

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: Karen Wooden

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:REFERENCE APP/19/0625 - 62, FERNDALÉ PO7 7PB

This planning proposal has been carefully studied. We have serious and strong objections to this proposal as well as some general observations.

The comments made by this house-hold in 2004 in relation to an application by the previous owners for a 2 storey extension at 62 Ferndale (case 04/59537/002 refers) still stand and we would wish them to be taken into account again. In addition, the constraints shown online to that plan are still relevant to this new proposal (APP/19/0625) and should also be applied to the new application.

2019 Comments

Design, appearance and layout.

1. Firstly there is the basic design of the large first floor extension. To be blunt, it is not at all in keeping with any of the properties in the area. The new first floor extension part of the plan appears to be like a large portakabin structure just resting on top of the existing ground floor!
2. The off-setting of the proposed new first floor also makes the whole building seem lop-sided.
3. The mixture of material colours and finishes - brick, light coloured render, timber, new blue-grey tiles, and zinc, may be innovative, but would give a disorderly and confused appearance. Again, this is not at all in keeping with the surrounding buildings.
4. 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. APP/19/0625 certainly does

not seem to do that.

5. We also 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.

Effect on Daylight and outlook

6. The proposed new first floor extension of 62 Ferndale, would have a serious deleterious effect on the occupants of 64 Ferndale, 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.

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

8. The new proposals would also mean that 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

9. For any future extension on 62 Ferndale, it is suggested that additional attention is focussed 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 water-logging, which also extended on occasion to the garden of 64 Ferndale.