

25 February 2024



Planning Services
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Dear Ms Taylor,

Reference to application: APP/24/00032

Construction of 9.5m access off of Manor Farm Close and
amendments to existing drainage basins*.
Land E of Manor Farm Close, Havant

as applied for by Mr S Briggs on behalf of Barratt David
Wilson Homes (BDW), Tolbar Way, Tolbar Road, Hedge
End, SO30 2ZP

*wording reproduced exactly as received in the
notification to the land owners and the application
(APPLICATION_FORM_REDACTED-1885429.pdf).

I am writing directly on behalf of the directorial board, and company membership, of the Manor Farm (Denvilles) Management Company Limited, as well as the wider body of residents living on the Manor Farm estate. In addition, I write with the interests of our neighbouring estate Nursery Fields to the north, and our friends and neighbours in Glenleigh Park, Hallett Road and Fifth Avenue all of whom indirectly benefit from the amenities and environment owned and managed by the Manor Farm Management Company.

For completeness, I repeat here the Management Company's interest in the submitted planning application, as was laid out in our formal objection to the released case, planning application APP/23/00584.

The Manor Farm estate comprises 91 properties. The neighbouring estate, Nursery Fields, comprises 110 properties. Glenleigh Park, Hallett Road and Fifth Avenue together comprise over 100 further properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.

In addition to maintenance of the estate's trees, planting, street lighting, roads, pavements and boundaries, the company maintains its open spaces of which the most significant is a wide strip of open land to the east of the estate, and along the full

extent of the estate running north to south. The proposed construction is located on, and passes through, this open space owned and maintained by the company.

The open space comprises several attractively landscaped ponds functioning as part of the estate's sustainable drainage solution, numerous trees and shrubs, grassed areas, a children's play area, communal seating and a network of footpaths linking parts of our, and our neighbouring, estates. A great deal of effort has been made, and monies allocated to, the installation and upkeep of a pleasant, natural open space.

The open land is enjoyed intensively on a daily basis throughout the year by local residents for a host of practical and recreational activities. In addition to supporting pleasant and safe off-road routes for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages, it is enjoyed by runners, dog walkers, families and children, both within the play area, but also more generally as a safe location to play away from road traffic.

Our key points of objection to the development are:

- 1) The proposal is self evidently a resubmission of preliminary works directly related to the permission applied for, and subsequently declined, in APP/23/00584 for which comprehensive arguments have been established for it being not approved.
- 2) Taken standalone the proposal has no stated merit, benefit or purpose in as of itself.
- 3) The proposal risks the correct functioning of the established SUDs ponds and other ecological impacts.
- 4) The application entirely removes a substantial and long established section of footpath without any remedial proposals.

Each of these points is expanded upon below:

- 1) The proposal is self evidently a resubmission of preliminary works directly related to the permission applied for, and subsequently declined, in APP/23/00584 for which comprehensive arguments have been established for it not being approved.

The application for planning permission was submitted as "construction of 9.5m access off of Manor Farm Close and amendments to existing drainage basins". Notification of the same was received by the Management Company 11/1/24 and no subsequent modification or correction of the submission was received by the Company, the applicable land owner.

It can be seen from the associated layouts, this application is submitting exactly the same layout file for this application as was previously submitted for application APP/23/00584. (I.e. document POND_PLANNING_LAYOUT-1885450.pdf from APP/23/00584 shows exactly the same content as POND_PLANNING_LAYOUT_WITH_SCALE-1802628.pdf from APP/24/00032).

I would therefore conclude this application is an attempt to move forward with the intent of achieving the goals of APP/23/00584, yet without addressing the detailed and legitimate objections that were conclusively established and summarised in the decision refusal notice (APP_23_00584-DECISION_NOTICE-1871776.pdf).

Furthermore, the cover letter states the works are “to accord with our contractual requirements”. This is identical wording to that given in the cover letter for APP/23/00584. The cover letter for APP/23/00584 makes it explicitly clear that the contractual requirements are for the construction of an access road.

Given APP/23/00584 was refused, and there being no substantive difference in the design or intent of this submission, I would contend that all the preceding objections from APP/23/00584 should apply equally to APP/24/00032 and this application be refused according to the same reasoning.

2) Taken standalone the proposal has no stated merit, benefit or purpose in as of itself.

Should the planning department be minded to consider the pond re-profiling in isolation, we have not been able to identify any other stated merit, benefit or purpose to making the changes to the ponds, no matter how cursory.

Surely it is reasonable to expect that every planning submission should have a clear and rational intent. In the absence of any other explanation of the purpose for the change, I submit that members of the impacted community should not be subject to the risks, disruption/disturbance and inconvenience of arbitrary change.

3) The proposal risks the correct functioning of the established SUDs ponds and other ecological impacts.

Further to the points raised in (1), without any clear purpose for the change, the changes to the SUDs ponds do present at least some level of risk as to the correct ongoing functioning of the ponds and stability of the earthworks, not least during the construction phase, as has been commented on in the consultee comments from the Senior Flood and Water Management Project Officer. Changes to the ponds also disturb a very long established habitat, which we would argue should not be impacted without a thoroughly sound reason.

4) The application entirely removes a substantial and long established section of footpath without any remedial proposals.

The planning submission appears rushed and ill-considered. At face value, by resubmitting one component of the preceding planning application in isolation, I would suggest the submission is egregiously incomplete in that the proposal cuts directly and entirely through an existing thoroughfare without any acknowledgement, analysis or mitigation of the same.

We would expect the rejection of any planning submission that, for whatever reason, entirely removes a substantial section of a long established footpath, and thereby prevents future use of that section of footpath, without any other proposed resolution.

This concludes our objections to the proposed development. On behalf of the stakeholders detailed above, we strongly oppose the submitted proposal.

May we take this opportunity to invite you and the wider planning department to contact the directorial team should you wish, or need, to clarify any of the points raised, or should you want any additional information that would be helpful in addressing this planning proposal.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Manor Farm (Denvilles) Management Company Limited, 2019 – present