

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

PROPOSAL	Construction of an attached two-storey 1 bed (2 person) dwellinghouse with associated extended vehicular access and parking together with porch to existing dwelling (No.19).
LOCATION:	19 Corhampton Crescent, Havant, PO9 3BX
REFERENCE NO:	APP/25/00840
APPLICANT:	Mr Mihai Cicos
APPLICATION TYPE:	Full planning permission
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	12/01/2026
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	05/02/2026
WARD:	Leigh Park Central and West Leigh
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site relates to a semi-detached two storey dwelling located on the southern side of Corhampton Crescent, within an established residential area. There is a strong sense of uniformity to the Crescent with every pair of semi's being of the same gable sided design with a gap between. None of them have any first-floor side additions, with only single storey side structures and porches in evidence.
- 1.2 All of the properties are set back by about 7 to 8m and generally have low front boundaries. Some have dropped kerbs leading to side parking areas. Corhampton Crescent is distinctive in that there is only development on one side of the road; opposite there is open grassland fronting either the Hermitage Stream, Riders Lane Stream or wedge of grass before Purbrook Way. As a result, the area is quite open and spacious. Generally, the dwellings are set slightly higher than the road, which has no parking restrictions.
- 1.3 Number 19 is typical of the Crescent and is constructed of a creamy grey render/pebble dash, with all the windows having distinctive smooth surrounds. The roof is in a brown concrete tile. It has a small lean-to front porch and a flat roofed side infill outbuilding extension. There is an existing dropped kerb with hard surfaced area for parking adjacent the shared southern boundary. There is a lamp post in the pavement outside the site.
- 1.4 Due to the curve of the Crescent the site tapers with a wider frontage than rear. The rear garden extends some 19m, but it is very narrow, being only about 5m wide at its narrowest point. The rear boundaries are largely close boarded fencing with the boundary with number 21 to the south also including a wall with fence above.
- 1.5 The application property is currently vacant and is understood to have been empty since February 2024. The site lies just outside any current or future flood zone.

- 1.6 Number 21 to the south has a large flat roofed side extension that extends up to the shared boundary and also projects forwards by about 2m. This forms a side utility area and shower room. All the properties have two first floor side windows serving the landing and a bathroom.

2. Planning History

None applicable at the application site, but at number 27:

APP/17/01056 - Side extension over attached garage, addition of a front bay window.
Permitted 11/12/2017

This was for a first-floor side extension which was set back and down, and away from the side, so sufficiently recessive to be supported. However, it was not implemented.

3. Proposal

- 3.1 Construction of an attached two-storey 1 bed (2 person) dwellinghouse with associated extended vehicular access and parking together with porch to existing dwelling (No.19).
- 3.2 The proposed dwelling would extend up to the shared side boundary and align with the rear elevation. At the front, the ground floor would protrude forward by 2m, and an attached 2m deep porch is proposed for the host dwelling. At first floor level the front façade would align with the front façade of the host dwelling and be offset slightly from the side boundary to enable provision of a concealed gutter.
- 3.3 The roof would match in ridge and eaves height with a blank side gable end (albeit tapered to align with the sloping site). The front of the dwelling would have a width of 5m (when measured at first floor level) and a maximum of 6.3m (measured at ground floor level). The rear would have a width of 2.6m. Materials are proposed to match, including provision of window surround detail.
- 3.4 The proposal also includes the provision of a new dropped kerb for the host dwelling to provide 2 on site parking spaces on the frontage of number 19. The new dwelling would utilise the existing dropped kerb and one on site parking space would be provided for the new dwelling.
- 3.5 The rear garden would be subdivided in an L shape – the host dwelling would retain a 14m length garden, tapering from 6.3m wide to 3.5m wide, with the garden for the new dwelling wrapping around this i.e. it would be 2.6m wide for a length of 15m, then widen to 5m for a length of 5m.

