DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	**Erection of two-storey and single-storey extensions, associated roof alterations and external remodelling/rendering of the existing dwelling.**
LOCATION:	81 Mitchell Road, Havant, PO9 3QA
REFERENCE NO:	APP/26/00605
APPLICANT:	Mr Matthew Papaspyrou
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	18/09/2026
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	15/10/2026
WARD:	Bedhampton
CASE OFFICER	Robert Riley

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

1. Site Description

1.1 The application site comprises of a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Bedhampton. Parking is provided to the front and side of the dwelling, and it is noted the dwelling is extended with a small rear and side extension/ attached outbuilding. To the rear of the dwelling is the rear garden which features a grey clad outbuilding and a black canopy/pergola structure.

1.2 The application site is in an urban and residential area, with similar styled dwellings in evidence, however, some properties have extended to the side with one and two storey side extensions.

2. Planning History

2.1 No history.

3. Proposal

Erection of two-storey and single-storey extensions, associated roof alterations and external remodelling/rendering of the existing dwelling.

Officer comment:

3.1 The proposal has been amended to reduce the width of the northern single storey rear extension and to replace a rear bay window to be a flush window following concerns upon residential amenity.

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 2026, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the Planning Considerations section of the report.

National Planning Policy Framework, August 2026
DM3 - Determining development proposals
DM6 - Use of planning conditions and obligations
S3 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
S4 - Principle of development within settlements

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
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
N/A

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

Councillor Michael Lind	No comments received.
Councillor Philippa Gray	No comments received
Councillor Jason Beal	No comments received.

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: 6

Number of representations received: 0

Material planning considerations are addressed in Section 7.

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) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
(iii) Impact upon residential amenity
(iv) Highways/parking provision
(v) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
(vi) Human Rights Act
(vii) Equalities and Diversities

(i) Principle of Development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, i.e. within a 'Settlement' for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), August 2026, where further development is considered acceptable in principle, subject to consideration of detailed development management criteria.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

Two-storey side extension

7.3 Regarding two-storey side extensions, the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD states:

"*Two storey side extensions should be set back behind the main building line. The ridge height of the extension can also be reduced to below the height of the main ridge so that the extension does not dominate the main frontage. The angle of the roof should be the same as or similar to the existing roof. Flat-roofed extensions are not normally acceptable, particularly at two storey height. In general, the extension should not be closer than two metres from the boundary with neighbouring properties*".

7.4 It is noted that the two-storey side extension would accord with the design guidance of being set down and back and featuring a similar roof angle and not featuring a flat roof, which is considered as acceptable. It is noted that it would not however accord with the guidance of featuring a two-metre separation distance from the boundary, with the extension featuring an approximate 40 cm separation from the boundary with No.79 Mitchell Road. However, it is noted the Mitchell Road street scene, features numerous two-storey extensions close to the boundary as seen with Nos 52 Mitchell Road, No.73 (though this is a one and half storey extension) and No.61 Mitchell Road and whilst there would be an increase of terracing, this would not be so severe with regard to the existing street scene to warrant the refusal of this planning application.

Two-storey rear extension

7.5 Whilst the proposed two storey rear extension would be similar in depth to the existing depth of the dwelling, it would feature a pitched roof and lower ridge height promoting subservience in design to the original dwelling and featuring an acceptable roof form. Moreover, it would be to the rear of the dwelling whereby impacts upon visual amenities are reduced. With regards to this, officers consider the proposed two storey rear extension element of the works to have an acceptable impact upon visual amenities and consider this as acceptable.

Single-storey rear extensions

7.6 The 2 No single storey rear extension elements of the works would feature a modest proposed height, and regarding their proposed depth are considered to be subservient features to the original dwelling.

Site coverage

7.7 It is noted that a significant amount of the plot would feature extensions and outbuildings, however, the depth of the rear extensions are not dissimilar to what could be done under permitted development rights and moreover half the garden can be covered by outbuildings under Class E of the GDPO. With regards to this, the level of footprint on site which would feature developments is similar to what can be done under permitted development rights and is not considered to comprise a reason for refusing this planning application.

Materials

7.8 The pitched roof materials would match the existing dwelling which is considered as acceptable. The external walls have been annotated to feature render, of which the agent has clarified by email that this would be cream/off-white coloured render, which with reference to the render on the street scene is considered as acceptable.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

7.9 With regard to the proposed location and scale of the works, properties to the front and rear of the application site are considered to be acceptably impacted. The proposed changes of external materials are considered to have an acceptable impact upon neighbouring properties.

No.79 Mitchell Road

7.10 The northern single storey rear extension would have minimal impacts upon this property due to shielding from the other elements of the works. The two-storey side extension whilst featuring a limited approximate 40cm separation distance from the shared boundary would face 2No first floor side windows and the 1No ground floor side window and side door appear to be obscured, and impacts are considered to be limited and acceptable There would be ground floor fenestration, however this would not face any clear windows which is considered as acceptable. There would be rear fenestration, however this could only provide oblique views which is considered as acceptable.

