

**APP/15/01024/HOUS – Dairy Cottage, 23 Claremont Gardens,
Waterlooville PO75LI**

I visited the property and was able to view the site from public land. There was no one at home so I did not attempt to view from the rear garden. I have subsequently undertaken a cursory planning search from which I note there is a background of unauthorised activity. This was prompted by the condition of the front garden, in particular the presence of a large steel storage container, and related naval memorabilia, red telephone kiosk etc. From this research I note planning permission has previously been granted for a double garage in the rear garden. Comparing the photos forming part of application 05/60513/002 shows how the landscaping of the, front garden (and the setting for the listed building) has deteriorated.

On my visit, I had assumed there was no existing garage provision. Placing such a structure in a prominent front garden would not be the first choice. It would be the only logical location for additional garaging. I note the support from neighbours and I can see the benefit in screening the property (and front drive) from view. No explanation has been provided for the new structure, or the choice of location. As a structure it is of reasonably well designed.

I can not ignore the ugly steel container which detracts from the building's setting and does not have the benefit of planning permission. The building appears to have been re-rendered following the removal of extensive ivy growth, but these operations have long since ceased. It has no short term purpose in connection with on-going construction works and its presence is harmful to the building's setting.

I feel we need to establish the following facts:-

1. Has the permitted garage been built and if so what is its current use.
2. What is the container being used for.
3. What purpose does the new garage/carport have that the permitted garage does not perform already.

I am concerned that unless there is a clear a justifiable purpose for the new building it merely perpetuates the assortment of storage buildings which include the steel container (no permission) and log store (retrospective permission) etc.

If a clear case for the building can be made, the chosen location is the least harmful. It has the benefit of some partial hedge screening and is reasonably well designed/ The materials are acceptable in principle. If weatherboarding is permissible I would recommend the use of wide oak boarding allowed to naturally weather to silver grey. The new building is set close to the neighbouring boundary. A building of this construction may not be permissible under the building regulations due to the spread of fire. I advise this be resolved with building control.

If the case for the structure can be justified and minded to grant permission, I wish to see it tied into the removal of the steel container so as to start to

regain something of the building's setting. Likewise I advise that its use should be controlled.

In short it is not as straightforward as would seem at first sight. If we get that far I can advise further on conditions.

John Townsend
Conservation Consultant
02/10/15