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

CS11 (Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of
Havant Borough)

CS16 (High Quality Design)

CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)

CS21 (Developer Requirements)
CS9 (Housing)
DM10 (Pollution)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM24 (Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

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

Southern Water

Details of proposed means of foul water drainage disposal required; if any SuDs then should comply with guidelines and be maintained; plan shows build close to public sewer or within 3m; investigation of sewer required, if no greater than 225mm and no deeper than 3m then may be allowed subject to no works parallel within 500mm and where within 3m foundations to be 150mm below sewer. Build Over agreement required; request condition to protect apparatus; any new connection requires S106 connection application.

Ecologist

The application is not accompanied by any ecological information. I have therefore carried out my own non-exhaustive desk-based assessment using the application documents, online sources and GIS mapping.

The applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Statement – this is not a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment (see comments below in relation to BNG) and it is unclear what document the ‘Biodiversity Action Plan’ mentioned in the statement is referring to. This statement contains a series of proposed measures, including an unfounded statement that the proposal will result in a 100% net gain in biodiversity – no assessment of the site’s biodiversity value has been carried out. It is not clear which of these measures is to be implemented – none of the submitted plans show any of these measures. The proposed three fence-mounted nest boxes for Black Redstart are unsuitable – this species will not nest in gardens nor use boxes placed on garden fences. Three nest boxes would be welcome, but these are best placed on the dwelling, away from cats, to be used by common garden species rather than nationally very rare birds.

I can confirm that if Havant Borough Council considers the proposal to meet the requirements for Self-Build and Custom-Build CIL relief then it would indeed also be exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). I am content that the existing dwelling is not likely to be of ecological value. No further ecological survey information is necessary.

The Council very much expects new developments to provide biodiversity enhancements, but it is not possible at this stage to determine exactly what is being proposed in this regard.

Building Control

Initial comments

- 1) A Public Surface water drain runs across the front of the property and the new development maybe within 3m of the sewer Therefore consultation with Southern Water Services should be undertaken
- 2) The ground floor area requires a WC to comply with Approved Document M requirements
- 3) It is unclear the opening sizes of the first floor windows these should be large enough to comply with Approved Document B (Means of escape) requirements

Comments on amended plans

It appears comments raised previously by Building Control on the 11/12/2025 regarding this scheme have been resolved. Therefore, we have no further comments and await a submission for said works.

HCC Highways

initial response:

The applicant proposes that a new access is created which would require the creation of a dropped kerb to allow facilitate a vehicle crossover arrangement for the existing dwelling (No. 19). It is understood that parking for the proposed new dwelling can be accessed via an existing dropped kerb arrangement. The applicant should be made aware that subject to any planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority, a subsequent agreement will need to be granted by HCC as Highway Authority to undertake the revised access works on the Highway. Details of this procedure can be found via the following link:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/parking/droppedkerbs>.

It is important to note that if there are any minor utility diversions that are required to facilitate the proposed access additional costs may arise in addition to the initial application fee.

Drawing MS24503 Rev 0 has been provided to show visualisations of the proposal however these would not currently be considered sufficient for the Highway Authority to make a conclusive assessment with. The applicant should also provide drawings which show that there is sufficient visibility from the proposed new access onto Corhampton Crescent in accordance with the guidance in Technical Guidance Note TG3. The 'y' distance shall be based on the posted speed limit and a 2.0m 'x' distance set back can be utilised for a vehicle crossover arrangement. 2.0m x 2.0m pedestrian intervisibility splays should also be demonstrated in accordance with HCC TG3. This can be found at the following link: TG3 - Stopping Sight Distances and Visibility Splays

The existing street lighting column should be clearly shown on any future drawing revisions to ensure that the access arrangements do not conflict with this infrastructure.

Recommendations Having regard to the above, the Highway Authority are unable to provide a recommendation at this time until further information regarding the visibility at the access arrangement has been provided.

Comments on amended plans:

It was requested in our previous response that the applicant should provide drawings which show that there is sufficient visibility from the proposed new access onto Corhampton Crescent. This has not been provided. Notwithstanding the above, it is

conceded that the existing access would have worse vehicular visibility than the proposed access. Moreover, several properties have similar accesses along the road. The Highway Authority have undertaken an internal review of accident data and can confirm that no accidents have occurred as a result of the existing access arrangements with constrained visibility. No boundary features are proposed appear to be proposed therefore this would not have an impact on achievable visibility for both vehicles and pedestrians. Therefore, the Highway Authority is content that visibility splays are not necessary for this property in this instance.

