

PLANNING REF : 251846
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Frankforte
: Basingstoke Road, Three Mile Cross
: RG7 1AS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Colin Boorman
DATE SUBMITTED : 01/10/2025

COMMENTS:

We have received notification of the above Planning Application and feel we must strongly object to this proposed development.

This is a substantial overdevelopment of the site and what is proposed will be more than double the original building. It actually works out at a 150% increase in size. It will also create a Terracing effect with our property and will be overbearing. It will also totally alter the street appearance and be an eyesore.

The documents submitted with this application are full of inaccuracies in the mathematics and design.

The CIL form 251846-Planning CIL Form-05082025.pdf under question 6 states a total Existing gross internal area of 149m² with 6m² to be demolished and the total gross internal area proposed will be 161.4m².

However, according to the plans submitted, the existing gross internal area is actually 115m² with 2m² to be demolished and the total gross internal area proposed is 286m². Such a difference appears to be deviousness.

From measuring the submitted floor plans, the External dimensions are: existing 136m², to be demolished 3m² and total proposed 318.5m².

The second document 251846-Planning Statements and Reports-31072025(1).pdf.

The Design and Access statement again is wrong and misleading. According to the plans submitted, there is no part single storey extension. The plans all show a double storey extension. The introduction states "to accommodate residents off the property" implying the property becoming an HMO. It will no longer be a family home.

Figure 4 shows a Garage - This garage is no longer there.

Site analysis statement

We would take issue with the whole of this statement.

? It quotes a core strategy of "providing additional family accommodation". This proposal does not provide any additional family accommodation. There is already a large 3 bedroom family home and the proposal is to increase its size by 150%.

? It states "The proposals make strong and clear reference to inherit the street scene" This proposal does not meet that statement. The proposed design and siting are not in keeping with the street scene and is totally at odds with the existing distance between properties. Other extensions have been sympathetically and aesthetically designed to blend in and a reasonable distance and

separation is maintained between buildings.

? This proposal looks totally out of sorts, creating a terraced look due to lack of spacing, looks like a bolted-on extension and, therefore would be an eyesore.

? The statement says "The properties configuration ensures that the proposal confirms with the daylight rules".

The overbearing nature of this proposal will greatly impact our right to enjoy light. The proposal will block the light to our property and our property will remain in its shadow.

? The statement says that "similar extensions have been done"; this is untrue. Whilst Basingstoke Road is a very long road, in this part of Basingstoke Road in Three Mile Cross, there are no similar extensions. Any extensions have been in keeping with the neighbouring properties and the spacing between the properties has been maintained.

Design Principles

We can only go on the plans submitted and measuring them by using the scale given:

? 4.1 The plans show an extension of an additional 163.5m² (81.75m² x 2) and not the 68.4m² claimed. The 68.4m², in any case, does not correspond with the CIL statement which claims only 12.4m².

But, the actual increase in internal floor area is from 115m² to 286m², an increase of 171m², which equates to 150% or 2 times increase in size. The claim of an extension of 68.4m² is totally incorrect.

? 4.2 It is stated "The proposed height of the extension is 3.7m". This is at the lowest part only, but it is actually 5.6m for the majority, which the statement fails to mention.

The proposed extension is a massive overdevelopment of the site and by more than doubling the size of the house, which will be overbearing on our property, cause massing, removing the spacing between the properties and overshadowing our house.

Aesthetically it looks like a bolted-on extension and not as any part of the original. The side extension will be overbearing and totally against what we currently enjoy.

6.0 Conclusion

The conclusion attempts to refer again to a core principle of NPPF. There is currently on the site a large family house. We fail to see how more than doubling its size and creating a larger house has any relevance to the policy of creating a "much-needed family home and is the best use of underdeveloped land". It is not creating a new house; it is just increasing the existing size by more than double.

The third document 251846-Planning Statements and Reports-31072025.pdf.

This Daylight and Sunlight Assessment is wrong and misleading.

The diagram (Figure 1) bears little relationship to the site plan (251846-Planning Plans-31072025(2).pdf) or the plans for the extension. It is difficult to see accurately as no scale has been given, but the distance between the existing Blackmoor and Frankforte on the Site plan is 6.5m (by measuring the plan), but on this Daylight plan it appears to be 6m. However, the actual

physical measured
distance (wall to wall) is 5m.

The application under No. 251574 was indeed for an 8m rear extension single storey and we had no objections. This application is for a double storey 4m rear extension and a double storey side extension, which will tower over our home and create a terracing effect.

Blackmoor is to the South side of us and therefore any sunlight comes from that direction; this proposal will have a drastic impact on the amount of daylight and sunlight that we will receive.

The current 5m distance between our houses allows sunlight to come to our house. This extension will create a small dark corridor of space between the houses and it will obscure the sunlight to our house.

Instead of the 5m distance between the houses we will end up with a small dark corridor of space which would be unacceptable.

With regard to the internal plans and external elevations -
251846-Planning Plans-17092025(1).pdf and 251846-Planning
Plans-17092025(2).pdf

We have the following observations:

The proposed side extension is 5.1m wide, yet there is only a 5m gap between the two houses of which 1m is within our property.

In conclusion, this proposal:

? Does not provide additional housing despite claims to do so

? Is a gross overdevelopment, over-massing of the plot and overbearing on our home

? Is unsightly and not in keeping with the street scene

? Will create a Terracing effect and contrary to the current mix of houses

? Will cause a massive breach of our right to light and will stop us enjoying our property

? Is littered with inaccuracies, mis-measurements and claims that are contradictory

? The Claimed Existing Internal area is 149m²; in reality it is 115m² ? The Claimed Internal amount to be demolished is 6m²; in reality it is 2m²

? The Total proposed Internal Area is claimed to be 161.4m²; in reality it will be 286m².

We trust this application will be refused.

Yours faithfully
Mr & Mrs C Boorman