

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	Erection of part single storey and part two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, installation of front and rear dormer windows.
LOCATION:	8 Beach Road, Emsworth, PO10 7JS
REFERENCE NO:	APP/26/00046
APPLICANT:	Gerard and Jan Ducker
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	17/03/2026
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	26/03/2026
WARD:	Emsworth
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:	Approve with Conditions

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to a substantial detached Victorian dwelling located on the east side of Beach Road. It is constructed of traditional red brick with sash style windows, beneath a slate roof with contrast ridge. There is a half width gable to the front, and lean-to style loggia running across the front elevation. The brick work on the side elevations is browner, with feature red banding.
- 1.2 The property is set back from the road, behind a low flint wall, by about 3.8m, which is slightly further forward than its immediate neighbours. There is a single storey lean-to style garage on the south side, which extends up to the shared side boundary with number 10. The property is set up to its northern boundary and to the rear there is an original single storey lean-to addition adjacent the northern boundary. There are also foundations of a rear conservatory which was recently demolished.
- 1.3 Notably the adjacent similar style and scaled properties are set deeper within their plots such that the rear of the application site is recessed between the two storey flank walls of both number 6 and 10. Both these properties have windows in these side walls including a large first floor window that serves the stairwells, and ground floor windows that serve kitchen/dining rooms.
- 1.4 The site lies outside any current or future flood zone.

2. Planning History

03/68686/000 – Single storey side/rear extension comprising garage/store and conservatory. Permitted 23/10/2003

There were no conditions requiring the garage to be used for the parking of vehicles only.

3. Proposal

- 3.1 Erection of part single storey and part two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, installation of front and rear dormer windows.
- 3.2 During the course of determining this application amended plans have been received changing the flat roofed design to a pitched roof design and making other minor changes – such as omitting the parapet along the northern boundary and reducing the scale of the rear window slightly and adding brise soleil.

4. Policy Considerations

In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the Planning Considerations section of the report.

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS13 – Green Infrastructure

CS14 – Efficient use of resources

CS16 – High Quality Design

DM13 – Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

ENP_D1 (General Design Policy)

ENP_D2 (Height, Mass & Materials)

ENP_D3 (Layout, Form & Density)

Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011

Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable

5. Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Emsworth Residents Forum – *on original flat roofed design*

The application does not adhere to the design guidelines set out in the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan. Policy D1 b) and c) of the Neighbourhood Plan call for a Design and Access Statement which inter alia should show how the Design Checklist in the Neighbourhood Plan has influenced the proposed design, but there is no Design and Access Statement as part of this application.

Paras 41 and 42 of the Design Checklist cover rooflines and silhouettes, as well as advice against the inclusion of flat roofs. Flat roofs are not typical of the architecture in Emsworth generally and are somewhat at odds with the general grain of urban development in this part of Emsworth.

In the case of this proposal, the mass of the extension topped with a flat roof sets it at odds with neighbouring properties since it completely dominates the rear elevation of the property and has a different roofline and silhouette to the original house. This conflicts with para 45 of the Design Guidelines which calls for house extensions to be sympathetic with the style of the host house although that guidance goes on to say that modern designs would be acceptable provided they are of high quality design

On Revised Plans –

The design of the rear of the proposed extension is a distinct improvement on the original proposal since it now respects the original roof line and profile of the property. A very large extension is still proposed, however, with a somewhat uncompromising chequer board fenestration proposal which is somewhat discordant with the rest of the property or indeed surrounding properties.

Our primary concern now is with the potential for light spillage from the proposed full height atrium which would need to be have blinds or curtains to prevent light spillage. Policy D7 of the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan is designed to minimise this risk, posed both to neighbouring properties and nocturnal wildlife. External, as opposed to internal lighting in this part of Emsworth has previously given rise to complaints from neighbouring properties concerning the level of intrusive light spillage from neighbouring properties at night and it is suggested that as well as taking steps to curb light spillage from internal lighting, any external lighting scheme should also be subject to approval.

6. Publicity and Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Local Code of Corporate Governance and the Statement of Community Involvement.

