

Havant Borough Council
Planning Department
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

Our ref: 6492

Sent by email: planning.development@havant.gov.uk

06 January 2026

Dear Planning,

**Planning Application Reference: APP/25/00936 – Proposed Dwelling
Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)**

We (Bell Cornwell LLP) write on behalf of our Client, [REDACTED] to **strongly object** to the above proposals for the erection of a 2-storey detached dwelling within the existing garden of 4 South Close, Havant, PO9 2TD. [REDACTED] are very concerned about the impact of the Proposed Development on their property.

No 4. South Close occupies a double plot, comprising No 4 and the adjacent land that would have occupied No 5. South Close. No. 4 has been significantly extended in recent years, including the addition of extensions to the main property, 4 outbuildings, pool and significant areas of hardstanding. This has resulted in the property encroaching into the plot of No 5 if it had existed and relying almost entirely on this area for use as traditional garden space.

The subdivision of the site and erection of a new property will further erode the existing amount of garden afforded to the main property, resulting in an awkward built arrangement that will further remove the



sense of space that defines the character of this part of Havant and lead to a poor relationship with the neighbouring properties, [REDACTED]

Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant part of the Development Plan is *The Core Strategy (2011)*. The main policy of relevance in this case, is Policy CS16 (High Quality Design). Additionally, the Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Parking SPD are material considerations.

Character of the Surrounding Area

Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy states that ***all development should use the characteristics of the locality to help inform the design of the new development including heights, massing, existing buildings lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors.*** The Design SPD echoes the same sentiment.

The surrounding area is residential in nature and defined by principally detached properties on substantial plots with ample green space and deep driveways. The erection of an additional dwelling at this location results in a building that sits awkwardly within its context, resulting in a cramped garden and a property that is located uncomfortably close to the boundaries with the neighbouring properties. This fails to comply with Policy CS16, resulting in a cramped arrangement that does not reflect the character of the surrounding area.

The proposed choice of materials is similarly out of character, proposing a silver/grey vertical cladding that is not considered to form part of the established character of this area. Again, the proposal fails to accord with Policy CS16.

Impact on Amenity of Neighbourhood

Part 1e) of Policy CS16 requires that ***all new development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours through smell, the loss of privacy, outlook, noise and overlooking.***

The siting of the proposed dwelling will result in an unduly prominent 2-storey brick wall [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The resultant bulk and mass will create an unneighbourly form of development that will harm the visual amenity and amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed [REDACTED]



The introduction of windows within the side elevations of the proposed dwelling, exacerbated by the proposed siting of the property on the neighbouring boundary, is considered to introduce overlooking directly into the adjacent properties which will similarly amount to an intrusive and unneighbourly form of development. This is considered to result in unacceptable harm to amenity which fails to comply with Policy CS16.

Car Parking / Site Access

The Havant Parking SPD requires sufficient space to be provided for residential car parking with sufficient turning facilities.

The access for the dwelling is proposed to be shared with the existing access afforded to No. 4 South Close. Similarly, the car parking arrangement is located immediately next to the entrance of No. 4 and again relies on shared access, with the two car parking spaces requiring users to reverse out onto the shared access.

This is an odd relationship which is likely to cause issues with access and egress of vehicles, with vehicles needing to queue on the Close if both neighbours were trying to leave or enter their property at the same time. This is considered to fail to provide a satisfactory car parking and access arrangement, in discordance with the requirements of the Parking SPD.

Summary

Overall, the proposed development is considered to amount of the overdevelopment of the existing plot, resulting in a cramped site layout that will cause harm to the character of the area and amenity of neighbouring properties, [REDACTED] Accordingly, the Development fails to comply with Policy CS16 of The Core Strategy, the Design Guide SPD and the Parking SPD and should be refused.

Should you require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. We have set out below a schedule of photographs which support our assessment and demonstrate the harm which will result from the development.

Yours Faithfully,

BELL CORNWELL LLP

[REDACTED]



BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI
Principal Planner

