

Comments for Planning Application APP/19/00625

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/19/00625

Address: 62 Ferndale, Waterloooville, PO7 7PB

Proposal: First floor rear extension; alterations to external wall and roof finish; replacement of existing windows; raised deck to the rear and front boundary fence.

Case Officer: Ross Leal

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: THIS IS AN AMENDED OBJECTION CORRECTING 3 ERRORS IN THE ORIGINAL
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the amended plans for the proposed first floor extension on 62 Ferndale.

1. The changes to the original proposed plans that relate to the comments made by us in July are noted. Namely:

- a. Very small reduction in height of proposed flat roof (13cm?)
- b. The alteration in the originally proposed "overhang" profile at the south side of the 62 Ferndale

2. Nevertheless, after careful scrutiny of the amended plans, we still have fundamental major objections to the overall appearance and construction of the proposed extension. It is certainly NOT acceptable in the proposed form

3. To start with there seems to be two inconsistencies with the revised plans.

- a. The new plans (South elevation and East elevation) indicate a very small reduction (13cm) in overall height of the flat roof.

However, this reduction is not shown in the North elevation plan.

- b. The South elevation and East elevation show an oriel window on the 1st floor extension.

However, in the North elevation, this oriel window is not shown

What are the correct versions please?

4. Whilst the change in proposed profile with the loss of the overhang at the South side of 62 is a step forward, the overall design is still not in keeping with any property in the area. The first floor concept for the extension still appears to be a portakabin-type structure resting on the current ground floor extension.

5. The amended plans still propose a mixture of material colours and finishes; brick, light coloured render, timber, new blue-grey tiles, zinc and large glass screens for the large external deck. This innovative proposal just gives a muddled and disorganised appearance. Once again, this is completely out of step with any surrounding building.

6. In our original comments and objections we did not mention the proposed large external decking at the rear. However, having studied the new plans it can be seen that the screens for the suggested external deck will stick up above the fence between 62 and 64. In fact the North elevation plan clearly shows that the glass screens would rise to only about 0.5m below the level of the base of the projected first floor. Whilst it is appreciated the glass will be obscured, it will be a further distinct eyesore raised above the level of the border fence.

7. To reiterate a comment made in our original objection. In the past we have been told by representatives of the Council that permission for house extensions will normally be granted only if they relate sympathetically to the original dwelling and the surroundings both in architectural style and in building materials. There is no way that APP/19/0625 does that.

8. Again, we also have understood from previous investigations that the Council will not normally permit a two storey extension with a flat roof where the original dwelling has a pitched roof. Indeed, that is why the small one room 1st floor extension to 64 Ferndale (containing a lift and disabled shower room) was built with a pitched roof.

9. Effect on Daylight and outlook

The proposed new first floor extension of 62 Ferndale, would have a serious and significant deleterious effect on the occupants of 64, especially with regard to a reduction in light to the ground floor kitchen and utility room on the south side of 64. During the 2 main summer months, June and July, this effect is not that noticeable as the sun is high in the sky all day long. However, for the vast majority of the year, especially in the winter, autumnal and early spring months, when the sun is lower in the sky, a new first floor extension on 62 Ferndale would significantly cut out the light into the south facing windows and door on the ground floor of 64 Ferndale.

10. Just to underline this fact, I will forward to the case officer a photograph taken on 17th Sept 2019. This was taken from the utility room in 64 Ferndale and shows the sun just after midday over the existing ground floor extension of 62 Ferndale. If the proposed extension was in place the sun would have been totally obscured and goes to prove just how much light would be lost

11. This loss of light would inevitably result in increased electricity bills (and costs) for the occupants of 64 Ferndale.

12. Despite amendment, the proposal for the first floor extension to 62 would mean that the general outlook from the garden of 64 would be much altered with the slab-sided first floor extension having a severe adverse visual impact.

General observation

13. For any future extension on 62, it is suggested that additional attention is focused on the guttering and drainage. Ever since the single storey extension was built in 2004/5, there have been frequent difficulties with the guttering not being sufficient to take away rain water efficiently, leading to ground waterlogging, which has extended on occasion to the garden of 64 Ferndale.