

Planning Application H/24/98362

14 THOROLD ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5BT

Representative	Address	Comments
Mr Kelvin & Mrs Laura Lawence	12 THOROLD ROAD CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 5BT	We write to comment on the planning application no. H/24/98362 (14 Thorold Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 5BT) in respect of the proposed two storey side extension and raising of ridge to form habitable accommodation with dormers within roof space. While we want to be supportive and encouraging of local property investment, we were concerned to read correspondence specifically referencing our property dated 3 September 2024, from Eastleigh Borough Council, refusing planning application H/24/97714 (14 Thorold Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 5BT). Direct reference was made to "The proposed increase in ridge height and alterations to the roof design, due to their scale and proximity to the neighbouring property, are considered to create an overbearing presence and result in a loss of outlook for 12 Thorold Road. As such this would have an adverse impact on residential amenity". Having now considered all the points relating to the original refused application, we are concerned that no adjustment has been included in the revised application for a reduction in ridge height and the proposed application, especially on the side of the shared boundary, still appears very large and prominent. We have these concerns because 14 Thorold Road: a) Is in very close proximity to the shared boundary with 12 Thorold Road, and b) 14 Thorold Road is already set on higher ground with increased elevation meaning any increase in size or height above the bungalows current low-profile roof will be more prominent, and c) It is unusually staggered and set back from our own property meaning any increase in additional mass especially on the south side of the property including increase in roof height and additional dormers x 3 (South, East and West) will feel especially overbearing to us due to the staggered position of the properties. In addition, looking specifically at the proposed side elevation drawing of the property (south side), we believe that: a) No change has been included from the refused application to the suggested ridge height on the south side. The proposed ridge height on a large area of the roof on the south side would still effectively double the height of the roof (from gutter to ridge) and make the property substantially higher and larger in volume, and b) The proposed addition of three gable style dormers protruding from the roof close to our property (facing East, West and South), would also add a feeling of overbearing presence and contribute to the loss of our current outlook by replacing the low-profile roof, which currently, in simple form tapers up to the current ridge height on the South and East side of the property. n.b., we assume the East facing dormer has been mistakenly omitted from the south side elevation drawing but would protrude from the roof and be visible "side on" from the South side of the property. We hope the above comments allow you to consider why we feel the re-submitted application would have a negative impact on our residential amenity and particularly from the South side of the property closest to our shared boundary, would be overbearing and visually intrusive such that we would suffer a loss of outlook.