
Copseys Nursery (Havant) Management Company Limited
Fisher House
84 Fisherton Street
Salisbury
SP2 7QY



Planning Services
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

29 August 2023

Dear Miss Donophy

Objection to application

APP/23/00584 Construction of maintenance access off Manor Farm Close and amendments to existing drainage basins. Land E of Manor Farm Close, Havant as applied for by Mr S Briggs on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes (BDW), Tolbar Way, Tolbar Road, Hedge End, SO30 2ZP

We are a management company responsible for 110 properties that are directly affected by the above planning application. We cover Windrush Close, Daffodil Way, Iris Close and parts of Poppy Way.

The other part of the 'joint estate' is run by our sister management company Manor Farm (Denvilles) Management Company Limited, which looks after 100 further properties. [REDACTED]

We object to the above planning application. We have discussed the application with our fellow directors in the Manor Farm management company (and residents) and our objections are set out in their letter dated 28 August. We are mentioned in their letter.

I have attached a copy of this letter. In summary, as set out in the letter, our key points of objection to the development from Copseys Nursery (Havant) Management Company Limited are:

1. The proposal is unnecessary because maintenance access already exists, hence it duplicates existing infrastructure.
2. The proposal is out-of-scale and over-engineered for the stated purpose.
3. The proposal has a disproportionately severe impact on the appearance, safety, utility and amenity of a long standing resource enjoyed by hundreds of local residents.
4. There has been a complete lack of any form of consultation or engagement by any party associated with the planning application prior to its submission.

Further details supporting these objections are in the attached letter.

We also submitted an online comment, but given the limits of the online submission we also needed to sent a letter.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Directors of Copseys Nursery (Havant) Management Company Limited
(<https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/company/08775992/officers>)

Enc: Copy of objection letter dated 28 August 2023

28 August 2023

Manor Farm (Denvilles) Management Company Limited
Fisher House
84 Fisherton Street
Salisbury
SP2 7QY

Planning Services
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Dear Miss Donophy,

Reference to application: APP/23/00584

Construction of of maintenance access off Manor Farm
Close and amendments to existing drainage basins.
Land E of Manor Farm Close, Havant

as applied for by Mr S Briggs on behalf of Barratt David
Wilson Homes (BDW), Tolbar Way, Tolbar Road, Hedge
End, SO30 2ZP

I am writing directly on behalf of the directorial board, and company membership, of the Manor Farm (Denvilles) Management Company Limited, as well as the wider body of residents living on the Manor Farm estate. In addition, I write with the interests of our neighbouring estate Nursery Fields to the north, and our friends and neighbours in Glenleigh Park, Hallett Road and Fifth Avenue all of whom indirectly benefit from the amenities and environment owned and managed by the Manor Farm Management Company.

The Manor Farm estate comprises 91 properties. The neighbouring estate, Nursery Fields, comprises 110 properties. Glenleigh Park, Hallett Road and Fifth Avenue together comprise over 100 further properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.

In addition to maintenance of the estate's trees, planting, street lighting, roads, pavements and boundaries, the company maintains its open spaces of which the most significant is a wide strip of open land to the east of the estate, and along the full extent of the estate running north to south. The proposed construction is located on, and passes through, this open space owned and maintained by the company.

The open space comprises several attractively landscaped ponds functioning as part of the estate's sustainable drainage solution, numerous trees and shrubs, grassed areas, a children's play area, communal seating and a network of footpaths linking parts of our, and our neighbouring, estates. A great deal of effort has been made, and monies allocated to, the installation and upkeep of a pleasant, natural open space.

The open land is enjoyed intensively on a daily basis throughout the year by local residents for a host of practical and recreational activities. In addition to supporting pleasant and safe off-road routes for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages, it is enjoyed by runners, dog walkers, families and children, both within the play area, but also more generally as a safe location to play away from road traffic.



The open space looking north from the south end of Manor Farm Close.



The open space looking north approximately due east of Hallett Rd.



The children's play area to the south of the proposed development.



The location of the proposed access road.

Our key points of objection to the development are:

- 1) The proposal is unnecessary because maintenance access already exists, hence it duplicates existing infrastructure.
- 2) The proposal is out-of-scale and over-engineered for the stated purpose.
- 3) The proposal has a disproportionately severe impact on the appearance, safety, utility and amenity of a long standing resource enjoyed by hundreds of local residents.
- 4) There has been a complete lack of any form of consultation or engagement by any party associated with the planning application prior to its submission.

Each of these points is expanded upon below:

- 1) The proposal is unnecessary because maintenance access already exists, hence it duplicates existing infrastructure:

The application and cover letter state the proposal is to provide “farming” or ‘maintenance’ access to the farm land to the east of Manor Farm [title number]:
[REDACTED]

Simply put, the farming access described *already exists*. It has been provisioned since the development of the estate in 2014. It is located at the southern end of Manor Farm Close and has been in constant regular use since completion of the estate.

Nowhere in the application is the existing access referenced, nor any explanation of why the existing infrastructure is inadequate or insufficient. We would suggest it is remiss, in the context of requesting planning permission, not to identify this existing infrastructure and explain and justify the new proposed infrastructure relative to, and in the context of, the existing access.

The applicants should be aware of its existence as BDW were responsible for the construction of said existing access. The land owner benefitting from the proposed access must be aware as they utilise the existing access typically on a daily basis.