Neighbouring properties consulted (as defined by the Statement of Community Involvement)

Number consulted: 11

3 letters received from 2 addresses:

Objects received
We object for the following reasons: 1) the proposed rear extension in these plans will significantly reduce the light to windows 2) the eastern aspect of the proposed rear extension is all glass. This will significantly increase the extent to which neighbouring gardens are overlooked with a corresponding loss of privacy 3) the proposed rear extension is out of character with all neighbouring properties
At present amenities of daylight and sunlight enjoyed and kitchen window provides only direct sunlight to the habitable space for the bulk of the day. Will be severely impacted by the proposed bulky high rear enlargements; bad unneighbourly design breaches BRE guidelines and adopted SPD 5.07 – 10. Existing outlook is open sky and sunshine as existing outrigger not materially above party fence line. Extra projection of much higher dingle storey enlargement with parapet will mean will look at nothing but brick walling.

<p>Increased height of single storey element significant resulting in high wall on boundary with 2 storey flank wall beyond. Adverse impact on living conditions from complete loss of sunlight, massive loss of daylight, and overbearingness will be oppressive enclosure.</p> <p>NPPF at para 131 re good design and if not then para 139 directs refusal. Not in accordance with the development plan and therefore pursuant to s38(6) of the PCPA 2004 permission should be refused. Unsustainable development.</p>
<p>Referring to the <u>revised plans</u> submitted by the applicant 03/03/26. We object for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The revised plan will significantly reduce daylight. The proposed single storey extension still blocks kitchen window affecting light. Single storey extension is close to boundary meaning outlook onto brick wall just 1.2m away. This breaches BRE guidelines and the adopted SPD.</p> <p>2) Daylight is further reduced by the proposed 2 storey flank wall beyond. This further impacts the amount of daylight received.</p> <p>3) The points raised in our agents objection dated 13/02/26 are still relevant. Including the last two paragraphs which refer to the fact that the extension breaches the Planning Framework and the development plan.</p>

7 Planning Considerations

- 7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring amenity
- (v) Parking
- (vi) CIL
- (vii) BNG

(i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

- 7.3 In terms of street scene impact the only changes to the front elevation would be a new pitched roof dormer on the front roof slope; and the re-roofing of the attached side garage with associated change in roof profile from lean-to, to flat roof with parapet.
- 7.4 Both these changes are considered acceptable in design terms – the dormer is pitched roof and small and not overly dominant, meeting the Design Guide SPD requirements. The parapet would increase the height but because it is set back from the front façade would also not be overly dominant.
- 7.5 In terms of the rear extension proposed, this is much larger, and as originally proposed with flat roof with height above eaves line, was not considered sympathetic or subordinate to the older style character of the existing dwelling. It was considered a poor design solution contrary to the adopted Design Guide SPD and policy CS16 and could not be supported.

- 7.6 The amended proposal has revised the design to include a pitched roof with gable end having a dropped eaves line of 4.5m high. This better reflects the existing rear gable feature and is more sympathetic to the host dwelling.
- 7.7 Materials are proposed to match, continuing the feature banding, and the elements of parapet with brick soldier course are also considered appropriate. Overall, the design approach of the amend plans is now considered appropriate, compliant with policy CS16, having no adverse impact on the character of the area.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring amenity

- 7.8 The central two storey element of the proposed extension would extend 6.5m in depth and be 6.6m wide, with eaves height of 4.5m. The separation to the southern boundary with number 10 would be retained at about 2.6m. The amended plans have omitted the original large first floor side window.
- 7.9 The side elevation of number 10 facing the site includes 3 windows – 2 on the ground floor, one of which is obscure glazed and the other serves a habitable room that has some additional light from linked rooms. The first-floor side window serves a large stairwell and landing. These rooms face north and currently have no direct sunlight. Outlook from these rooms will change and face the side wall and sloping roof of the proposed extension, but with a 2.6m separation, then the impacts would be limited. It is considered that due to the orientation then the light to these rooms would only be marginally impacted and from a privacy point of view the intervening fence would screen the ground floor windows from each other.
- 7.10 Number 6 to the north also has a ground floor side kitchen window and first floor large side stairwell and landing window close to the shared boundary. These however face south and do currently receive sunlight. The proposal would replace the existing sloping roof single storey extension, plus single storey detached outbuilding, which are built on the shared boundary, with a similar depth single storey extension that would be higher than existing by virtue of the change from shallow slope to flat roof. The amended plans have omitted the originally proposed parapet along this northern boundary to minimise the height on the boundary to between 2.6m and 2.8m (to account for a slight level change), with height to parapet on the rear elevation of 3.1m. The two storey eaves height of 4.5m would be set some 2.7m away from the shared boundary.
- 7.11 There is no doubt that due to the orientation, the mass and bulk of the proposed extension would have some impact on light and outlook from the windows of number 6. Therefore, a light study has been provided that demonstrates that the overshadowing of the first-floor landing would only be worse in the winter. As a non-habitable room this impact is acceptable.
- 7.12 The ground floor kitchen window is part of an open-plan large room that has a lot of light from the rear and is not therefore the sole light source to the room. The light study does indicate that this window would be subject to additional shade in the spring and autumn, but notably whilst more of the window would be overshadowed, it would not be entirely in shade. As a secondary window to a large living space the additional impact on light is considered minimal and acceptable.