7.11 Regarding the single storey rear extension and two storey rear extension it is also noted that there is 1No rear canopy, whilst there would be an increase of overshadowing and overbearing it is noted, that No.79's main rear amenity space would be to the rear of their dwelling, and the works would primarily impact to the side of the dwelling where impacts would be lessened. Whilst it is noted that there would be an impact it is not considered so significant to warrant the refusal of this planning application. Regarding overlooking, there would be rear fenestration to these elements of the proposal but any views would be oblique of No.79 and this is considered as acceptable.

No.83 Mitchell Road

7.12 The proposed two-storey side extension would have minimal impacts upon this property due to shielding from the existing dwelling. The southern single-storey rear extension would also have an acceptable impact upon this property due to shielding from the northern two-storey and single-storey rear extensions. Regarding the two-storey and northern single-storey rear extension elements of the works, there would be one first-floor side window facing this property; however, this would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and only openable above a minimum height of 1.7 metres from finished floor level, which is considered acceptable. At ground-floor level, the rear fenestration would face No. 81's rear garden, which is considered acceptable. The rear fenestration of the first-floor extension would, at most, provide oblique views of No. 83's garden, which is also considered acceptable.

7.13 The proposed two-storey side extension would have minimal impacts upon this property due to shielding from the existing dwelling. The southern single storey rear extension would also have an acceptable impact upon this property due to shielding from the northern 2 storey and single storey rear extensions. Regarding the two-storey and northern single storey rear extension elements of the works, there would be 1No side window at first floor level facing this property, however this would be conditioned to be obscure and only openable at a minimum of 1.7 metres from finished floor level and this is considered acceptable. Regarding rear fenestration, at ground floor level this would face No.81's rear garden which is considered as acceptable. The rear fenestration of the first-floor extension would at most provide oblique views of No.83's garden but as this would be oblique this is considered as acceptable.

7.14 Regarding overshadowing and overbearing concerns from these extensions, a 45 degree angle test as found in figure 5.12 of the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD regarding depth and height has been provided during the application process. The proposal would need to fail both to be considered to have an unacceptable impact regarding overshadowing. The proposal would fail the depth test but would meet the height test and overshadowing impacts are considered as acceptable. To reduce a sense of enclosure, the approximate 4.5-metre-deep northern single storey extension has been amended to be approximately 90cm from the shared boundary. With reference to the northern single storey rear extension and two storey rear extension, on balance there is not considered to be an unacceptable increase in the sense of enclosure.

7.15 Consequently, on balance it is considered that the proposal will 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) <u>Highways/parking provision</u>

7.16 The application would increase occupancy of the dwelling from 3 to 4 bedrooms and would reduce potential parking space to the side of the dwelling. A parking plan has been provided which shows that 3 parking spaces would still be able to be accommodated to the front of the site which is considered as acceptable and the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and The Havant Parking SPD and the proposal is considered acceptable regarding parking provision.

(v) Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

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

(vi) Human Rights Act

7.18 The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act, and in particular Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Act itself. This Act gives further effect to the rights included in the European Convention on Human Rights. In arriving at this recommendation, due regard has been given to the applicant's reasonable development rights and expectations which have been balanced and weighed against the wider community interests, as expressed through third party interests, the Development Plan and Central Government Guidance.

(vii) Equalities and Diversities

7.19 This application has had due regard to Section 149 of the Equality Act with regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty and it has been concluded that the application does not cause discrimination on the grounds of gender, race and disability.

8 Conclusion

8.1 This proposal has been assessed against the recently updated NPPF, August 2026 and the development plan. The proposed development is acceptable in principle, is appropriate in terms of design and its impact on the character of the area and on balance 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 Planning and Growth** be authorised to **Approve with Conditions** for application APP/26/00605 subject to the following conditions:

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: 26-0809 D06 Rev6: Proposed Section A-A: Uploaded 09/10/2026

   Drawing Number: 26-0809 D01 Rev6: Existing and Proposed Block Plans and Location Plan: Uploaded 09/10/2026

Drawing Number: 26-0809 D05 Rev6: Proposed Elevations: Uploaded 09/10/2026

Email By Dave Chamberlain named: Email confirming render colour: Uploaded 09/10/2026

Drawing Number: 26-809 D03 Rev6: Proposed Ground, First Floor & Roof Plans: Uploaded 09/10/2026

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, 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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, prior to first occupation of the extensions hereby permitted the window in the first floor on the northern elevation serving the shower room shall feature to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 4 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall be non opening to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level and shall be retained as such thereafter.

   Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

1. In accordance with Policy DM3 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.