

Emma Chisnall
Case Officer
Havant Borough Council Planning Dept.
Public Services Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant PO9 2AX



Date: 14 November 2017
Your ref: Planning application no: 17/01111

Dear Ms Emma Chisnall

I object to the above application on a number of points:

1. The Planning Statement is not sound and has a tendency to obfuscate where it should clarify.

It also places great significance on restating "*Relevant Planning Policies*", as if the application has gone to great trouble to comply with these policies, namely:

- a) Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011, Policy CS11 Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough.
- b) Policy CS12, Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- c) Policy CS16, High Quality Design
- d) Draft Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Beauty SPD

However, some of these, such as Policy CS11 and Policy CS12, are intended to deal with larger developments than this application so a great deal of the text is of limited relevance. The Draft Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Beauty SPD is particularly relevant but the comments made in response do not answer the criteria presented.

2. Rear elevation - excessive levels of fenestration and glazing

Even when a particular clause in the above policies has relevance, the Planning Statement does not provide an adequate response to the issues or criteria presented.

For example, *Policy CS12* clearly states, *Development will be permitted where it: 1. Carefully assesses the impact of individual proposals, and their cumulative effect, on the Chichester Harbour AONB, and its setting.* This clause is relevant to this application in terms of the increased area of glazing being proposed for the south elevation overlooking the Emsworth Harbour.

The above clause is later qualified in the '*Draft Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Beauty SPD*' (item d above) by clause 9.1 on page 11 of the Planning Statement. Clause 9.1 states:

'Understandably most proposals for new dwellings and extensions include large amounts of glazing to maximise light and, particularly in waterside locations, views across the harbour. However the visual impact of glazing, in particular the issue of reflection, is a key concern in the AONB.'

The Planning Statement responds to this with:

"The property is located to the rear of the seafront properties and is therefore only partially visible. The proposed fenestration would be of a significantly higher quality than the existing white UPVC windows and would occupy a similar proportion of the elevation as compared with neighbouring properties in the area."

If the above response is an offer of mitigation it is a poor one, for the following reasons:

- To change the white UPVC framing, (which currently blends with the existing white painted exterior, the house adjoining and that of neighbouring houses), the proposed gray aluminium framing will merely make the windows frames stand out, or in certain lighting conditions will make the glazing appear larger.
- The reassurance that the proposed fenestration will '*occupy a similar proportion of the elevation as compared with neighbouring properties in the area*', is very misleading. The existing elevation drawings show that at present on the first floor there is one glazed door and one window and on the second floor there are two dormer windows.
- The proposed elevation drawings show the first floor with four french doors opening out onto a balcony and on the second floor two floor-to-ceiling glazed doors. It is definitely a greater proportion of the elevation as compared with neighbouring properties in the area, especially its neighbour no. 4.
- Although fenestration does not normally include balconies, the balcony proposed for the first floor will have a glass front and sides across the width of the building, and the balconies proposed on the second floor will also have glass fronts and sides.

As a result the amount of reflective glass on the south elevation facing the AONB greatly exceeds anything on any neighbouring buildings and any house in the rest of the Conservation Area. The fact that there is a restricted view from the south on the sea wall is not a sufficient reason for allowing this excess of fenestration. The entire rear elevation of this building will still be visible from the water as leisure boats sail across the opening and for residents and visitors walking along the sea wall promenade and foreshore at any time of the year and for many years to come.

All this additional glasswork must be taken into account when considering the question of "*cumulative effect on the AONB*" and the Conservation Area.

It is worth remembering that this Conservation areas was upgraded to "Outstanding" status in 1977 and for this reason requires a higher level of protection than would normally be given to a standard Conservation Area on the part of the Council.

3. Front elevation – negative long term effect of contrast with existing design and styling of Orange Row courtyard buildings.

The Orange Row development was granted permission in 1979 and comprises three different groups of properties, namely:

- a row of three townhouses in three stories with single dormer windows to the north of the courtyard
- a pair of semi-detached properties in three stories joined to a mews style flat over three garages to the south of the courtyard
- a pair of semi-detached properties in three stories which face onto South Street with entrances and car parking in Orange Row.

