

In my role as the Applicant for APP/26/00504 I am submitting an extra document in an attempt clarify some of the many misleading and inaccurate points raised in an objection letter dated 3 September 2026. This has managed to convey a depressingly bleak picture of an ugly, intrusive war-movie-era dog boot camp, with unhappy barking dogs and unhappy noisy owners shouting at them causing unacceptable disturbance, noise and smells which would ruin the rural peace and tranquility that exists at present.

Instead, it is our intention to re-create the happy, private playpark-for-dogs atmosphere that exists in similar enclosed dog walking paddocks on the mainland, and where I, who have visited them often, have never heard any person shouting or any dog barking. Although the two paddocks proposed in this application are somewhat smaller than the mainland ones they are quite large enough for a good long gallop from one end to the other. They are not intended as training areas, and any added features such as moveable wooden constructions to climb over, jump off or go through will essentially be for fun if a dog so chooses. The huge advantage for Hayling Island dog owners will be the fact that these two paddocks can be easily accessed by local residents without long and tiresome car journeys on and off Hayling Island through the almost permanently jammed main road at any time of day, both leaving and returning. I do not believe the immediate local area, on Hayling itself, is rich with suitable alternative enclosed dog running paddocks such as the ones we are hoping to create.

Whilst horse grazing would continue to be a mainly silent and visually appealing activity going forward, the hard reality of the 2020's is that it is no longer economically feasible to continue this use. The current costs of building maintenance and repairs, fencing, gates, tree surgery, vegetation clearance and disposal, track maintenance and repairs, vandalism, insurance, electricity and water supplies far exceed any possible income from renting stables and grazing, and the operation has been running at a significant financial loss for many years now. Climate change has made things even worse, and cutting down the number of horses (and rent) within our total acreage has not worked either. I am fully aware that stabling and grazing space is much in demand in Hayling Island and greatly regret having to give up on providing for this evident need. We have done our very best at keeping going over the last 50 years, but sadly it is now time to bring it to an end.

A very major concern is the paragraph in the 03/09/26 objection letter insinuating that this proposal is merely a stepping stone in a process to "develop this land for residential use". The letter states that "this has long been a publicly stated aim of the owner on land they own". The use of the words "this land" and "land" in the two preceding sentences, is ambiguous, and probably intentionally so. No evidence has been provided to support the extraordinary and grossly inaccurate "publicly stated aim of the owner" insofar as it relates to the specific area of land covered by this planning application. If any such evidence can be shown to actually exist, it will be openly and formally quashed as soon as possible so there can be no possible doubt as to our current or long term intentions. From the moment the family started discussing alternative uses for this particular field, all and any forms of residential development have been completely off the table – now, and for the long term future as well. We are fully aware that it is located in an AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty), and is adjacent to two SSSIs (Sites of Special Scientific Interest) – Tournerbury Woods and the creek known as My Lords Pond, which terminates at our land boundary with the sea. We would not be so foolish as to waste precious time and money on applying for anything remotely residential with zero prospect of success. Indeed, we even turned down the idea of applying for dog kennels due both to potential barking noise and because it involves building a permanent building on land that we want to keep as green as possible, and as green as it is now. The other grazing fields owned by the family are some distance away between Mengham Lane and Selsmore Road, and are unequivocally not part of this planning application. They are also not part of the AONB and do not abut SSSIs.

The paragraphs regarding potential noise disturbance seem to be exaggerated and speculative. Whilst I cannot guarantee that the occasional dog customer will not engage in some or constant barking during its maximum 45 minute session, dogs such as these will be strongly discouraged, or in some cases banned, from making return visits. As to potential shouting by owners, if this should occur at all, once again for a

maximum of 45 minutes, it will be much reduced by the considerable level of ambient noise that exists in the built up parts of Hayling Island on the western side of the public footpath, including cars, motorbikes, lorries, bin lorries, deliveries, lawn mowers, hedge trimmers, chain saws, building repairs, helicopters and light aircraft flying overhead, wind, tree leaves rustling, birds and very loud conversations into smartphone microphones as people walk along the public footpath.

Potential user numbers are not yet possible to predict as the business is not yet operational. It is expected that most owners will bring along a single dog to enjoy its run, but in multiple dog families it would be acceptable for up to three dog siblings to attend at the same time. This should not increase barking levels as they will know each other well.

It has been suggested that the proposed Clippex fencing will be a serious blight on the landscape, and will ruin the view from Chichester Harbour. The location and site plan make it quite clear that there is to be no dog walking paddock facility along the creek edge. Indeed, the simple, strand wire fencing will remain as it is now, with three horses, two of them miniature ponies, continuing to live and graze in this paddock and the next one along on the southern side of the track. Clippex stock fencing and posts are indeed not particularly attractive, but it does have the advantage of 30 year longevity, unlike pretty wooden rail fencing, which would be useless at containing dogs and keeping out deer and foxes, and which would rot within a decade or so. When seen from a distance of 5 to 10 metres Clippex stock fencing appears completely see-through, and would not block any view into or out of the two dog walking paddocks. The use of XHLT13-190-7.5 was proposed because of the 75 mm (3 inch) spacing between the vertical wires, unlike XHLT13-190-15 with 150 mm (6 inch) spacing. A photograph of the latter has been included in the original application documents, but it was not possible to find any photograph of an installed fence using XHLT13-190-7.5. The advantage of using the narrower gap stock fencing material would be to prevent any passage across by small foxes or tiny dogs who could possibly squeeze through the 150 mm type.

The operating hour confusion is a function of the shorter hours being the booking times, and the longer hours being the operational times.

The question of potential ecological disturbance to existing wildlife was covered in my last submission. It will be no better or worse than what exists at the moment. There are no trees within the site area that are large or mature enough for nesting birds to use, and certainly not buzzards or tawny owls, and those around the site, and in nearby Tournurbury Woods, will still be there unaltered and available if required.

Some limited raising of the ground level in the two paddocks closest to the creek did take place in the late 1960's and early 1970's to help control flooding, but everything deposited was carefully checked by the current environmental authorities of the day and found to be uncontaminated. The grass growing above these two areas in our normal heavy clay soil above the infillings has been grazed perfectly safely by horses for the last 50 years, and not one of them has ever shown any signs of poisoning or illness as a result.

The comments on the rights of way and parking are something of a red herring as well, and mirror similar conflicts that have arisen in another unconnected planning permission application in Tournurbury Woods. The right of way through the southern access is for domestic and recreational use only of Woods Cottage and Tournurbury Woods by the beneficial owner. There is no mention of dedicated passing places, which have never heretofore been an issue. The area used for car parking at the stables has never blocked the access to Tournurbury Woods since the right of way began in 2004. Should there ever be additional cars all there at the same time on odd occasions in the future, at least 3 extra car parking spaces will be available on the concrete surface of the existing stable yard to ease any congestion.

Arrangements for maintenance of the track between the two proposed dog walking paddocks is not connected to the current application, but a private matter for negotiation between the relevant owners.

I hope the above provides re-assurance that this proposal will not prove to be a bad mistake, but something that will be of benefit and pleasure to the many Hayling Island dog owners who have pets that would enjoy an outing to our facility.