

5 Drummond Way
Chandlers Ford
EASTLEIGH
SO53 1TX

6 June 2023

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Application **H/23/95227**

(Roof alterations and extensions to create first floor living accommodation with 2no. front and rear dormer windows, front porch and garage conversion)
at 10 Drummond Way, Chandlers Ford

Thank you for your letter dated 24 May 2023 notifying us of this planning application.

We wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. The proposed conversion from a bungalow to a chalet-style house would not fit in well with the street scene.

Drummond Way has three bungalows (nos 7, 8, and 10) which were carefully sited to reduce the visual impact of the density of the estate. Nos 7 and 8 are sited next to North Millers Dale to reduce the visual impact on that road. Number 10 is sited to reduce the visual impact at the Ormesby Drive/Drummond Way junction.

When travelling along Ormesby Drive, three properties in a row (6 Albury Place, 1 Albury Place and 10 Drummond Way) form a cohesive set of bungalows contributing to the balanced street scene.

The proposed conversion unduly increases the massing of the property at the prominent Ormesby Drive/Drummond Way location, impacting the open plan character of the locality.

2. The proposed form and design of the application would not fit in well with the street scene.

No other properties in Drummond Way, Ormesby Drive, Albury Place, Apsley Place or Stratfield Drive are chalet-style houses with dormer windows. Hence, the proposal is

not in keeping with the distinctive character of the estate, which forms part of the North Millers Dale Character Area.

The proposed roof design and pitch is incongruous to neighbouring houses (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 Drummond Way, 13 Ormesby Drive etc.) which have a common architectural roof style. This difference can be seen clearly in the proposed East elevation which shows the comparison to the roofline and pitch of 9 Drummond Way, and if approved would make 10 Drummond Way stand out on its prominent corner plot.

3. The proposed building materials of the application are unclear.

The proposed elevation plan states “pantiles to match existing”, however the design and access statement on page 9 states “dark grey pantiles”, which would not match the existing. Further, the design and access statement on page 10 shows a picture of a style of pantile that is different from the current tiles.

The existing bungalow and neighbouring estate use terracotta coloured “Marley Bold Roll” tiles. If the application is approved, use of these tiles should be a condition.

4. The parking provision is inadequate.

While the applicant’s plan shows they believe it is possible to fit two car parking spaces into the space available at the front of the property, this seems unrealistic in practice. The two proposed spaces share the same narrow triangular access making it difficult if not impossible to drive the cars past each other, and both spaces are up against the property boundary, either fence or hedge. The awkward parking proposal is likely to result in additional demand for on street parking, which is in short supply generally, and especially on the grass verge alongside 10 Drummond Way at the narrow entrance to the cul-de-sac.

The existing parking arrangements should be retained, with one space in the garage (which is the same size as the proposed external spaces) and another on the drive.

Note that pages 3 and 7 of the design and access statement show inaccurate property boundaries.

Finally, although the officer report of the previous refused application (H/23/94738) states that loss of the bungalow is not a material planning consideration, this is surprising given that Local Plan Policy DM24 “Creating a mix of housing” states that residential schemes will be required to “demonstrate how the proposal contributes to the overall mix of housing in

the Housing Market Area, informed by the current need, current demand and existing housing stock (including approved developments) considering the context and character of the site”, and the council has an aim of “delivering a more diverse mix of housing and encouraging a mix of housing types”. We would ask for a more full explanation as to why the loss of the bungalow is not a material planning consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Ian & Claire Partridge
5 Drummond Way