

Eastleigh Borough Council,
Eastleigh House,
Upper Market Street,
Eastleigh,
Hants.
SO53 1FQ

32 Wychwood Grove,
Chandler's Ford,
Eastleigh,
Hants.
SO50 9YN
31st January 2025

Planning Department
F.A.O. Alexandra Stone

Application No. H/24/98672

Conversion of Garage, single storey rear extension with alterations to the
fenestration.

Site : 30 Wychwood Grove, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Hants. SO53 1FQ.

Dear Madam,

Please find attached our comments on the above proposed
development for your consideration.

Yours Sincerely

Nick Wisby/

Application H/24/98672

Conversion of garage, single storey rear extension with alterations to the fenestration.
30 Wychwood Grove, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Hants. SO53 1FQ.

Comments on the above Planning application from
Number 32 Wychwood Grove, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Hants. SO53 1FQ.

The submitted drawings are not accurate and can be misleading: -

- To the East Elevation there is a 1.2m wide passage between the No.'s 30 & the garage wall of No.32, it is important to note that there is a step change in levels between the properties of 750mm at No.32 and 900mm at No.34 with the garage wall forming a retaining wall. Beyond the garage to the south there is a brick retaining wall between the properties. Consequently, the top of the existing 1.8m high fence is only 900mm above the path of No.30 – this is not show on the drawings and has an impact on our privacy.
- The level of the rear garden of No. 30 falls away considerably to the south, this only exaggerates the Visual Impact an Obtrusive nature of the proposed rear extension to No.'s 32,34 and 36.
- The Existing East Elevation shown on Drawing A-201 rev. C shows a concrete ramp up to the cill of the back door. - This is incorrect; The cill of the back door is at DPC level, and the concrete path is 150mm below DPC. There is a concrete step local to the door from the path to the door cill.
- The Existing Elevations shown on Drawing A-201 rev C. South Elevation shows the head of the kitchen window at the same level as the head of the East elevation back door; the door head is in fact 150mm lower.
- Drawing A-101 rev. C Existing First Floor Plan bedroom 1 shows an Existing En Suite – This is Incorrect, there is an existing chimney where the En-Suite walls are drawn. Drawing A-201 rev. C Existing elevations does not show the existing chimney either.

Proposed East and West Elevations

- We note that for the Proposed rear extension there are no dimensions given for the Maximum Heights of the roof at eaves or where the roof meets the existing wall, or for the pitch angle.
- There are no dimensions given for the proposed size and position of the new windows – what size and what are the proposed positions?
- Drawing A-001 rev. C shows plan dimensions from the SE corner of the existing to the extension wall of 652mm. The East boundary with No.34 step returns in line with the line of the existing wall which results in the proposed new extension will be 650mm from the boundary. – It should be noted that the owner of No.30 has already removed an existing tree along this boundary in preparation, and the tree that is left will have to be removed in order to excavate for the foundations. - Trees along this boundary are covered by a TPO, and we have not received any notification from EBC for removal of any trees. – this will result in loss of our privacy.
- The proposed rear extension East wall has a large window shown which will overlook the rear of No's 32,34 and 36 where they will be able to look into our kitchen and dining room resulting in the loss of our privacy. There are no dimensions given for the size and position of this window or whether it will open to the boundary.
- Considering the Elevated position, close proximity to the property boundaries, pitch and height of the roof, the proposed development has a far more Visually Intrusive Impact than the drawings would suggest. – To this end it would be useful for the Planning Officer to visit the Rear gardens of No's 32, 34 and 36 to fully appreciate the Impact of the proximity and height differences between the properties and I would request that the Officer Visits.
- The drawings detail that the rear extension wall finish in K-Render. This does not match the existing and is not in keeping with area. All other extensions and alterations in Wychwood Grove are constructed in Brick. Rendered walls will only make this proposed extension even more Obtrusive.
- Drawing A-202 rev. C Proposed South Elevation there is a note that the roof covering to the rear extension pitched roof is Synthetic Slate roofing tiles. All other Houses, Extensions and Alterations in Wychwood Grove have Concrete Pantiles or Flat Roofs. This again would only make this proposed extension even more Obtrusive and not in keeping with the area.
- The Kitchen and Utility Rooms will no doubt need some form of mechanical Ventilation – there are no details on the location of any vents. If these are sited on the East Elevation, we will be subject to the Noise and smells from these vents as the walls are so close to the boundary.