It is noted that the proposed crossover is not aligned properly with the proposed indicative location of parking space on the right side. It is unlikely that this would occur in practice given there is ample space to park on the property in line with the proposed dropped kerb. This would prevent access at an awkward angle and driving over a full-height kerb. The Planning Authority may wish to request the applicant amends their plans for clarity prior to determination.

Recommendations Having regard to the above the Highway Authority provide no objections subject to the following informative:

S171/174 Informative: The applicant should be aware that as the proposals include the formation of a new or altered access onto the highway, these works will be required to be undertaken in accordance with standards laid down by, and under a Section 171/184 license agreement with the Highway Authority.

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.

Publicity Type	Publicity Details	Start Date	End Date	Reasons
Site Notice		19/12/2025	12/01/2026	Is advertised in the public interest

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

Number consulted: 10

1 letter received:

We would like to raise some objections:

- 1) If the new property were to be built, there is likely to be damage to foundations
- 2) There would be no space between the two buildings to allow for brickwork/rendering or maintenance to the garage wall & guttering
- 3) A two storey building would inhibit light to rooms
- 4) Due to the length of time the project would take (if it were permitted) it would cause considerable noise and inconvenience, not to mention the mess.
- 5) Storage of materials and equipment for the build would be left in the front garden

as there is no rear access, would be concerned that this is an opportunity for thieves or vandals to loiter.

We have also noticed that on the CIL (Additional Information) form, Note 7 - Existing buildings, it has been said that the property (19) has been occupied for 6 of the previous 36 months. This is incorrect - there has been nobody living there since it was purchased at auction.

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 neighbouring residential amenity and future occupants
- (iv) Parking and highways
- (v) Developers Contributions/CIL
- (vi) Biodiversity
- (vii) Compliance with the Habitats Regulations

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area where further development is considered acceptable in principle, subject to consideration of detailed development management criteria.

7.3 The Council's Five-Year Housing Land Supply, updated 1st April 2025, indicates the Borough's housing land supply position as 1.3 years with a 20% buffer applied. This shortfall engages Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF with its presumption in favour of granting permission unless there are any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against policies in the framework taken as whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places etc.

7.4 It is accepted that the proposal would result in the net gain of 1 small dwelling unit, within the main urban area of Havant, in a relatively accessible and sustainable location, making more effective use of the land. The proposal would therefore make a modest contribution to housing supply, and these benefits of the proposal must be afforded weight in the overall planning balance.

7.5 Current policies AL2 and CS17 direct development towards the built up urban areas, and encourage making the most effective use of land; and policy CS9 supports housing that achieves a suitable density that respects the surrounding landscape, character and built form. Policy CS16 seeks High Quality Design that respects its local context, and policy CS11 protects the Borough's landscapes. These policies align with the NPPF and should therefore be afforded weight in the determination of the application, as detailed below.

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

7.6 By virtue of the open space between the front of the dwelling and Purbrook Way (a main feeder road in the area), the properties 1 – 23 Corhampton Crescent are visually

prominent in the area. Their uniformity of design and spacious regular spacing contributes to the character of the area.

