Building a Better Future Plan - Representation Form

Part A - Personal Details

Please indicate whether you are completing this form yourself or if you are an agent completing this on behalf of a client

I am completing this form myself

Part A - Personal Details (Completing form on own behalf)

Please provide the following personal details.
Please note that these details are required for all representations and your information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate.
The personal data you provide will be used to ensure that representations comply with government guidance and that they can be used as part of the Local Plan examination process. More information on how we use your personal information can be found as part of the 'Planning Policy' privacy notice is available here.

Title	Mr
First Name	Gareth
Last Name	Howard

[redacted]

Please provide the following details where applicable and/or relevant

No Response

Part A - Personal Details (Agent on client's behalf)

If an agent is appointed, please provide the following information:
Please note that these details are required for all representations and your information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate.
The personal data you provide will be used to ensure that representations comply with government guidance and that they can be used as part of the Local Plan examination process. More information on how we use your personal information can be found as part of the 'Planning Policy' privacy notice is available here.

No Response

Please provide the following information about the client for whom you are completing this form on their behalf

No Response

Part B - Your representation(s)

Which part of the Building a Better Future Plan does your representation relate to?
Please provide as much detail as possible.
If you wish to make a change to the Policies Map, please comment on the corresponding p olicy, and explain what change you would wish to make. If you would be helpful if you could show this in visual form
A full list of policies and allocations can be found in the contents page(s) of the Publication Plan - you can access this document here.

Policy Number	-
Allocation Number	2
Paragraph Number	-
Page Number	95-97

Do you consider the Local Plan is ...
(Please select as appropriate)

	Yes	No
Legally compliant		X
Sound		X

Please give details of why you consider the Building a Better Plan is not legally compliant o r is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.
If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

1. It is a greenfield site, not brownfield land

The Council's own 2026 SHELAA describes the land as predominantly open fields, grazing land and horse paddocks, rather than previously developed land.

This is important because development of previously undeveloped countryside should not simply be justified by a general need for housing where more appropriate alternatives exist.

There is also a documented history of the developer previously describing the site as brownfield, which was challenged by councillors.

2. Major landscape and countryside impact

The Council acknowledges that development would introduce buildings into open countryside north of Emsworth.

The site is also close to the South Downs National Park, which the Council specifically identifies as a constraint.

An objection should therefore argue that a large housing estate would urbanise the northern edge of Emsworth and permanently alter the existing rural landscape.

3. Biodiversity and protected species

This is potentially one of the strongest objections.

The Council's 2026 SHELAA specifically identifies:

* a woodland TPO;
* Southleigh Forest SINC;
* locally occurring Bechstein's bats;
* ancient woodland adjacent to the site; and
* other important trees and hedgerows.

These are not merely aesthetic issues. The development needs to demonstrate that protected species, ancient woodland, habitats, ecological corridors and trees can be adequately protected.

There is also previous planning evidence concerning Long Copse Lane identifying concerns about bat corridors and lighting affecting bat foraging routes.

4. Traffic and highway safety

This deserves a detailed objection.

The previous proposal involved two access points from Long Copse Lane and widening parts of the lane.

The earlier planning debate recorded concerns that Long Copse Lane is narrow, lacks adequate pedestrian infrastructure in places and is unsuitable for the substantial increase in traffic associated with a large development.

You can argue that the Council should require convincing, independently verified evidence demonstrating:

* adequate road capacity;
* safe junction arrangements;
* adequate visibility splays;
* safe pedestrian routes;
* safe cycling routes;
* emergency vehicle access;
* construction traffic arrangements;
* cumulative traffic effects; and
* the impact on the Long Copse Lane/Westbourne road network.

5. Drainage and flooding

Surface-water drainage is specifically part of the proposed development.

Previous planning discussions concerning Long Copse Lane recorded concerns about drainage problems and whether they could be adequately resolved.

Please give details of why you consider the Building a Better Plan is not legally compliant o r is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.
If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

You should therefore ask the Council to require robust evidence that the development will not increase flood risk to existing properties, Long Copse Lane or neighbouring land, particularly considering the scale of hard surfacing created by hundreds of homes, roads, driveways and parking spaces.

6. Water quality and the Solent

This is another particularly important point.

Previous Council planning material concerning Long Copse Lane demonstrates that development in this area requires consideration of nutrient neutrality and impacts on the Solent's designated ecological sites. The Council's assessment identified potential effects involving water quality and the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA.

An objection should require the applicant to demonstrate that the entire development can be accommodated without causing an adverse effect on protected habitats.

7. The previous 210-home application was withdrawn

This is worth highlighting.

The Council's February 2026 SHELAA explicitly records that application APP/21/00893 for approximately 210 dwellings was withdrawn in June 2025.

That does not automatically mean a new proposal must be refused, but it gives you a legitimate reason to ask:

What material changes have occurred since the previous application that now demonstrate that the fundamental highway, ecological, landscape, drainage and infrastructure problems have been satisfactorily resolved?

