

Eastleigh Borough Council
Eastleigh House
Upper Market Street
SO50 9YN

01 May 2024

Dear Sir / Madam

70 Freegrounds Road, Hedge End, Hampshire, SO30 0JA

This letter is written in support of the application for a rear extension and roof alterations at 70 Freegrounds Road, Hedge End.

By way of background, the property has recently had permission granted for a 6m rear extension with roof alterations. This application was approved after discussions with the case officer and the architect (originally acting as agent) to reduce the massing of the roof by removing the originally proposed rear gable-end and replacing with a slightly smaller hip-roof arrangement.

Since that application has been approved, another extension at 66 Freegrounds Road has been approved. That application involved extending the property considerably with an extension just under 8m in depth, running the full width of the house. Whilst their extension retains a hipped-roof arrangement as per the original property, their extension extends much further than that which is proposed in this revised application, and therefore the implications are the same; the application at 66 Freegrounds Road was found to be *'suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance'*, having explained that the *'extension is not exceeding the height of the existing dwelling and keeps the same appearance. The dwelling is detached and suitable distanced from the two neighbouring properties. The extension would bring it in line with property of 64 Freegrounds at the rear.'*

The application at 66 Freegrounds is proportionately much larger than that proposed at 70 Freegrounds, even with the differing roof types; the overall mass created greatly exceeds that of our revised proposal. The plan titled 'no66 & no77 layout Extension Layout Plans' highlights the difference between the depth of extensions applied for (no. 70) and approved (no.66) in relation to the rear elevation of number 68.

The proposed gable-end of this revised application effects the rear elevation, and therefore there are minimal changes when viewed from the streetscene. Neither adjacent neighbour has previously objected to the proposals, and they are the ones most obviously impacted by the proposals.

My clients, given the outcome of the application at 66 Freegrounds and due to their wish to

build a house which fully reflects their needs and desires, are therefore now re-submitting their householder application in its original form. I have reviewed the decisions taken by the LPA I have advised them of their options to re-submit and appeal if necessary, given the nearby example. They understand that whilst each case is decided upon its own merits, there also needs to be a degree of consistency between determining applications of the same nature.

I trust that the information provided with the application is sufficient for you to be able to make a positive determination, however should you require any additional information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Faithfully

Helen Rosier
Planner
BA (Hons) • MSc • MRTPI