These restrictions are observed when parking is sufficient. Unfortunately, at peak times and when there are visitors or other displacement of residents' parking, then the double yellows are ignored. Parking then blocks both sides of the entrance. Grass verges get churned up as overflow parking. I attach several photos showing the view from our sole vehicular exit. Layby parking obscures any view of approaching traffic. Even distant glimpses of approaching traffic are prevented by vehicles on the grass verge outside of the proposed development site, uphill from the layby. On occasions we have had to ask neighbours to stand guard to beckon us out from our entrance drive, or had to rely on hearing approaching traffic rather than be able to see it. Any increase in pressure on roadside parking would significantly endanger our safety and the users of the public Telephone Exchange, as well as innocent travellers on the A27 that may see our emerging vehicles too late. There has already been significant development on the upper half of Providence Hill since the Character Area Appraisal was last revised in 2008; its description of on-street parking as 'insignificant' is outdated. Particularly on the grass verge alongside the western end of the proposed development site, (where the new care cottages are proposed), roadside overspill parking for Ensign House and Langtry Court has become the norm.

2. Visual impact when viewed from the rear garden of our property, which lies directly to the east of the development site. The developer has severely cut back the native hedgerow and overhanging tree branches within the TPO zone. When combined with Overhead Power Line clearance works this spring, the effect has been the loss of most of the boundary screening between the oaks T5 and T6, with T6 also much diminished. This hedgerow was, at least until recently, a dormouse habitat being rich in oak, ancient hedgerow, hawthorn and hazel understorey. It was singled out for preservation when many of the wildlife corridors to the Windmill Fields Wood SINC were recently destroyed.

3. Eastern Boundary treatment. Our boundary with the development site is the historic bank which lies on our land, having been formed by a ditch that was dug to the west of it but was infilled in the 20th century. The bank is the only known heritage asset immediately bordering the development site and none is known within it. As Chairman of the Bursledon Local History Society, a History / archaeology graduate as well as resident, I have investigated this boundary feature and note that it is possibly of medieval origin. It appeared as the boundary (certainly by the start of the 18th century) between enclosed agricultural fields to the east and the Common land to the West (until the 19th century enclosure partitioned the area including Brookfield). When the Gosling Turning development was proposed a reasonably thorough archaeological investigation took place, including test trenches, which suggest that this linear feature continued up the side of the adjoining Windmill Hill and is known to have incorporated a footpath. We are naturally anxious when the appellant continues to depict the site's boundary as though they own the bank and state on their Landscape Arrangement Plans "Boundary treatment within vegetation unknown. Condition and requirement for repair or replacement to be assessed at demolition stage", as though they are ignorant of who owns the bank or have plans to alter it. The plan also shows new native mixed scrub as proposed within that eastern boundary, including the area of the bank. Whilst land ownership is not a 'planning matter', we consider insufficient regard has been paid to this modest but ancient bank. In contrast to the Goslings Turning development, there was little sign of any true historical, archaeological or ecological assessment of this site.

4. Impact on neighbouring Windmill Conservation Area. I note that the "Bursledon Windmill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals" (2011), which was specified as a

Supplementary Planning Document, has been omitted from the debate. [<https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/3010/bursledon-windmill-conservation-area.pdf>] . The proposed development is clearly of very significant bulk and 4-storey height, which will have a visual impact on the Conservation Area. Its size is readily apparent from the 'Aerial view from east - Clay render'. Has any potential impact on windflow to the Windmill be assessed?

5. Lack of publicity. The timing of the appeal, in which letters dropped on neighbours doormats on the same day as the Local Area Committee approved the Care Home development was clearly intended to apply pressure on the Borough Council to accept a revised set of plans, but also has the effect that residents will assume the appeal is not happening or was a mistaken mailshot. The site borders the A27 and has 2 entranceways, but no posters have appeared to notify people of the appeal. Hence, a muted public response may be interpreted as ambivalence by residents, when it truly reflects confusion and ignorance that the appeal is proceeding with the more controversial and extreme proposal back in contention.

6. Net effect of this edition of Planning proposals and cumulative effect. I guess that the Borough Council's approval of a slightly revised plan (application F/25/99169) on 19th June 2025 means that in planning terms that is considered to already be in place? Therefore the appellant will argue that the only areas for consideration are the small differences between the approved and the previously rejected plans. Whilst there is power in their argument that the differences are small, it may also be said that each difference was an improvement to the residential amenity of neighbours and the visual impact and general bulkiness of the development. However, none of the impacts of the development have been felt yet. We feel that this appeal over the previous iteration of plans is the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back, so both that straw and the overall burden requires consideration. For example, the vehicular access is currently a grown over farm gate, with not a single vehicle using it for years. The Care Home will bring about 40 vehicles coming and going at least once a day from that unused entrance on to a busy road, with additional overspill parking on the verges inevitable. This, and the loss of a valued green open space and last fragment of countryside will all have an impact as yet unrealized.

We wish to invite the Inspector to access our property in order to view the eastern boundary of the development site and more particularly to see the layby and verges that will be directly impacted by any increase in demand, through displacement of existing parking and the parking requirements of the proposed Care Home business.

COMMENT DOCUMENTS

The documents listed below were uploaded with this form:

Relates to Section: REPRESENTATION

Document Description: Your comments on the appeal.

File name: Layby from Morellos entrance, 11 July.JPG

File name: Layby with excess parking and on verge parking bordering proposed development.JPG

File name: View from Telephone Exchange and Morellos shared exit.JPG

PLEASE ENSURE THAT A COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED WHEN POSTING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS TO US