

5, Woodcroft Gardens,
Lovedean,
WATERLOOVILLE,
Hampshire,
PO8 9PZ

Tina Pickup
Case Office Development Control
Havant Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Centre Road
HAVANT
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

3rd December 2018



Dear Ms Pickup,

**RE: PLANNING APPLICATION No 18/01107 - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
TO LAND ADJACENT TO 97a LOVEDEAN LANE, WATERLOOVILLE, PO8
9RN**

I refer to the posted notice regarding the above application proposing to Erect 3xNo. 4 bed dwellings including parking and landscaping, on land to the rear of 97A Lovedean Lane, Waterlooville, PO8 9RN

I consider that the following should be considered during the Planning Application hearings:

- I understand from surveys in 2002 (more of later), that a number of the trees in the woodland have a preservation order on them. As it is understood that the Council has not got a proper record of which trees are concerned, it is inevitable that trees with a preservation order will be damaged and/or killed. Some of the oaks are thought to be over 100 years old and the boundary hedge to the copse is thought to be of greater age. Looking at old maps it may also be thought that this woodland and James Copse woodland are the last vestiges of the old Forest of Bere, that stretched from Wickham to beyond Clanfield.
- Green woodpeckers, bats (a protected species I believe) and other significant wildlife frequent the woodland, hedgerow etc. The undergrowth within the woodland can be considered virgin in that there is no right of way through them and the destruction of this habitat is unnecessary.
- There is little enough forested land in the area and to take more for such a development is considered inappropriate, especially after planning consent was originally refused in 2002, is this a case of try again after 16 years?
- Water and especially sewage facilities originally built to service one property with an occupancy of perhaps 2 adults and 2 or 3 children would have to be "spurred" to cope with the outfall from more substantial and large family

dwellings, possibly occupied by up to 8 adults and 10 children, plus the homes originally built under planning application 02/58832/002

- Traffic occupancy and throughput in the immediate area would again increase, probably up to another 8 or even 9 vehicles for the proposed 3 new properties, causing even more grief at the junction of Lovedean Lane, Woodcroft Lane and Milton Road. This junction suffers from severe problems, what with a Tesco shop and Woodcroft School in Woodcroft Lane.
- This is a further step in the elimination of the entire copse/wooded area that commenced by stealth in 2002.

I believe that the points made above, taken singly give good reasons to refuse planning consent for the proposed development. Taken as a whole, I believe there are overwhelming reasons to refuse consent.

I enclosed my letter regarding the original proposals in 2002. I realise that the points made today almost repeat what I wrote in 2002, but they are just as relevant.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Tony Wise', written in a cursive style.

Tony Wise

Enc:

Letter dated 21st July 2002 RE: PLANNING APPLICATION No 02/58832/002 - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT TO LAND ADJACENT TO 97 LOVEDEAN LANE, WATERLOOVILLE, PO8 9RN



5, Woodcroft Gardens,
Lovedean,
WATERLOOVILLE,
Hampshire,
PO8 9PZ

Mrs J A Batchelor
Head of Development Control
Havant Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Centre Road
HAVANT
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

21st July 2002

Dear Mrs Batchelor,

**RE: PLANNING APPLICATION No 02/58832/002 - PROPOSED
DEVELOPMENT TO LAND ADJACENT TO 97 LOVEDEAN LANE,
WATERLOOVILLE, PO8 9RN**

I refer to the posted notice regarding the above application proposing to site 2 x 3 bedroom houses and 2 x 4 bedroom houses adjacent to 97 Lovedean Lane.

I consider that the following should be considered during the Planning Application hearings:

- A number of the trees in the woodland have a preservation order on them. As it is understood that the Council has not got a proper record of which trees are concerned, it is inevitable that trees with a preservation order will be damaged and/or killed. Some of the oaks are thought to be over 100 years old and the boundary hedge to the copse is thought to be of greater age. Looking at old maps it may also be thought that this woodland and James Copse woodland are the last vestiges of the old Forest of Bere, that stretched from Wickham to beyond Clanfield.
- Green woodpeckers, bats (a protected species I believe) and other significant wildlife frequent the woodland, hedgerow etc. The undergrowth within the woodland can be considered virgin in that there is no right of way through them and the destruction of this habitat is unnecessary.
- There is little enough forested land in the area and to take more for such a development is considered inappropriate. Trying to shoe-horn 4 substantial sized houses in the space is probably driven by the desire to make money rather than any real need for the homes in this particular vicinity.
- The size of homes proposed for the development is out of place with the character of the present homes in the vicinity.

- Water and especially sewage facilities originally built to service one property with an occupancy of perhaps 2 adults and 2 or 3 children would have to be "spurred" to cope with the outfall from 4 substantial and large family dwellings, possibly occupied by up to 8 adults and 10 children.
- Traffic occupancy and throughput in the immediate area would increase from perhaps 2 vehicles for one property to possibly 2 vehicles for the present property, plus probably up to another 8 or even 9 vehicles for the proposed 4 new properties and also the attendant problems of yet another junction in a short stretch of Lovedean Lane that already has 4 junctions in close proximity. This stretch of Lovedean Lane from James Copse Road to the Milton Road junction is already extremely busy most periods of the day.
- This may be the first step in an endeavour to develop the entire copse/wooded area by stealth.

I believe that the points made above, taken singly give good reasons to refuse planning consent for the proposed development. Taken as a whole I believe there are overwhelming reasons to refuse consent.

A "proper" brown field site would be considered a more appropriate place for future development, as announced by the Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, in Parliament this week.

Yours sincerely,



Tony Wise