

40 Nichol Road  
Chandler's Ford  
Hampshire  
SO53 5AU

11 March 2024

Mr D Huckfield  
Eastleigh Borough Council  
Eastleigh House  
Upper Market Street  
Eastleigh  
Hampshire  
SO50 9YN

Dear Mr Huckfield

**Application no:** F/24/96900

**Description:** Demolition of existing house and single garage and construction of a new two-storey house with separate guest annexe/gymnasium, associated landscaping and parking. Creation of a new vehicular access point from Nichol Road.

**Site:** 38 Nichol Road  
Chandler's Ford  
Eastleigh  
SO53 5AU

Thank you for your letter of 22 February 2024.

We (no. 40 Nichol Road) have for some time expected that an application to extend no. 38 would be submitted if there were a new owner and we understand the wish to develop the existing bungalow.

However, we object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

**Overbearing – height:**

Being a corner plot, the current property at no. 38 extends further along the back garden boundary between no. 38 and no. 40 than would usually be the case for non-corner plots.

Presumably because of this, the current house was designed as a bungalow. As such, only the roof is currently visible from no. 40 (*photos included below*).

The proposed scheme retains the orientation of the existing bungalow, ie extending along the back garden boundary between no. 38 and no. 40, whilst increasing the height significantly from one storey to two and extending towards the boundary with no. 40.

An additional storey alone would make the new house overbearing to no. 40. The inclusion of 2 gable ends extending towards no. 40 further increases the extent of the overbearing given that even more of the proposed house is in very close proximity to the boundary.

From what we can see, none of the corner properties in Nichol Road have to date been permitted to extend or rebuild higher than their original roof height. We understand that on some occasions applications have been made and refused.

#### **Overbearing – footprint:**

The footprint of the proposal is larger than that of the current bungalow. In particular, it extends further in an easterly direction along the boundary with no. 40, into the garden, again increasing the amount of building visible from no. 40.

#### **Overlooking & loss of privacy – main house:**

The proposed house includes 4 upstairs windows in the north elevation which runs along the boundary of the back garden of no. 40. From these windows there will be a view both towards the rear of the house (no. 40) and into the back garden of no. 40.

Three windows are proposed to be obscured, but these will still give rise to a perceived loss of privacy due to their close positioning overlooking the house and garden.

The fourth is a floor-to-ceiling, non-obscured window overlooking both the house and garden of no. 40 and only a few metres from a bedroom of no. 40. There is likely to be a direct view from the new windows into the rear windows of no. 40.

#### **Overlooking & loss of privacy – annexe:**

The proposed guest annexe/gym has 2 upstairs windows looking directly back up towards the house and into the garden of no. 40.

#### **Overshadowing & loss of light:**

Due to no. 38 being located to the south of no. 40, the increase in both overall height and depth of building above one storey will significantly reduce the amount of light reaching the garden and rear windows of no. 40, particularly in winter.

#### **Other matters:**

The 3D model of the proposal included in the document “Design and Access Statement”, is accompanied by the comment, “It highlights how much larger no. 40 Nichol Road is compared with no. 38”. However, the model shows no. 40 as disproportionately large, occupying the full width of its plot, which it does not.

Since the 3D model is specifically referred to by the applicant to demonstrate the size of no. 40, we would like to highlight this as it is misleading.

With regards to context and visual intrusion, in Woodlands Close, the road onto which the proposed property fronts, all the houses are of a chalet style as originally built, and while some have been extended to the rear, none have increased the roof height or altered the style of the building when viewed from the road (*reference Supplementary Planning Document, Hiltingbury Road West Character Area Appraisal*).

We understand we can ask that the following conditions be considered should the application be approved, and that this does not weaken our above objections:

- all windows on the north elevation of the main house and the east elevation of the annex should be obscured and fixed or fanlight only, opening only above eye-level
- planting should be put in place which obscures the view from the windows into no. 40
- reasonable working hours on site
- considerate parking of works vehicles
- consideration should be given to the materials used on the north elevation. The proposed white render will make the building more overbearing than a brick finish for example

Yours sincerely

Roger and Sandra Cath  
(by email)

Cc Susannah Flood



*Current view of roof of no. 38 from no. 40*