

Planning Development
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX



26 August 2026

Dear Sir

**PLANNING APPLICATION APP/26/00525
WADE COURT COTTAGE
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR INSTALLATION OF SEPTIC TANK**

While I have no objection in principle to this proposal there are a number of matters which cause me concern.

1. The boundary between the application site and the Granary is incorrect at the point Septic tank is located. The tank is shown to the north of its actual location and part of the installation is on land owned by the Granary.
2. The scale of the plan at 1:1250 is too small to allow accurate measurements to be taken. A detailed drawing at 1: 200 would be more appropriate. The lines on the drawing which presumably are meant to show the pipe work do not correspond with the pipework that has actually been constructed. A three-way connector has been installed to the west of the garage door on the outbuilding and a pipe has been installed from the septic tank to connect with it. Presumably other pipe work also connects into it. None of this is shown.
3. The location of the infiltration tunnels is incorrect. No excavation has taken place to the east of the gate across the back lane. A single trench was excavated from the septic tank close to the boundary of the Granary and this stopped short of the gate. It was not in the centre of the lane as is shown on the application plan.
4. The application form states that no trees or hedges need to be removed or pruned to carry out the development. This is not the case. A hedge and a tree on the western boundary of the Granary were removed and other trees on the southern boundary heavily pruned and/or damaged.
5. In the design and heritage statement it is said that the proposal avoids the need for excavation within landscape garden areas. This is not the case as areas of mown grass have been dug up and destroyed. It is also mentioned that existing hard standing is being utilised where possible. In fact there was no hard standing. The driveway from the lane through to the courtyard had a thick covering of gravel.

6. The design and heritage statement says that there will be no material change to the setting of the property or views across the site. Because of the amount of vegetation which has been removed and the damage to trees which are protected being in a conservation area there has been a severe impact on the scenic quality of the area. The vegetation which has been removed is an intrinsic part of the setting of the buildings on the site and on the adjoining parts of the Wade Court complex there should be provision in any permission granted for the management of the remaining trees and the planting of further trees and shrubs where possible to offer the impact. There should be a condition imposed on any permission issued for a landscaping scheme management plan.
7. Paragraph 9 of the design and heritage statement states that the installation is replacing an existing foul drainage system. This is incorrect. It is a completely new system which will include providing a foul sewage system for the outbuilding which does not have one at present.
8. The calculations regarding the required drainage field should be looked at carefully. The plant is referred to as being suited to a three bedroom dwelling. The drainage field area calculations are stated to suit a five person sequential batch reactor sewage treatment plant. The calculation for the drainage field is given as $\text{Area} = V \times P \times 0.20$ where P is the maximum number of persons the unit is designed to serve. V is 58 sec and P = 2 persons. This gives a drainage field required of 23 m².

This calculation does not fit with the statement that P is the maximum number of persons the unit is designed to serve which is given as 5. The calculation should therefore surely be $58 \times 5 \times 0.20 = 58 \text{ sqm}$. If this is correct then the drainage proposed is inadequate.

9. Reference is made to 4x tunnel sections. There is no evidence that these were installed or that there is sufficient room to install them. Evidence on the ground showed a single trench, less than one metre wide and 1.15 metres deep. Standing water was found in the trench at 1.15 metres below ground level. A perforated pipe was laid in the trench.

I would ask that the details of this application are examined carefully.

Yours sincerely

