



52 Long Copse Lane  
Emsworth  
Hants  
PO10 7UR

17/03/17

Dear Mr Oliver

Planning Application APP/16/01234 - Change of use from private equestrian yard to a mixed use comprising private equestrian yard and single pitch, private gypsy and traveller site ( including amenity block and one touring caravan pitch ) Revised application.

I am writing to strongly object to the above planning application.

Importantly Havant Borough Council (HBC) together with Hampshire County Council found in 2014 that there was no identified need for Traveller sites in this area up to 2027

The development would be outside the Local Development plan. The developer describes the site as previously developed land which it is not.

There are a number of issues within policy CS10 in the adopted local plan core strategy which still are of concern in the revised application..

There would be a significant and unacceptable adverse affect on the amenity of the residents of the property adjacent to the proposed development as well as the local community. The DCLG good practice guide states that there would be a higher density than normal of children and vehicles at such sites. Noise from children, barking dogs, radios and TV's, amenity block, shouting, together with vehicle movements and the visual impact of floodlights are inappropriate in this location. Long Copse Lane has been designated as being of "special interest" by HBC and should be protected from unsuitable developments.

The Travelling community by definition will have a variety of vehicles ranging from private cars and caravans to lorries many of which will be unsuitable for Long Copse Lane and would constitute a road safety hazard.

All fields in and around the site quickly become saturated in heavy rain so soakaway surface water drainage is doubtful. With a top soil over London clay it is questionable whether a new cess pit could be constructed safely to avoid leaks which would contaminate the area.

Views from the National Park and from Long Copse Lane are impacted by the site and the extensive use of floodlighting ( without permission ) is a major visual intrusion in the Lane in general and the adjacent property in particular.

Both the mobile home and travelling caravan ( which is parked within a few metres of the adjoining property ) are both illegally on site and demonstrate the complete disregard of the developer for planning laws.

The developer's nomadic and residential status and need for such a developed site should be vigorously tested.

The local community is also greatly concerned that the application, given the developers previous conduct, would lead to the site being developed as a fully commercial enterprise which would be totally unacceptable in this location.

I therefore request that the application be refused permission because of lack of need and the adverse effects on neighbours and locality.

Yours sincerely,

Dr A.L Thomas