- 7.7 The proposed attached dwelling would disrupt this visual pattern of development by infilling the gap to the side of 19 Corhampton Crescent with a dwelling of differing proportions. This would affect the otherwise regular rhythm of the crescent and the loss of this side gap and space about the property would be harmful to the visual character of the area.
- 7.8 Policy CS16 requires new development to respect local context and clause 1 c) specifies that it should use the characteristics of the locality to inform design, including '*existing building lines, plot widths and depths, materials and proportions of windows and doors*'. The adopted Borough Design Guide SPD also encourages good design that respects local character and patterns of development. Table 4.1 on page 26 specifically identifies the gaps between buildings as important contributing factors to local character and layout. Paragraph 5.37 considers 'Side Extensions' and advises that they should be subservient to the main building and set back behind the main building line with reduced ridge line to avoid being overly dominant. Paragraph 5.38 states:
"It is important that gaps are retained between buildings. This helps form the pattern of development in an area, which in turn influences local character. Therefore, side extensions which have a negative effect on the gap between buildings should be resisted."
- 7.9 Whilst the proposal is for a new dwelling, not just a householder extension, nevertheless the same principles are considered should apply in order to achieve a design in harmony with its surroundings. The layout with regular gaps between dwellings at Corhampton Crescent forms the pattern of development of the Crescent and is considered important in contributing to the more spacious visual character of the area. The proposed development is not recessive or subservient and would completely infill the side area up to the shared boundary with number 21. This is out of keeping with the established layout and pattern of development and would result in a loss of space between properties and skyline about the roofline. This would potentially lead to a 'terracing effect' and is considered harmful to the visual appearance and character of the area.
- 7.10 Furthermore it is noted that the site is too narrow to provide a new dwelling of equal size and proportion to the host dwelling and others in the Crescent. All the properties in Corhampton Crescent have a ridge width of 6.5m wide, but the proposed width of the ridge line would only be 3.5m. Due to the tapering of the site, the proposed dwelling would only be 5.5m wide at the front and 2.6m wide at the rear (compared to the host which is 6.3m). As a result of a substandard plot width, the dwelling would appear visually narrower and contrived and be out of keeping with the strong visual uniformity of the Crescent, having a detrimental impact on the regular rhythm of the street.
- 7.11 Due to the narrowness of the site, one of the first-floor window proportions has been reduced and would not entirely repeat or match the rhythm of fenestration design found elsewhere on the Crescent. Since the windows with their distinctive surrounds are a particular feature, then the misalignment would also be visually out of keeping with the strong vernacular of the area.
- 7.12 It is also noted that due to the narrowness of the site the rear garden of the host and proposed dwellings would be particularly narrow, unusable and contrived. For the proposed dwelling it would only be 2.6m wide for some 15m, before widening out to

5m wide. For the host dwelling it would retain a 14m length garden, tapering from 6.3m wide to 3.5m wide. By virtue of the cul-de-sac curved layout, other gardens in the area do taper and narrow, but number 19's is already one of the longest and narrowest. To further subdivide it would result in a particularly restricted garden space that is out of keeping with the general pattern and character of the area. The restricted plot width is therefore considered a direct conflict with clause 1 c) of policy CS16 and results in a layout that is at variance with the pattern and character of the area.

- 7.13 Overall it is considered that the tapered site is of inadequate width to achieve an additional dwelling that respects the character and design of the Crescent. The contrived wedge-shaped plot and resultant tapered dwelling is not in keeping with the otherwise uniform rhythm and pattern of development and is considered an overdevelopment of a modest plot. This would erode the regular spacing and gap between properties to the detriment of the spacious visual appearance and pattern of the Crescent, contrary to policy CS16 and the Borough Design Guide SPD.

(iii) Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity and future occupants

- 7.14 The neighbouring property, number 21, has two first floor side windows as well as a rooflight in the single storey side addition. However, it is noted that these face north-east and serve non-habitable rooms. Whilst the additional bulk of the proposed dwelling would have some impact and no doubt result in less light reaching these rooms, the impact on residential amenity would be limited.
- 7.15 Similarly, because the proposed development would be aligned with the first floor front and rear facades, then it would not overlap the rear or be overbearing to the rear garden of number 21 or the host dwelling number 19. Due to the taper of the site, the front of the dwelling would sit slightly further forward than number 21 but given the presence of number 21's ground floor side extension, then this would also not be unduly overbearing or oppressive.
- 7.16 The single first floor rear window would serve a bathroom and be obscure glazed, so there would be no additional overlooking in this established residential area. Overall, it is considered that any harm to neighbouring amenity would be limited and insufficient to justify a reason for refusal.
- 7.17 In terms of adequacy of private amenity space, the Borough Design Guide SPD sets out a 10m rear garden minimum. The existing dwelling would retain a rear garden having a length of 14m and whilst this would be narrow, tapering to just 3.5m wide, nevertheless the overall length and area it would provide meets the SPD. This is considered to be sufficiently useable and adequate outdoor space for future occupiers of number 19 as a family dwelling.
- 7.18 The proposed dwelling would have a 15m long, but exceptionally narrow garden, being just 2.6m wide. In terms of length and mathematical area, this meets the SPD and would provide adequate outdoor space to serve the occupiers of a 1 bed dwelling. However, the narrowness is considered rather unusable and a symptom of the contrived nature of the plot. No other gardens are so long and narrow and this is considered out of keeping with the character of the area, as noted at para 7.12 above, rather than having an adverse impact on amenity.
- 7.19 To provide an adequate standard of accommodation for future occupiers then the new dwelling should meet the Nationally Described Space standards. As a two storey 1 bed 2 person dwelling the standards require a dwelling to have a minimum gross internal

