

Comments for Planning Application APP/17/01111

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/17/01111

Address: 5 Orange Row, Emsworth, PO10 7EL

Proposal: Single storey rear extension with replacement balcony to the top and replacement fire escape stair to courtyard garden, alterations to fenestration, new chimney and erection of outbuilding.

Case Officer: Bee Crawford

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard van Dulken

Address: Lower Cottage Ruffles Yard, Church Lane Castle Hedingham

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing on behalf of my mother, the owner and resident of the adjoining (to the east) property to No. 5, and the one in Orange Row most likely to be affected by the proposed changes.

I would like to point out from the outset that, despite what is mentioned in the Planning Statement, there has been absolutely no consultation with my mother.

Our objections are as follows:

1. We see absolutely no good reason why the integrity of the colour scheme of the houses in the Orange Row courtyard should be disturbed by one house being painted off-white rather than the white which has served it well for 34 or so years. Likewise is a modern door, as proposed, acceptable in this Conservation Area?
2. The proposed permanent structure in the rear courtyard of No. 5 appears incongruous in terms of size relative to the courtyard, and the area generally where it disrupts the overall view towards the waterside (particularly from the upper windows of No. 4)
3. The proposed 1.8 m extension will result in the small courtyard garden of No. 4 feeling even more hemmed in by a high (10 feet?) concrete wall forming the eastern side of the extension. This rear space is quite precious to my mother and we feel that the extension will damage the

enjoyment of the amenity.

4. The proposed balcony on top of the extension will inevitably cause a total loss of privacy to No. 4, with users of the balcony sitting right above the courtyard garden, and being able to look straight into the ground floor and middle floor windows of No. 4.

We trust that the applicants will be able to find a solution to their problem which will not totally remove the privacy of users of the outside space at No. 4, as the current proposal obviously does.