This development with variations in building heights and massing, which reflects the juxtaposition of old buildings within the Conservation area, has been unified through the application of a design concept that made intelligent use of local architectural materials and features. These comprise the following:

- **An individual position for each property in the north and south facing groups** have been stepped slightly backwards in an easterly direction as they approach South Street. This creates, both a lively dynamic on entering the courtyard from South Street and emphasises the individual nature of each property.
- **The large courtyard and its use of silver gray granite sets** laid in a circular pattern of groups of reducing concentric circles creates an original surface and links the various properties.
- **Staffordshire blue bricks** have been used as a border to the granite courtyard, to indicate boundaries between properties, ground planting bed borders and a dwarf wall
- **White rendered stucco** on front facing walls, side and rear walls contrasts well with the brick work.
- **Black framed windows** create a positive and dramatic contrast against either white stucco walls, brickwork or the weathered lead work on either dormer windows or oriel windows
- **Window glazing** is without glazing bars creating a suitably modern effect
- **The light gray leadwork** which contrasts well with the roof tiles and white rendered walls also has detailed shaped leadwork above and below the two oriel windows and all dormer windows.
- **Black painted garage doors** with vertical tongue and grooved boards and no windows.
- **The subtle arch** at the entrance is echoed over all windows and front doors.

The whole effect is of a small but modern development that works well in its location.

The following points are listed in no particular order but support my concern about this application.

- No serious attempt is being made to harmonise the front elevation of no 5 with either the adjoining or other properties in Orange Row.
- The failure to even include no. 6 in the Planning Statement introduction to Orange Row is a concern and indicates a possible superficial assessment of the Orange Row courtyard properties.
- The absence of the adjoining properties nos 4 & 6 on the drawings for 'existing' or 'proposed' elevations makes it difficult to assess the effect of the proposals on both of these properties. This is an important consideration for views from within the courtyard and from the harbour. It is especially important for nos 4 & 5 as they have been designed as a matched pair of semi-detached houses.
- The joining of no. 5 to no. 6 which is situated over the garage block was neither an accident nor case of expediency, but a considered decision to enhance the sense of unity in the courtyard by having a single cohesive group of properties on the south side. It also means that no. 5 has a central role in the building group on the South side of Orange Row.
- Thus the front elevation of no 5 has the potential to either continue uniting this group as at present or to divide the group.
- The current proposal to change the colour scheme from white and black to off-white and grey will break the visual unity that exists within the courtyard since the development was built in 1983 and the community spirit that follows from this equal treatment of properties in each of the three groups of buildings.
- The proposal to widen the front door of no. 5 seems to contradict the advice that was given (by possibly the same planning officer) earlier this year. The occupants of nos 2 and 3 were asking about permitted window frame widths and if widening a narrow window above a front door by 150mm would be permitted, but were advised that the external appearance of nos 1 to 3 were sacrosanct. It is

puzzling that this safeguarding of the external appearance seems to apply only on one side of the Orange Row courtyard.

4. Excessive ground floor extension, balcony and studio office against a garden wall

The proposed extension will seriously disadvantage the neighbouring property (no. 4) which is already stepped back from No. 5. by 1.2 metres. The additional 1.8 metre extension will increase the difference between the two buildings to 3 metres. It will also introduce a higher flanking wall for the same distance.

The proximity of the garden office to the garden wall separating no 5 from no. 4 will now rise above the garden wall to 2.2 metres and this does not include the extra height of growth for a sedum roof.

When one includes the height of the glass side panel to the balcony above, and the height of the garden office against the wall with sedum roof, the overall effect is:

- a major loss of light to ground floor rear rooms
- the creation of a larger area of shadow with resulting loss of vitality in the garden
- loss of privacy in rear rooms and to the garden

The long term consequences of all the above will undoubtedly devalue the usefulness of the garden at no 4 at a time when such green spaces are in very short supply in this historic part of Emsworth.

Please email me if there is any further information you require.

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of Thomas Griffin.

Thomas Griffin