floor area of 58sqm. The submitted plans indicate the proposed dwelling would meet this requirement with a floor area of 59.88sqm.

7.20 It is however noted that the existing dwelling is a 3 bed 5 person dwelling and has a floorspace of 91.08sqm. The standards require 93sqm so there is a marginal shortfall. However, as an existing older style property, the standards would not have applied at time of construction of number 19.

7.21 Overall it is considered that the proposed new dwelling would not result in any material harm to neighbouring amenity and would on balance provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation and garden space for future occupiers, in accordance with relevant standards and policy CS16.

(iv) Parking and highways

7.22 The existing dropped kerb would provide access for the parking of 1 vehicle to the front of the proposed new dwelling. Together with the cycle parking shown in the rear garden, as a 1 bed property this is sufficient to meet the adopted Parking SPD.

7.23 The existing dwelling would have alternative parking provided through the provision of an additional dropped kerb to provide on-site frontage parking for 2 vehicles. Together with the cycle parking shown in the rear garden, as a 3 bed property this is also sufficient to meet the adopted Parking SPD.

7.24 The existing lamppost is unaffected by the proposal, and the Highway Authority have confirmed no objection to the proposal. Should the entire frontage be hard surfaced for parking then this would have a detrimental affect on the visual appearance of the road. Therefore, if planning permission were to be recommended then provision of a landscaping scheme would be conditioned to ensure provision of some soft landscaping to break up the frontage and retain some of the more verdant appearance characteristic of the area.

(v) Developers Contributions/CIL

7.25 As a new dwelling the floor space created is CIL liable. The appropriate forms have been submitted, including a Self Build Exemption claim which claims the applicant will reside in the premises as his sole or main residence for 3 years following completion. However, given the recommendation for refusal, the Draft Liability Notice has not been prepared and could be done so at appeal stage if necessary.

(vi) Biodiversity

7.26 In terms of ecological information submitted this has been found by the Council's Ecologist to be inappropriate and lacking. Had the application been recommended for permission then amended details would have been requested to correct the detail of, for instance, nest boxes proposed, or a condition imposed.

7.27 In terms of Biodiversity net gain (BNG), this is now a legal requirement for planning permission introduced for small sites such as this (since 2nd April 2024). In this case the applicants have claimed an exemption from the BNG requirements due to the site being less than 0.5ha and a Self-build and custom development. This requires the individual or association of individuals to build or complete houses to be occupied as homes by those individuals. Whether the applicant is building this proposed dwelling for himself has not been evidenced and the LPA is concerned that in this instance the applicant will not be residing in the new property personally.

- 7.28 Should the self-build claim not be supported then BNG would apply to the development, unless any other exemption is claimed, but no metric has been submitted to date. Had permission been recommended then these matters would have been addressed and additional information would have been requested to validate the claim for Self-build. However, in light of the recommendation for refusal on other matters, this has not been pursued. In the absence of adequate information, it has not been demonstrated that the Self-build claim is valid, and with no BNG metric submitted, it has not been demonstrated that the development would achieve the mandatory 10% gain if necessary. As a result, the proposal is considered contrary to Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the NPPF and policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.