- 7.13 It is also noted that the outlook from the kitchen window would change with the increased height of the replacement extension on the boundary and higher extension beyond. But regard must be had to a permitted development 4m deep single storey rear extension which could be up to 4m in height. In this case this would have a greater impact on the neighbouring kitchen window than that proposed.
- 7.14 The siting and relationship of the existing dwelling with its immediate neighbours is unusual, being recessed relative to the side walls of numbers 6 and 10. This has enabled these properties to benefit from an unhindered outlook over the garden of the application site from ground floor side windows. The more normal linear arrangement of dwellings prevents this, and any ground floor side windows would normally face a fence and flank wall. This proposal would result in the footprint of the dwellings being more closely aligned, without resulting any identified material harm to the neighbouring side windows.
- 7.15 The other area of third-party concern relates to the size and scale of the rear opening and glazing, together with the potential light spillage from such. Although the rear window would be unlikely to result in any actual additional overlooking in this established residential area, particularly as the first-floor room is recessed behind a void to the room below, it is accepted that the extent of glazing could lead to a perception of being overlooked. Amended plans have been received slightly narrowing the opening and adding brise soleil to the first-floor section and top bit of ground floor window. This would both significantly reduce the perception of being overlooked and also reduce the light spillage from within.
- 7.16 Overall it is considered that the amended proposal will not appear overbearing or have any adverse impact on outlook, light or privacy, and would have limited and acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

(iv) Parking

- 7.17 The site currently only provides 1 onsite space but to increase this would involve the demolition of the existing flint boundary wall which has a positive impact on the character of the area. The existing dwelling has 4 bedrooms, and whilst the alterations result in 6 bedrooms, this does not itself trigger the need for any additional onsite parking to serve the development to meet the adopted Parking SPD. Whilst the existing shortfall is acknowledged, this is a long-standing scenario. There are no parking restrictions outside the site.
- 7.18 Overall it is considered that the retention of the boundary flint wall is more visually important than addressing the long-term shortfall of parking at the site. In the circumstances there is no objection to the single parking space at this site.

(v) CIL

- 7.19 The net gain in floorspace is about 74 sqm so less than 100 sqm and so the development is not CIL liable.

(vi) BNG

- 7.20 With respect to BNG, as a householder application the development is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

8 Conclusions

- 8.1 The amended proposed development is acceptable in principle, is appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area and would have a limited and acceptable impact on the neighbouring properties. On this basis the proposal is recommended for approval.

9. RECOMMENDATION:

That the Interim Head of Planning be authorised to Approve with Conditions for application APP/26/00046

Conditions:

1	<p>The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>
2	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <p>Block & Location Plan – Drawing Number 25042-PL-001 Rev P05</p> <p>Proposed Ground Floor Plans - Drawing Number 25042-PL-002 Rev P06</p> <p>Proposed First Floor Plans - Drawing Number 25042-PL-003 Rev P06</p> <p>Proposed First Floor Plans - Drawing Number 25042-PL-004 Rev P06</p> <p>Proposed Elevations - Drawing Number 25042-PL-00 6 Rev P06</p> <p>Aerial Light Study - Drawing Number 25042-PL-320 Rev P01</p> <p>Reason: To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.</p>
3	<p>The external materials used shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

Informatives:

In accordance with paragraphs 38-50 of the NPPF Havant Borough Council (HBC) takes a positive and proactive approach and works with applicants/agents on development proposals in a manner focused on solutions by:

Offering a pre-application advice service, and
Updating you of any issues that may arise in the processing of your application and where possible suggesting solutions, and,

In this instance:

You were updated about issues after the initial site visit, amended plans submitted, making your proposal acceptable.