

ONLINE COMMENT

on Planning Application to
Fareham Borough Council

Submitted By:

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

Application: **P/26/0935/LB**

Single storey front and rear extensions including works to the interior
The Orangery Hook Park Estate, Hook Park Road Warsash SO31 9LH

COMMENT:

Submitted Online: 11/09/2026

Internet Ref: OWPC43796

We make the following objections to the above planning application

1. Design. This proposal does not maintain the architectural integrity of structures already abutting the north side of the listed wall. The style of roof being hipped rather than a simple mono pitched roof is not reflective of the current roof styles. We refer you to planning application P12/0954/FP dated 10/11/2012 for 1 Dormy House. This application was refused because the planning officer stated the proposed flat roof departed from the established and consistent design of existing additions abutting the listed wall. He stated that this proposal would be harmful to the character of the existing building, the setting of the listed buildings and the walled garden and as such contravened Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Fareham Core Strategy. The previously approved plan P/24/1030 dated 04/11/2024 for extension of the Orangery on the north side of the wall respected the established and consistent design of existing structures abutting the listed wall and was of appropriate size and depth.
2. Size. This proposal doubles the living area of the Orangery and dwarfs other structures abutting the north side of the wall. The reason given for the size is to create a usable living room. Plan/24/1030/LB showed the living area to be in the Orangery itself and this substantial space should be sufficient and negate the need for such an inappropriate structure abutting the wall. The previously accepted plans described an extension that complements the established pattern for extensions abutting the listed wall and was an appropriate size and depth. The size of the proposed extension does not respect the historic importance of the listed wall and would not reflect the style of structures which would

historically have adjoined the enclosed structure of a walled garden. The size of the proposed extension cannot be justified by comparing it to a detached lightweight temporary structure which did not benefit from planning consent.

3 The chimney. The proposal for a chimney so close to an avenue of Hornbeam trees must constitute a fire risk. It would be 8 metres from the front of Hook Park House and below the roofline of the house. Smoke would therefore be blown directly into Hook Park House.

4. Loss of light to Hook Park House. The proposed structure would result in a high and long wall being built 8 metres from the front of Hook Park House reducing the amount of light to the front rooms of the house