(vi) Compliance with the Habitats Regulations

- 7.29 In order to comply with Regulation 63 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 the application requires a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), including Appropriate Assessment (AA) as the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on several Solent European Sites due to both the increase in recreation and the decrease in water quality that would result from the proposed development of a new 1 bed residential unit.
- 7.30 The LPA operates two packages of avoidance and mitigation measures. The first is a package of measures based on the suggested scale of mitigation in the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. The second is a package of measures based on the Position Statement on Nutrient Neutral Development. The applicant has not completed the European Site Avoidance and Mitigation Checklist correctly (omitting the recreational disturbance options) and no Solent Nitrogen Budget has been submitted. Therefore, it has not been possible to undertake an HRA/AA.
- 7.31 However, given the recommendation for refusal on other matters, the relevant documents have not been requested, and therefore Natural England have not been consulted as required by the Habitats Regulations. Taking a precautionary approach to decision-making as required by Government guidance, at this stage the risk of the proposal having an adverse effect on a European site's integrity cannot be ruled out and it is therefore necessary to include the non-provision of any avoidance and mitigation packages for both recreational disturbance and impact on water quality as a reason for refusal as contrary to policies CS11, CS21 and DM24, as well as non-compliance with the Habitats Regulations. Should an appeal be lodged against the decision to refuse, then these matters can be revisited at appeal stage.

8 Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 8.1 It is acknowledged that the Council's Five Year Housing Supply (updated April 2025) is below the threshold, engaging paragraph 11 d of the NPPF, December 2024 with its presumption in favour of development unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against policies in the Framework taken as whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places etc. It is also acknowledged that the proposal would provide one new dwelling in a sustainable location making more effective use of the land, which would make a very small contribution to the Council's housing need.
- 8.2 However it is contended that in this instance the benefit of providing a single dwelling does not outweigh the harm arising from the proposed development, such that the

planning balance is not tilted in favour of the proposal. It is considered that the tapered site is of inadequate width to achieve an additional dwelling that respects the pattern and design of the Crescent. The contrived wedge-shaped plot and resultant tapered dwelling is not in keeping with the otherwise uniform rhythm and pattern of development and is considered an overdevelopment of a modest plot. This would erode the regular spacing and gap between properties to the detriment of the spacious visual appearance and pattern of the Crescent, contrary to policy CS16 of the Local Plan and the Borough Design Guide SPD.

- 8.3 It has also not been evidenced that the self-build claim for BNG purposes is valid, and without a BNG metric it has not been adequately demonstrated that the development would achieve the mandatory 10% BNG gain. Additionally, there is a lack of appropriate mitigation measures for likely significant recreational harm and impact on water quality to the Solent European Sites as specified by the Habitats Regulations, and as result the proposal is also contrary to policies CS11, CS21 and DM24. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

9. RECOMMENDATION:

That the Development Manager be authorised to Refuse application APP/25/00840

Reasons for Refusal:

1. Development of the small and tapered site in the manner proposed for an additional dwelling would result in a cramped and contrived development out of keeping with the otherwise uniform rhythm and pattern of development in Corhampton Crescent. The loss of the regular spacing and gap between properties would be detrimental to the visual appearance and character of area, contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Borough Design Guide SPD and NPPF.
2. The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding claim for BNG purposes has not been adequately evidenced as valid. Without such a valid claim, or other claim for an exemption, the development would not be exempt from the requirement to deliver biodiversity net gain. No BNG metric has been provided and there is therefore insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal would be capable of delivering the mandatory 10% gain if necessary. As a result, the proposal is considered contrary to Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, NPPF and policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011.
3. In the absence of a Habitats Regulations Assessment and suitable agreement to secure appropriate mitigation measures, the development would be likely to have a significant adverse effect on the Solent European Sites. The development would be likely to result in increased recreational pressures from future residents and have an impact on the water environment, and as such, it is contrary to Policy DM24 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations Plan) 2014, Policies CS11 and CS21 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024.

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 requested and forthcoming to overcome Building Regulations and Highway consultee comments, but your application is considered unacceptable for the reasons set out in this Decision Notice.