

APP/26/00504: RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS ON HBC PORTAL BOTH DATED 16/09/26

Two further sets of objections have appeared on the HBC planning portal which require a response.

Clippex fencing has been designed and marketed exclusively as agricultural fencing for the purpose of keeping livestock, animals and people on one side only. The wide range of stock fencing shapes and heights is to cater for all types of animals of different sizes and abilities to get across. It is now widely used in several countries, including the UK, Australia and New Zealand, where it was invented, as it is much faster, easier and cheaper to install, the different catch positions on different posts match the stock fencing exactly, and it is guaranteed to last for 30 years, unlike any type of timber fencing buried in the ground. Supplies in the UK are constantly running out as there is such high demand. It is not high commercial security fencing which will visually urbanise the landscape.

There will be no high turnover vehicular traffic, as each booking involves one car only that comes in, stays with the dog/dogs for the session time, then leaves. Each session has a ten minute slot for arrivals and departure. As part of our Noise Management Plan we have decided to stagger booking times for the long and short paddocks, one of them will start on the hour, the other one 30 minutes later. There would be no traffic congestion, vehicle idling or safety hazards at the site entrance beside the stable block. Additional safety signage will be provided at the end of Mengham Lane, as described in the Design & Access Statement.

No evidence has been provided by the writer to prove that there will be “regular” “daily” barking from “multiple” dogs, shouting owners, or car doors “slamming”. It is anticipated that some dog customers will bark, but noise mitigation measures will be put in place as part of the Noise Management Plan. A professional Noise Acoustic Report has now been commissioned, and will be provided to the Environmental Health Officer in due course.

Large numbers of dogs will not be concentrated in enclosed paddocks at the same time. The maximum number at any one time will be four sibling dogs, ie. dogs that live in the same household and are fully familiar with each other. They will be accompanied at all times by their human carer, and it is hoped that that person will be able to quell any barking promptly. If not, they will be asked to leave, along with all the dog brothers and sisters there at the same time.

Given the experience of Paws Paddocks and other mainland dog walking paddocks, the majority of human owners are very responsible about picking up their pets’ mess as soon as it has been made, bagging it up and depositing it in the bins provided. The outer bag containing the days small bags will be removed each night and secured indoors. Those who fail to pick up their dog’s poo will be cautioned, and eventually banned, before re-booking is permitted. Under these circumstances it seems unlikely that high levels of nitrogen and phosphorous will leach into the soil, damage local flora and then run off into Hayling Island’s sensitive coastal water ecosystems. The horses who have been urinating and dropping huge volumes of dung for the last 50 years have not been shown to cause serious environmental damage.

The applicant does not agree that the proposal constitutes an unsustainable and disruptive development of agricultural land.

The next set of objections states that the local community is deeply concerned that this commercial change of use is a phased strategy designed to unlock and exploit the vulnerable southern field for future residential housing. No-one in the local community has come forward to register these concerns with us or anyone else as far as we know, and the current Facebook thread regarding the proposed dog walking paddock (in the location we have applied for) has produced an overwhelmingly favourable response.

I do not propose to discuss each of the objections in detail, as they are irrelevant to the APP/26/00504 application under consideration. Its location, about 100 metres north of Mengham Lane, will never impact on access to the southern field, whether via Mengham Lane or Selsmore Road. The allegations regarding connected landscapes, dangerous precedents, creating a wedge to bypass housing bans etc. are entirely artificial and fabricated.