If the new proposal does not resolve those matters, the Council should not simply assume that a revised scheme is acceptable.

8. EIA/environmental assessment

There is a particularly useful piece of planning history here.

In January 2019 Havant Council issued an EIA screening opinion for the Long Copse Lane proposal and concluded that the development represented EIA development. The Council identified the potential for a significant urbanising effect on the environment, including the urbanisation of undeveloped land outside the adopted urban area, proximity to the South Downs National Park, landscape effects and increased traffic.

That is a very useful historical piece of evidence for an objection.

However, don't state that this automatically means the current proposal is unlawful. The correct argument is that the Council should ensure the current proposal has been assessed under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations appropriately, taking account of its revised site boundary and current circumstances.

9. Conflict with the existing character of Long Copse Lane

The existing character of Long Copse Lane is an important planning consideration.

Previous objections recorded that development along the lane is characterised by relatively spacious properties and that a concentrated housing estate would represent a significant change in character.

You can argue that the proposal would transform the northern approach to Emsworth from a predominantly rural/open landscape into an urban extension.

10. Cumulative development

Don't consider the application in isolation.

The Council's current SHELAA identifies multiple potential development sites around Emsworth.

Your objection should ask the Council to assess the cumulative impact of Long Copse Lane alongside other existing, approved and proposed developments, particularly regarding:

Please give details of why you consider the Building a Better Plan is not legally compliant o r is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.
If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

* traffic;
* schools;
* GP/healthcare;
* sewerage;
* water supply;
* drainage;
* biodiversity;
* recreational pressure;
* local services; and
* loss of countryside.

The strongest wording for your objection

I would concentrate on planning evidence rather than simply saying “I don’t want 260 houses.”

You could structure your objection around:

“The proposal is not sustainable development because the environmental, ecological, highway and infrastructure impacts have not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be capable of mitigation.”

And particularly:

“The Council’s own February 2026 SHELAA identifies that this is a greenfield site comprising open fields, grazing land and horse paddocks, with a woodland TPO, Southleigh Forest SINC, known Bechstein’s bat activity, adjacent ancient woodland and proximity to the South Downs National Park. These constraints require exceptional scrutiny before the site can reasonably be regarded as suitable for large-scale residential development.”

One important distinction

If by “not sound or legal” you mean you want to challenge the soundness of the Local Plan allocation itself, rather than simply objecting to a planning application, that is a slightly different legal/planning argument. “Soundness” has a specific meaning in Local Plan examinations.

Havant Council is currently considering the Long Copse Lane site under the EM02a/EM02b SHELAA references, and the previous 210-home application has been withdrawn.

If you tell me the planning application/reference number or send me the link to the current Long Copse Lane proposal, I can go through the actual plans and documents and produce a strong, formal objection for you, including specific arguments on highways, flooding, ecology, bats, ancient woodland, sewage, Solent pollution, landscape, EIA, planning policy and the legal tests rather than generic objections.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.
You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

1. It is a greenfield site, not brownfield land

The Council's own 2026 SHELAA describes the land as predominantly open fields, grazing land and horse paddocks, rather than previously developed land.

This is important because development of previously undeveloped countryside should not simply be justified by a general need for housing where more appropriate alternatives exist.

There is also a documented history of the developer previously describing the site as brownfield, which was challenged by councillors.

2. Major landscape and countryside impact

The Council acknowledges that development would introduce buildings into open countryside north of Emsworth.

The site is also close to the South Downs National Park, which the Council specifically identifies as a constraint.

An objection should therefore argue that a large housing estate would urbanise the northern edge of Emsworth and permanently alter the existing rural landscape.

3. Biodiversity and protected species

This is potentially one of the strongest objections.

The Council's 2026 SHELAA specifically identifies:

* a woodland TPO;
* Southleigh Forest SINC;
* locally occurring Bechstein's bats;
* ancient woodland adjacent to the site; and
* other important trees and hedgerows.

These are not merely aesthetic issues. The development needs to demonstrate that protected species, ancient woodland, habitats, ecological corridors and trees can be adequately protected.

There is also previous planning evidence concerning Long Copse Lane identifying concerns about bat corridors and lighting affecting bat foraging routes.

4. Traffic and highway safety

This deserves a detailed objection.

The previous proposal involved two access points from Long Copse Lane and widening parts of the lane.

The earlier planning debate recorded concerns that Long Copse Lane is narrow, lacks adequate pedestrian infrastructure in places and is unsuitable for the substantial increase in traffic associated with a large development.

You can argue that the Council should require convincing, independently verified evidence demonstrating:

* adequate road capacity;
* safe junction arrangements;
* adequate visibility splays;
* safe pedestrian routes;
* safe cycling routes;
* emergency vehicle access;
* construction traffic arrangements;
* cumulative traffic effects; and
* the impact on the Long Copse Lane/Westbourne road network.

5. Drainage and flooding

Surface-water drainage is specifically part of the proposed development.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.
You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Previous planning discussions concerning Long Copse Lane recorded concerns about drainage problems and whether they could be adequately resolved.

