



05/02/2022

Mr S Weaver,
Planning Department,
Havant Borough Council,
Public Service Plaza,
Havant,
PO9 2AX

Dear Mr Weaver,

Ref: APP/21/01310 – Tournerbury Wedding and events venue.

I am writing to you, somewhat regrettably, to address some of the objecting points that have been raised on this application.

I feel it is important that you understand that I am a neutral party, in so much as I know both Grahame and Sue Phillips and the applicants and have known them all well over many years. As such, I am *extremely* familiar with the comings and goings at both Tournerbury farm and Tournerbury Woods, up to the present day.

I have not commented in any substance previously over the last few years as I would really rather not become embroiled in the continuing saga, and I have also felt that it is best to leave the parties involved to sort out their own stalemate in regard to the Right of Way.

However, having looked through the latest comments that have been made public, I am somewhat horrified by the dishonesty and false claims made in some of the objector's comments.

Whilst I understand fully that any person can make representations to a planning application request, I do believe that such comments should be a) honest & factual, b) actually about planning merits (or not) in the public interest and c) not personally vindictive or made with malice.

Given some of the recent comments in opposition to this application, I therefore find it impossible for me to not avail you as to various falsehoods that may unreasonably skew your perception when determining / deciding this application, and likewise the perception of Councillors if this application is decided at your Committee.

Very specifically, at point F in what I understand is Sue and Grahame Phillips's letter to you of 2nd February 2022, Sue and Grahame say "It is wrong for TWE to state there has been **no accidents** on the route through to the woods. This is incorrect. Our family dog was killed by a vehicle".

I really do take exception to Grahame and Sue putting this information in front of you and in a way that presents the Snells (or the Snell's traffic) as being responsible. The truth of the matter, as told to me face to face, [REDACTED] within days of this sad event happening, was that Grahame Phillips had in fact accidentally run over one of their old dogs in his Manitou Telehandler, on the track to the marsh (not on the Right of Way at all).

[REDACTED]

I did not see this rather sad event happen myself, I can only relate honestly to you what I know, from what I have been told [REDACTED]

What I am able to say for absolute certain, given the animosity of Grahame and Sue to the Snells ownership of the Right of Way, is that if this event did take place with a vehicle that was entering or exiting the Woods, the Phillips's would have caught that vehicle's number plate on their four security cameras and reported it to the Police and would now be using such a Police report against this application. Their security cameras are on 24hr a day record mode and capture every vehicle movement using the Right of Way. If this accusation was honest in its entirety, then some real proof should be submitted by Grahame and Sue such as the Police report.

Not stopping when one runs over a dog is I believe illegal, and you have a duty to ring the Police. In knowing Grahame and Sue as I do, and their opposition to the Snells ownership of the Right of Way through the farm, it is really impossible for me to believe that if 'a vehicle' (and by that I mean Sue's insinuation of a vehicle using the Right of Way coming or going to the Woods) ran over their dog, rather than Grahame, they would have immediately rung the Police and filed a report and given the vehicle number plate to the Police.

I was very sorry when I was told this news and dismissed it as one of those things that happen, but to now see it in black and white and the heavy implication / innuendo being that the 'vehicle' was attributable to Tournerbury Woods traffic is to my mind an insidiously devious twisting of the facts. It's quite disturbingly fraudulent to use such a tragedy to further one's own agenda.

If, for the record you want me to state an objection or supporting stance, then I think I have to say that I support the application. I say this as I have witnessed the passion with which the Snells look after and care for the Woods, and that they see themselves as conservators who are 'just passing through' and that the privileged position they have in owning this very beautiful piece of land, is something that carries with it great responsibility, to leave it in good stead for future generations.

I also take the supporting view as I see no good coming from refusing this application – it will not stop the Right of Way being used, as the Heads of Terms for the alternative access offered to the Snells by Grahame and Sue are completely unreasonable (even as a supposed negotiating starting point as Sue says in her letter).

The Snells have told me many times that they would love to use the alternative access but will not be bullied into doing so and be forced to give up real property that they own at a ransom price for doing so. In fact, I believe that should you determine this application positively, then there is considerably more likelihood of Grahame and Sue and the Snells actually reaching a satisfactory agreement over the new access.

Whichever way you look at it, I don't think the Council's time and resources should continue to be unnecessarily spent on this matter, which ultimately comes down to two neighbours disagreeing with each other. You should approve this application and leave them to it.

I do hope that you will take the above into at least some consideration when you are making your mind up about this application and I hope that a positive determination for it will be based on environmental, social and economic sound planning reasoning (rather than melodramatic objection narrative) and in doing so, might create the right conditions for Grahame and Sue

and the Snells to come to a workable and satisfactory (fair) conclusion for all parties at some time in the not too distant future.

Yours sincerely,

