

Stone, Alexandra

Subject:

RE: Planning Application H/25/98845 Comment - RESEND WITH ADDRESS

Sent: 13 April 2025 15:19

To: Planning @ Eastleigh Borough Council <Planning@eastleigh.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning Application H/25/98845 Comment - RESEND WITH ADDRESS

You don't often get email from stella25maris@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

6 Twin Oaks
Botley
SO30 2BF

11/04/2025

Head of Development Management
Eastleigh Borough Council
Eastleigh House
Upper Market Street
Eastleigh
Hampshire
SO50 9YN

Dear Sir

Application No: H/25/98845 : Loft conversion including addition of front and rear dormers, ridge height raise and fenestration changes. **27 Pern Drive, Botley, Southampton, SO30 2GW**

I write to object to the planning application for the following reasons:

1. Amenity: The proposed loft extension will afford full view of my back garden substantially reducing privacy. Planned windows will also give direct vision into my property reducing privacy within the home. The exact impact is difficult to gauge because the plans do not appear to cite any actual measurements but the loss of amenity will be significant.
2. 27 Pern drive is one of three similar properties, built as retirement bungalows, with low pitched rooves that add to the character of the area. Significant change to the roof line impacts this character detrimentally.

Further considerations:

3. Sewerage is referenced in the Botley Neighbourhood plan. There are obvious concerns about the ability of existing systems to cope with increased output. The plan for 27 Pern Drive is to increase the number of rooms including bathrooms that has the potential to add to the sewerage burden.
4. I also wish to raise is the that of possible subsidence given that I understand, properties in the area are underpinned. I am concerned that the proposed extension could be detrimental to the ground structure that has the potential to impact my land.
5. Botley has an aging population with many older residents in larger properties that could be relinquished if suitable smaller properties were available. It seems to defy logic that properties be enlarged in an area where smaller properties are at a premium. With the amount of building in the area there is no shortage of larger properties in the local school catchment area.

It is for these reasons I wish to object to planning application H/25/98845

Yours sincerely
Stella Cousen