- Please would you consult with Building Control to comment on the practicality of the brick corner returns and piers between windows, as these would appear not to be compliant with Approved Doc. A – Structural Stability – this applies to SE and SW corner returns as well as the NW corner return to the Garage door and south elevation first floor windows – This will affect the appearance of the respective elevations, and there may be further comments.

Proposed North Elevation – Double Garage Conversion

- Drawing A-203 rev. C gives no dimensions for the size and position of the window. It would appear not to be the same as the existing windows on this elevation.
- There is no note as to the proposed materials to be used, what are they?
- The proposed elevation does not present a proportionate and balanced aesthetic in keeping with the area.
- A 2m wide up and over door, and new garage size is not compliant with EBC parking standards or Building Control to be Designated a Garage.
- EBC Parking Standards for a 4 Bedroom Property are now 3 spaces. Drawing A-002 rev. C shows that currently there are 2 spaces, and 2 spaces proposed. – If an additional space is required this would need to be of permeable material in accordance with SuDS. - Please be aware that currently there is a Runoff issue between No.'s 30 and 32 due to the level difference between the properties which periodically floods the Garage of No. 32.

Proposed Ground Floor Plan

- Drawing A-102 rev. C shows the downstairs Toilet being relocated from under the stair half landing to the east side of the Utility room. There is no detail of the route of the Toilet Drain. If the intention is to install a Foul drain down the side passage between No.30 and 32, this would entail removal of the concrete path in full or part which would disturb and compromise the DPM to the retaining wall part of our Garage wall. (This would have to be subject to the Party Wall Act) – Again, there are no details or dimensions.
- Drawing A-202 rev. C Proposed East Elevation shows a new sloping path to the new position of the Back door, if this is intended to be the full 1.2m width of the passage, this would compromise the DPC and DPM of the Garage to No.32. Runoff water would shed to the front of the property and into No.32 where, as previously noted there is already a water runoff issue whereby the Garage is periodically flooded.

Proposed First Floor Plan

- Drawing A-101 rev. C Bedroom 1 Shows a new En Suite which would entail the removal of the existing Chimney, but there is no note to show that this is the intention – The Drawings A-202 and 203 proposed elevations do not note this either.

We would suggest the following amendments: -

1. The new rear extension wall is moved away from the Eastern property boundary to at least 1.2m from the SE corner of the existing building wall.
2. The wall is built in brick to match existing and in keeping with the area.
3. The pitched roof is changed to a flat roof with maximum height dimensions to be adhered to.
4. The proposed large side window in the East Elevation is omitted.
5. The proposed smaller side windows to the East Elevation kitchen, door and utility should be designated Obscured Glass
6. Drainage to the Utility Toilet is routed through the internal floor space
7. There should be no level adjustment to the East Side passage levels
8. The External Design of the North Elevation garage infill is revisited to improve the appearance so that it is balanced and more in keeping with the area.

This we hope will help to reduce the Intrusive Visual Impact and Obtrusive nature of the proposed extension.

It will reduce the overlooking and Loss of Privacy and be more in keeping with the area.

Would EBC clarify for all concerned the Restrictions on Permitted Hours of work and the Measures to be taken to control Noise, Dust and Vibration to minimise the Disruption to the Neighbours.

Considering all the above, and the Drawings Presented for this Planning Application – There appears to be a considerable amount of Missing information and Incorrect detail. - This leads me to conclude that either the quality of the Drawings is very poor, or the intentions are not being made fully clear.

With this in mind, we consider it Essential that the Planning Officer Visit the site and the adjoining properties to see for themselves and discuss the issues raised before awarding any decision.