

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

Attention: Robert Riley

1 July 2026

Objection to planning application APP/26/00363 (13 Watersedge Gardens, Emsworth PO10 7EU)
(the "Planning Proposal")

I refer to the Planning Proposal and the planning statement submitted for 13 Watersedge Gardens (the "**Applicant's Property**") in connection with the Planning Proposal (the "**Planning Statement**"). I wish to formally object to the Planning Proposal on the grounds detailed below.

In summary, the proposed extension to the Applicant's Property (the "**Proposed Extension**"): (i) is too large and overwhelming in its current format for the location, (ii) would directly cause an excessive, disproportionate and unreasonable impact on the use and enjoyment of [REDACTED] (iii) will require new foundations that would encroach upon my land (giving rise to significant risk and danger to my existing drainage and services being damaged), (iv) will significantly reduce the natural light [REDACTED] and (v) will cause an adverse impact on access to (and privacy in) [REDACTED]

The final page of the Planning Statement states that the Proposed Extension will be achieved "*without affecting the neighbouring properties*" but (as outlined below), it is not in-keeping with the adjoining properties or the established character of the immediate area, and does not respect its location.

It should also be noted at the outset that the "3D View 2" drawing contained in the "Amended proposed plans and elevations and 3D views" file submitted on behalf of the applicant within the Planning Proposal is misleading: the plans/elevations shown in this drawing do not accurately depict the close proximity of the new extension to [REDACTED] (as the Applicant's Property is shown in isolation in this "3D View 2" drawing, without context showing the relationship to my neighbouring property).

1. Adverse effect of the Proposed Extension on [REDACTED] property: close proximity to boundary and disturbance from the proposed development works

The Planning Proposal contains plans that have been slightly amended, but only to move the boundary of the Proposed Extension inwards by 50mm compared to the original plans. This is insufficient and does not address the issues caused by the new foundations required for the external wall to the Proposed Extension. The Proposed Extension would still move the existing building on the Applicant's Property disproportionately close (only 100mm inwards from the boundary line) to [REDACTED]. In particular, please note:

- (a) The Planning Statement refers to an existing garage on the Applicant's Property with the same footprint as the Proposed Extension. This does not recognise that the foundations for the Proposed Extension are entirely different from the current foundations of the existing garage on the Applicant's Property, which are built on raft foundation. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] This existing path on [REDACTED] contains a live foul drain and three service pipes (water/gas/electricity) in close proximity in made-up ground, and the deep foundation trench required for the Proposed Extension would be very problematic to construct (due to the high risk of trench movement and associated damage to the current drain and service feeds). **The significance of this from a planning perspective is that the Proposed Extension is not capable of being constructed wholly within the Applicant's Property.**

- (b) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The scaffold necessary for the Proposed Extension would also add a considerable loading presence onto the existing pathway [REDACTED] (with the associated risk of damage to the drain and services which lie within this path, as noted in paragraph 1(a) above).

- (c) The new strip foundations for the Proposed Extension would be a minimum of 600mm wide (for Building Regulations compliance) and the outer face of the new wall would be 162mm from the edge of these foundations. Trench support (minimum 75mm wide) would be required to prevent any collapse of the made-up ground underneath the existing side path on [REDACTED] (notwithstanding the issue of the live foul drain and three service feeds in this pathway, as referred to in paragraph 1(a) above). This means that the minimum clearance from the boundary between the properties to the face of the new external wall on the Applicant's Property would need to be a minimum of 250mm (not 100mm, as shown on the drawings submitted by the applicant in support of the Planning Proposal). This accords with local planning guidance requiring extensions to be distanced from existing boundaries.

- (d) The Planning Statement contains a number of factual inaccuracies and misleading statements which should also be noted in connection with the points above, for example:

- (i) Page 2 of the Planning Statement states that the Planning Proposal is "*in keeping with the design of the [REDACTED] property and therefore [does] not look out of place*". This is not correct: no other property in Watersedge Gardens has a two-storey extension in such close proximity to a neighbouring property as would be the case with the Proposed Extension (as shown in the first photo on page 1 of the Planning Statement, which demonstrates the closeness of [REDACTED] and the Applicant's Property). **Currently, the clearance between the two properties**

is over 4m at first floor level – as a result of the Proposed Extension, this distance reduces to less than 1m.

- (ii) The Planning Statement notes that there is a two-storey development at 10 Watersedge Gardens. The 10 Watersedge Gardens property is not in the cul-de-sac where the Applicant's Property is located: it is in a separate block of three dwellings at the northern end of Watersedge Gardens (approximately 90 metres from the Applicant's Property). Crucially, the two storey extension on 10 Watersedge Gardens is adjacent to allotments and not an adjoining building. Previous development at 10 Watersedge Gardens should not therefore be relevant for the Planning Proposal.

2. Adverse effect of the Proposed Extension on neighbouring property: reduction in natural light, overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy

- (a) Significant reduction of daylight:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The Proposed Extension will therefore

(i) materially reduce the natural light to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and (ii) introduce a sense of enclosure [REDACTED]

(particularly in the autumn/winter and spring months, when the sun is lower in the sky and more likely to be blocked by the higher roof/ridge line of the Proposed Extension). This loss of daylight arising from the Proposed Extension would also apply [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- (b) Considerable overshadowing, overlooking, and loss of privacy: The privacy of [REDACTED] would be materially adversely affected by the new double window at first floor level which would be included in the Proposed Extension and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] This is not currently an issue with the Applicant's Property in its current form.

[REDACTED]

For the reasons outlined above, I formally object to approval of the Planning Proposal.