You should therefore ask the Council to require robust evidence that the development will not increase flood risk to existing properties, Long Copse Lane or neighbouring land, particularly considering the scale of hard surfacing created by hundreds of homes, roads, driveways and parking spaces.

6. Water quality and the Solent

This is another particularly important point.

Previous Council planning material concerning Long Copse Lane demonstrates that development in this area requires consideration of nutrient neutrality and impacts on the Solent's designated ecological sites. The Council's assessment identified potential effects involving water quality and the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA.

An objection should require the applicant to demonstrate that the entire development can be accommodated without causing an adverse effect on protected habitats.

7. The previous 210-home application was withdrawn

This is worth highlighting.

The Council's February 2026 SHELAA explicitly records that application APP/21/00893 for approximately 210 dwellings was withdrawn in June 2025.

That does not automatically mean a new proposal must be refused, but it gives you a legitimate reason to ask:

What material changes have occurred since the previous application that now demonstrate that the fundamental highway, ecological, landscape, drainage and infrastructure problems have been satisfactorily resolved?

If the new proposal does not resolve those matters, the Council should not simply assume that a revised scheme is acceptable.

8. EIA/environmental assessment

There is a particularly useful piece of planning history here.

In January 2019 Havant Council issued an EIA screening opinion for the Long Copse Lane proposal and concluded that the development represented EIA development. The Council identified the potential for a significant urbanising effect on the environment, including the urbanisation of undeveloped land outside the adopted urban area, proximity to the South Downs National Park, landscape effects and increased traffic.

That is a very useful historical piece of evidence for an objection.

However, don't state that this automatically means the current proposal is unlawful. The correct argument is that the Council should ensure the current proposal has been assessed under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations appropriately, taking account of its revised site boundary and current circumstances.

9. Conflict with the existing character of Long Copse Lane

The existing character of Long Copse Lane is an important planning consideration.

Previous objections recorded that development along the lane is characterised by relatively spacious properties and that a concentrated housing estate would represent a significant change in character.

You can argue that the proposal would transform the northern approach to Emsworth from a predominantly rural/open landscape into an urban extension.

10. Cumulative development

Don't consider the application in isolation.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.
You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The Council's current SHELAA identifies multiple potential development sites around Emsworth.

Your objection should ask the Council to assess the cumulative impact of Long Copse Lane alongside other existing, approved and proposed developments, particularly regarding:

* traffic;
* schools;
* GP/healthcare;
* sewerage;
* water supply;
* drainage;
* biodiversity;
* recreational pressure;
* local services; and
* loss of countryside.

The strongest wording for your objection

I would concentrate on planning evidence rather than simply saying "I don't want 260 houses."

You could structure your objection around:

"The proposal is not sustainable development because the environmental, ecological, highway and infrastructure impacts have not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be capable of mitigation."

And particularly:

"The Council's own February 2026 SHELAA identifies that this is a greenfield site comprising open fields, grazing land and horse paddocks, with a woodland TPO, Southleigh Forest SINC, known Bechstein's bat activity, adjacent ancient woodland and proximity to the South Downs National Park. These constraints require exceptional scrutiny before the site can reasonably be regarded as suitable for large-scale residential development."

One important distinction

If by "not sound or legal" you mean you want to challenge the soundness of the Local Plan allocation itself, rather than simply objecting to a planning application, that is a slightly different legal/planning argument. "Soundness" has a specific meaning in Local Plan examinations.

Havant Council is currently considering the Long Copse Lane site under the EM02a/EM02b SHELAA references, and the previous 210-home application has been withdrawn.

If you tell me the planning application/reference number or send me the link to the current Long Copse Lane proposal, I can go through the actual plans and documents and produce a strong, formal objection for you, including specific arguments on highways, flooding, ecology, bats, ancient woodland, sewage, Solent pollution, landscape, EIA, planning policy and the legal tests rather than generic objections.

If you wish to upload any documents to support your representation, please do so below. Please note that there is a maximum file size of 50MB and you can upload a maximum of 10 files to include with your form.

No Response

Examination Hearing Session Invitation

If your representation / representations are seeking a modification to the plan, do you consi der it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?
Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in exa mination hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to p articipate.
No details on the examination hearing session(s) have yet been determined and will be ma de available upon the submission of the Building a Better Future Plan to the Planning Inspe ctorate.

No, I do not wish to participate in examination hearing session(s)

Examination Hearing Session Invitation (2)

You indicated that you wish to participate in the examination hearing session(s). Please out line why you consider this to be necessary.
Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear th ose who have indicated that they wish to participate in examination hearing session(s). Yo u may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the m atters and issues for examination.

No Response

Future Notification

Do you wish to be notified of any of the following milestones in the Building a Better Future Plan process?
These milestones include:

The Local Plan has been submitted for examination
The publication on the Inspector's Report
The adoption of the Local Plan

If you indicate that you wish to be notified, the email address you provided in Part A of the f orm will be used by the Council to notify you of these milestones.

Yes, I wish to be notified