

Appeal reference: APP/W1715/W/25/3366480
Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon, SO31 8AU

I am writing to express my concern and objection to the appeal submitted by Colten Care in relation to the above application.

It is deeply disappointing that, despite having submitted a revised planning application which addressed previous concerns and was subsequently approved, the applicant has now chosen to appeal the original refused application. This raises serious concerns about their intentions and demonstrates a disregard for the legitimate concerns of neighbouring residents.

I would like to support and echo the points raised in the detailed objection submitted by my neighbour's, John White and his mum, Theresa White. In particular:

1. Overlooking, Loss of Privacy, and Visual Impact:

The initial visual representations submitted by the applicant were clearly misleading and did not accurately show the true scale and impact of the proposed development on the properties at 1–4 Brookfield. Verified images requested by the Planning Officer were never provided by the applicant, despite repeated follow-ups. This raises serious concerns about transparency and the real visual effect of the proposed care home, which will significantly overlook and overshadow neighbouring gardens.

2. Parking, Highway Safety, and Inaccurate Information:

The applicant's transport statement was based on factually incorrect assumptions and measurements—some taken from online sources like Google Street View—rather than proper site visits. These inaccuracies led to flawed conclusions regarding parking provision and highway impact. The local layby is already at capacity, and the displacement of vehicles from the site will increase pressure on Providence Hill, leading to further safety risks and inconvenience for existing residents. This will get worse and Providence hill will become unrecognisable with the number of cars parked out in the road.

It is absolutely vital that decision makers visit the site in person to fully appreciate the scale and implications of the proposed development and the concerns of how dangerous the increased congestion will become if appeal is allowed.

It is particularly frustrating that despite the second, approved application having addressed these issues, the applicant is now attempting to resurrect the first, more harmful version of the development via appeal. This undermines the local planning process and is incredibly unsettling for residents. It also shows the behaviours that Colten Care will demonstrate throughout this whole development.

I urge the Planning Inspectorate to give serious weight to the concerns raised by residents and to dismiss this appeal.

Kind Regards

Aidan Raj
3 Brookfield, Providence Hill
SO31 8AU
[REDACTED]

I confirm that I give permission for John White of number 2 Brookfield, to submit comments on behalf of myself in relation to this appeal.