

Friday, 31 July 2026

Objection to Application APP/26/00363

Site Address: 13 Watersedge Gardens, Emsworth, PO10 7EU

Description: Demolition of existing garage and replacement with 1.5 storey side extension with a front and rear dormer. Render the existing and proposed, dark grey windows, new porch and extended canopy to replace the existing structure over the front window.

Introduction:

This representation is submitted on behalf of [REDACTED] to object to the above application.

The grounds of objection are set out below, with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024), the Havant Borough Core Strategy (March 2011), the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, and the Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan.

The application seeks the demolition of the existing garage at No. 13 and its replacement with a 1.5 storey side extension incorporating a front dormer and a rear dormer, together with the rendering of the existing and proposed elevations, the replacement of windows in a dark grey finish, a new porch, and an extended canopy in place of the existing structure over the front window.

The proposal would introduce a substantial two storey element [REDACTED] in a position currently occupied by a single storey garage.

No. 11 has a number of side facing windows that provide light to habitable and other rooms, and which face directly onto the application site. These comprise two windows on the elevation facing No. 13 [REDACTED]

Discussion of Scheme:

Loss of light, outlook and overbearing impact

The proposed 1.5 storey extension would be built adjacent to the boundary with No. 11, directly opposite the windows described above. The Havant Borough Design Guide SPD advises that side extensions should generally be no closer than two metres from a shared boundary, precisely because two storey additions of this kind are capable of causing overshadowing and other adverse effects on neighbouring properties that a single storey addition would not (paragraph 5.38). The fact that the extension follows the existing garage footprint does not overcome this concern, since a single storey garage and a two storey extension have a fundamentally different relationship with the boundary in terms of height, mass and enclosure.

The Design Guide also sets out clear tests for assessing daylight and outlook impacts, including a 25 degree vertical angle test from a point two metres above ground level on the facing facade, and a combined 45 degree plan and section test for the loss of light to existing windows caused by an extension. Given the height and proximity of the proposed two storey element to [REDACTED] windows at No. 11, it is clear that the extension would fail these tests - resulting in a noticeable and unacceptable reduction in daylight, together with an oppressive and overbearing sense of enclosure [REDACTED]

The applicant's planning statement seeks to dismiss this impact on the basis that the affected windows serve a WC and a hallway landing rather than a principal habitable room. This distinction does not remove the harm. The Havant Design Guide recognises that daylight to kitchens, in particular, is an important consideration (paragraph 5.07), and in respect of the landing window, recent decisions of the Planning Inspectorate confirm that harm to outlook from a window serving a landing or hallway is nonetheless a material consideration. In a recent appeal decision concerning a two storey side extension close to a shared boundary (Appeal Ref 6004130, 23 The Dell, Westbury on Trym, dismissed 8 April 2026), the Inspector found that notwithstanding the space served was a hallway, the window was there intentionally and the proposal would detrimentally harm the occupiers' outlook and their experience of that space. The same reasoning applies with equal force to [REDACTED] window at No. 11, which is its only source of natural light [REDACTED]

Overlooking from the rear dormer

The proposed rear dormer sits directly adjacent to the boundary with No. 11 and would introduce a high level, close range vantage point providing direct and uninterrupted views over the neighbouring garden. This would result in a material increase in overlooking and a strong perception for the occupiers of No. 11 of being overlooked from a position immediately next to their boundary.

The Design Guide recognises that new development should be designed to concentrate habitable accommodation away from neighbouring properties where overlooking would otherwise be an issue, and that new windows and dormers should not have an adverse effect on the privacy of neighbours (paragraphs 5.06 and 5.50). Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy likewise requires that development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through loss of privacy or overlooking (Policy CS16, criterion 1e). The rear dormer as proposed conflicts with both.

Visual Amenity:

Watersedge Gardens is characterised by a consistent rhythm of detached dwellings separated by clear gaps, which allow views through to the rear and contribute to the spacious, open character of the cul-de-sac. The Design Guide identifies the retention of gaps between buildings as an important element of local character, explaining that side extensions which have a negative effect on the gap between buildings should be resisted, and that, in general, an extension should not be closer than two metres from the boundary with a neighbouring property (paragraph 5.38).

The Design Guide further explains, at paragraph 4.48, that where the gaps between buildings are eroded by extending into them, the resulting increase in built form obscures views and breaks the regular rhythm created by the existing pattern of development. The proposed extension would be built against the boundary with No. 11. By extending into and effectively closing that gap, the proposal would produce a terracing effect that is at odds with the established building line and would be harmful to the architectural rhythm of the street.

The Neighbourhood Plan's own design guidance further states that development outside the town centre should be designed to give an impression of spaciousness with opportunity for green landscape between buildings, and that house extensions should be sympathetic to the style of the host house (paragraphs 43 and 45 of the Design Checklist). A side extension that closes the gap to the No. 11 and introduces a terracing effect is contrary to both of these principles. Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy is also engaged, since it requires new development to respond positively to existing local character, including building lines, plot widths and the pattern of the surrounding area (Policy CS16, criteria 1a and 1c).

The applicant's planning statement points to other garage conversions along Watersedge Gardens and a two storey development at No. 10 as evidence that the proposal would not look out of place. These examples are not comparable. Garage conversions are typically carried out under permitted development rights and are of a single storey, whereas the current proposal is a two storey extension requiring express planning permission and falls to be assessed against the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework on its own facts.

The extension at No. 10 is in a totally different context to the current application; that dwelling's side elevation faces on to the allotments to the west, and does not close the gap between properties or result in any terracing effect.

Further to this, the introduction of a front dormer, in combination with the new porch, extended canopy and the rendering of the elevations, would materially alter the appearance of the principal elevation of No. 13 as seen from the street. Combined with the wider changes proposed to the front of the dwelling, the front dormer would add to the incongruous and unbalanced appearance of the development when viewed from Watersedge Gardens.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook and an overbearing impact on the [REDACTED] windows at No. 11 Watersedge Gardens, would give rise to unacceptable overlooking from the rear dormer, and would cause harm to the character and appearance of Watersedge Gardens by closing the gap between No. 13 and No. 11 and introducing an incongruous front dormer.

The application is contrary to the policies identified above and should be refused.