

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address:	22 Bedhampton Hill, Havant, PO9 3JW		
Proposal:	Single storey rear and side extension.		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission		
Application No:	APP/25/00436	Expiry Date:	31/07/2025
Applicant:	Corneliu Ungurean	Case Officer:	Robert Riley
Agent:	Mark Holman HRP Architects		
Ward:	Bedhampton		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises of a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in Bedhampton. To the front of the dwelling is parking space, to the side is a side access gate to access the rear garden. To the front of the house the house features brickwork and at the first floor level, the house features white render. To the side, the house is white rendered. The front elevation features a two-storey bay addition, with tilework and cladding.
- 1.2 The application site is in an urban and residential area, with the character of the street featuring a mix of designs and material finishes.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant history.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Single storey rear and side extension with 4No rooflights.

Officer comment: *The dwelling was installing a new roof as of the site visit, as this features similar/same materials to the existing roof this falls under permitted development rights. A certificate B has been served on No.20 Bedhampton Hill during the application process.*

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Liz Fairhurst - Bedhampton

No comments received.

Councillor Michael Lind

No comments received.

Councillor Phillipa Gray

No comments received.

HBIC

Within 50m: Notable and Protected Species: Common Pipistrelle in flight.

Officer comment: *The extension would be attached to brickwork and painted brickwork where bats would not typically be located, it is not anticipated that the proposal would be harmful to protected species.*

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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 properties
- (iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- (v) Ecology
- (vi) Parking

(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 The application is for a wrap-around side and rear extension to the dwelling. The works would be readily visible on the streetscene with regards to the side extension aspect of the proposed wrap-around extension.
- 7.4 The works to the side of the existing dwelling would feature a proposed approximate height of 2.9 metres a proposed approximate width of 2 metres and a proposed depth of approximately 7.95 metres. The works to the rear of the existing dwelling would replace a rear canopy, and would feature a proposed approximate height of 3 metres a proposed maximum approximate width of 7.6 metres and a proposed depth of approximately 4 metres.
- 7.5 Whilst most properties on the streetscene do not feature side extensions, it is noted that both neighbouring properties; No.24 to the southwest side and No.20 to the northeast side feature a side extension. With No.20 the semi detached property attached to the application site, featuring a side extension the proposed side extension is not considered to be out of keeping to detract from the pair of semi detached properties. The side extension is considered to be of an appropriate size to the dwelling.
- 7.6 Regarding terracing, officers note that the side extension would not accord with the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD's guidance for a 1 metre gap between single storey extensions and the boundary, *"Single storey extensions should therefore be at least 1 metre from the boundary with adjacent properties"*. However, officers note that the side extension element of the works could be undertaken by utilising permitted development rights, were this extension not attached to the rear element of the works. In addition a gap of 0.8m would be retained to the boundary with No.24. With regards to this, officers consider that the side extension would be regarded as having an acceptable impact upon the character of the dwelling and upon visual amenities.
- 7.6 The proposed rear extension element of the works would replace a rear canopy and is considered to be of an appropriate and subservient size to the dwelling and would not be visible on the streetscene and is considered acceptable with regards to the character of the dwelling and upon visual amenities.
- 7.7 Officers do note that the works are similar to what could be achieved under permitted development rights and note there are no planning conditions imposed on this site. The proposed side extension element of the works would appear to comply with Class A of SCHEDULE 2, PART 1 of the (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) were it not to be attached to the rear element of the works. The rear extension element would be reasonably similar, outside of the marginal overhang onto No.20's boundary and that it is proposed to be approximately 4m against the allowance of 3 metres,

Materials

- 7.8 The works would feature brickwork for the external walls and single ply membrane for the roof which is considered acceptable.

- 7.9 The design and appearance of the proposal is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011. It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.10 To the southwest and northeast sides of the application site are properties at No.24 Bedhampton Hill and No.20 Bedhampton Hill. Due to proximity, the main impact to assess would be in regard to these two properties. With regards to the location, scale and nature of the works, officers consider properties to the front and rear of the application site to be acceptably impacted by the works.

No.24 Bedhampton Hill

- 7.11 To the southwestern side of the application site is No.24 Bedhampton Hill. Regarding overlooking concerns, there would be a side window in the side extension element, however it would face a flank wall which is considered acceptable. There would be rear fenestration, however this would face the rear garden of No.22 Bedhampton Hill and oblique views would face boundary treatment which is considered acceptable. In light of this, No.24 is considered to be acceptably impacted regarding overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, the side extension element would face No.24's side extension which features no clear windows, and with regards to this, the side extension would have an acceptable impact regarding overshadowing and overbearing impacts. The rear extension element would not extend beyond No.24's side extension, and officers consider that there would be a limited and acceptable impact regarding overshadowing and overbearing impacts resultant from the rear extension were it to be permitted.

No.20 Bedhampton Hill

- 7.12 To the northeastern side of the application site is No.20 Bedhampton Hill. Regarding overlooking, the side fenestration of the wrap-around extension would not face No.20 which is considered acceptable. There would be rear fenestration, but this would face the rear garden of No.22 and oblique views would face boundary treatment which is considered acceptable. In light of this, No.20 is considered to be acceptably impacted regarding overlooking concerns. Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns, The side extension element of the works would not impact this property due to shielding from the rest of the property. The rear extension element would only extend approximately one metre beyond the rear elevation of No.20. With consideration of this minor protrusion, overshadowing and overbearing impacts are considered to be limited and acceptable.
- 7.13 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would not appear overbearing or lead to a loss of light, outlook or privacy and would have limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy) 2011. It is noted no letters of objection were received with respect to the scheme.

(iv) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 7.14 It is noted that this householder application is exempt from the requirements relating to Biodiversity Net Gain.

(v) Ecology

- 7.15 The application site has been located to be within 50 metres of a notable and protected species; Common Pipistrelle in flight. However, as the extension would be attached to brickwork and painted brickwork where bats would not typically be located officers consider unacceptable impacts to this protected species unlikely.

(vi) Parking

- 7.16 The works may reduce potential parking space, however as the driveway to the front of the dwelling is approximately 7 metres deep and features a width of approximately 9.4 metres it meets the requirements of the Havant Parking SPD and is considered acceptable.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The 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 it is recommended for approval.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Place be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/25/00436 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

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.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing Number: 9178 01 Rev A: EXISTING PLANS (WITH REAR CANOPY)
AND PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN: Uploaded 15/07/2025

Email by Mark Holman named PROPOSED ROOF MATERIALS dated 7th July 2025

Drawing Number: 9178 02 REV A: PROPOSED DRAWINGS: Uploaded 29/05/2025

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

- 3 The external materials used shall be as indicated on the submitted forms and hereby approved plans and the Email by Mark Holman named proposed roof materials dated 7th July 2025, or shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

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.