

Jeremy Payne & Claire Mason
6 Station Road
Netley Abbey
Southampton
Hampshire
SO31 5DT

4th February 2023

Alexandra Stone
Eastleigh Planning Department
Eastleigh Borough Council
Eastleigh House
Upper Market Street
Eastleigh
SO50 9YN

Dear Ms Stone

Re Planning Application – H/22/93164
4 Station Road, Netley Abbey, SO31 5DT

We note from recent correspondence that there are amendments to the above planning application which request consideration.

May we request that the decision for this application be decided by Planning Committee rather than a delegated decision please.

The comments made in our objection of the 20th July 2022 are still very much valid and the amendments do nothing to change our view, in fact the design is even worse than the proposed flat roofed dormer if that is possible.

We wish to object to these amendments to the original application for the following reasons:

- The proposed dormer extension at 2nd floor (roof level) does not fit with the aesthetic qualities, street scene and historical importance of Coastguard Cottages and goes against principles outlined in the Netley Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal, which was adopted on 27th January 2010.

This proposed dormer extension is hideous, almost more so than the application for a flat roofed dormer, as the proposed roofline of the pitch is higher than the existing roof line. Neither is an acceptable proposition for Coastguard Cottages.

The comments by Mr Tim Dyer, Conservation Officer say it all –

Paragraph 197 of the be-holds local authorities to *'take account of c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness'* and section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local authorities to define as conservation areas and *'areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'* with section 72 giving local authorities a general duty to pay special attention *'to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'*.

Conclusion.

This proposed rear dormer is in total conflict with the requirements of the above quoted planning laws, quite apart from looking dreadful in any context and in this case would also set a precedent for the rest of the row which would destroy the character of this character area of the Netley Conservation Area.

When we extended our house in 2013, we deliberately chose not to have an extension at roof level because it would be detrimental to the appearance and character of Coastguard Cottages. Our design did not face any objections or negative comments.

- Creating a third bedroom in the property with a dormer extension constitutes over-development. No 4 Station Road is a two-bedroom cottage with a loft room and was sold to Mr Keel as such.

Whilst attending the Hound Parish Council Planning Committee meeting last year when this application was originally considered, all members of the Committee were unanimous in the view that this proposed dormer extension would be considered as over development, with one member even commenting that, "If Mr Keel wanted a three-bedroom house, he should have purchased a three-bedroom house, not try and make a small two-bed room cottage into a three-bedroom house".

Also, Eastleigh Planning Department reported that making this a three-bedroom property would not be allowed as No 4 Station Road has no off-street parking. The proposed plans submitted by Mr Keel show the loft room as a bedroom. We believe that Mr Keel has already made the loft room a third bedroom.

I wonder if Fire Safety requirements have been considered/followed in the application for the work already undertaken and this proposed extension?

- The installation of a new window to first floor rear elevation, and the proposed dormer at second floor (roof level) will completely remove any privacy in our rear garden. Currently the existing rear window of the property is a bathroom and as such, has frosted glass. The addition of a second window, for a new bathroom may well result in the existing window being replaced with clear glass (for a bedroom) and therefore removing our privacy.
- The erection of an enlarged porch would also change the aesthetic character of the front of the property. Although there is currently a small open porch, some years ago

Eastleigh Borough Council remarked that further development of, or changes to porches would not be allowed in Coastguard Cottages because of this adverse change in appearance. Eastleigh Borough Council wish to preserve the front of the Coastguard Cottages Terrace as well as the rear.

We also have concerns that enlargement of the porch will be a pre-cursor to Mr Keel enlarging the front door, something he stated he intended to do when he first purchased the property. Given that the cottages are in a conservation area, we would request that Eastleigh Borough Council give consideration to this possibility.

- The replacement of existing rainwater goods also raises a concern. I am in agreement that the proposed rainwater goods will be more in keeping of the age and character of the house but they are to be joined to our guttering in the front of our two houses (two very different types of guttering) and we share a downpipe, which is situated directly on the boundary between our two properties. We are concerned whether appropriate care will be taken with this, given the situation Mr Keel has created (described below) with his renovations to date.
- The addition of a dormer extension, immediately adjacent to the Velux window in our loft room, which is our son's bedroom, will reduce available light, despite it being north facing. The size of this proposed dormer is overbearing. We request that should this application even be considered; a light survey must be undertaken to satisfy this query.

On studying the Amended Proposed Floor Plans, the drawings do not appear to show the party wall in the correct position. On these plans it appears to show the party wall as running through Mr Keel's property. Maybe this is for illustrative purposes but given that we already have party wall concerns (see below), we believe it is only fair to question this.

Additionally, we have carried out an internet search on the Archetivess, Architectural and Engineering Associates, who have drawn up these plans for Mr Keel and cannot find any trace of them. Given that Mr Keel told us that he had designed the proposed flat-roofed dormer extension, this raises further concerns with us because to my knowledge, he is not a trained architect or structural engineer.

Although outside of this planning application, Mr Keel has undertaken significant works to renovate the property, including some major structural work which include, removal of a chimney breast (which is shared with our property), removal of a suspended wooden floor and replacing with a concrete slab throughout the whole ground floor, and more seriously, removal of the original rear structural wall and replacing with steel beams which are cut into the party wall and sat on concrete pads which were excavated immediately adjacent to the party wall.

Mr Keel did not serve a Party Wall Notice and we have had to instigate a Photographic Inspection of Condition by a Party Wall Surveyor at our own expense, a cost which should have been borne by Mr Keel under a Party Wall Notice. Our Party Wall Surveyor was adamant from the information provided and photographs which Mr Keel had taken of the work, without doubt, all of these works would be covered by the Party Wall Act.

We have tried to engage on numerous occasions with Mr Keel to resolve this manner amicably or by mediation but he mostly did not respond, only latterly issuing a hastily written letter in pencil denying undertaking any works which would be covered by the Party Wall Act. We are very concerned that his DIY style of renovation in the last 20 months is already causing problems to our property. The bricks of our home are 150 years old, soft and friable. Having smashed out his chimney breast with sledgehammers it would be unsurprising if there has been an impact on our property.

We add these comments to highlight that not only do we object to the planning application outright, we have worrying concerns that have not been resolved so far, and potentially could be made worse by additional work that Mr Keel undertakes himself should permission be granted.

In essence, this proposed dormer extension is an awful monstrosity, completely out of character with the current lovely continuous roofline and appearance of Coastguard Cottages. We appeal to Eastleigh Borough Council to reject this application fully to avoid further speculative applications for over development of this property and protect the whole terrace for the future.

As originally stated, it will have a detrimental impact on a building of local importance and its setting and certainly does not preserve or enhance the value of Coastguard Cottages to the Netley Abbey street scene.

Yours faithfully,

Jeremy Payne & Claire Mason