In the absence of any justification for the need for new farming access in the submitted documentation, and despite attempting to elicit the same by informal verbal enquiries, we would put forward an evidence base that the existing infrastructure meets all the needs of providing farming access.

To wit, during the 9 years of use of the existing access, residents can testify to it facilitating the following examples of farming and maintenance activities: routine access by tractors and other farm equipment; introduction of, and extraction from, the farmland, on multiple occasions, of substantial livestock viz. flocks of sheep, and their care while on-site such as the provision of dietary supplements and water; sowing and harvesting of crops.

For the avoidance of doubt, maintenance and farming activity has been conducted successfully throughout the entire plot and has in no way been limited to the vicinity of the existing site entrance. Furthermore, the access is suitable for, and has regularly been used by domestic scale vehicles, such as that employed routinely by the land owner, through to HGVs which accesses the pumping station at this location via the existing access.



Existing farm access at the south end of Manor Farm Close



Sympathetic use of grass pavers to achieve the existing farm access



Livestock introduced via the existing access. June 2020



Livestock introduced via the existing access. May 2020

Therefore we would conclude, on the available evidence and the demonstrable use of the existing access, that the proposed access is wholly redundant.

2) The proposal is out-of-scale and over-engineered for the stated purpose:

The application ostensibly states the proposal is to provide maintenance access to farm land. We would argue the specific design submitted in the proposal is highly inappropriate to achieve the stated purpose. It lacks any attempt to minimise its impact.

Most extraordinarily, on the assumption developments naturally seek to minimise cost, materials and impact on the immediate environment, the proposed choice of a road design is one that we believe makes sense only if the submitted design were to ultimately facilitate *frequent and substantial volumes* of regular automobile vehicular traffic.

To be specific:

- i) Why has the access been characterised as a road (a.k.a. highway, as defined the referenced Manual for Streets April 2010) in the design documents?
- ii) Why does the access need to be 2 lane when a single lane would be sufficient?
- iii) Why has a full 2 lane 5.5m road specification been proposed when the road it connects to is a narrow mews style street of only 4.6m width and without centre markings?
- iv) Why does the proposal introduce a miss-alignment of the centre line of the proposed road with the centre line of the existing street by over 2m?
- v) Why has a dedicated footway been provisioned if access use is occasional?
- vi) Why has a dedicated footway been provisioned in preference to a shared space given the nature of the location and estate speed limit of 10mph?
- vii) Why does the proposal not explicitly specify the carriageway surfacing, but recommends Asphalt*, without justification as to why forms of hidden carriageway would not be appropriate as has been successfully achieved with the existing access? (*see submitted document titled TRANSPORT_AND_HIGHWAYS_TECHNICAL_NOTE_FOR_FARM_AC CESS-1802627, section 5.1.5)
- viii) Why does the proposal elect to remove the right of way of pedestrians and cyclists use of the existing path network, rather than to ensure their consideration and priority given a clear expectation they will remain the dominant users of this space?

In summary, the proposal sets out a wholly inappropriate design for connection to the existing infrastructure and the stated use.

3) The proposal has a disproportionately severe impact on the appearance, safety, utility and amenity of a long standing resource enjoyed by hundreds of local residents:

The existence of an attractive landscaped open space away from any road traffic is a much valued and greatly appreciated community resource that we argue should be protected and preserved with a high degree of priority.

The proposed access bifurcates an otherwise consistently green open space and the pedestrian and cycle paths on the site. The routes link our estate with and the neighbouring estate and 2 children's play areas, each providing unique play amenities. Introduction of any vehicular traffic in this location is profoundly undesirable.

In particular, the development is placed in the immediate view and surroundings of properties [REDACTED] Manor Farm Close and [REDACTED] Fifth Avenue such that it will entirely alter their outlook including aspects of their immediate existing soft landscaping.

In summary, construction of the proposed road such as is has been laid out in the submitted plans would create a dominant and unwarranted change to the character of the open space. Alternative designs such as a single lane of grass pavers could easily have fulfilled the stated need while hugely diminishing the impact.

4) There has been a complete lack of any form of consultation or engagement by any party associated with the planning application prior to its submission:

We, as the landowners of the affected land, were not consulted by either the land owner benefitting from the proposed access, or BDW as the entity submitting the planning application.

We are assured, following a thorough investigation by the company secretary, that service of notice on 30 June 2023 as detailed in the application was not received by Manor Farm Management Company.

However, more significantly, neither the company, nor residents, were approached for consultation prior to submission of the proposal. We feel certain it goes without saying that proper consultation serves the public interest by allowing all stakeholders to have their voices heard and contributes to a more transparent and equitable planning process.

Had community engagement been undertaken, the impact on the existing amenity may have been minimised. The lack of said consultation has resulted in inadequate consideration of the potential impacts of the proposed development on our property, its beneficiaries and the surrounding area.

Had consultation with the impacted landowners been undertaken we may have shared local knowledge and design considerations constructively, and in advance of the proposal, and in so doing have benefitted all parties.

In summary, we believe the lack of consultation exhibits a flagrant disregard for the affected community and, in and of itself, are grounds to dismiss the application.

This concludes our objections to the proposed development. On behalf of the stakeholders detailed above, we strongly oppose the submitted proposal.

May we take this opportunity to invite you and the wider planning department to contact the directorial team should you wish, or need, to clarify any of the points raised, or should you want any additional information that would be helpful in addressing this planning proposal.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]
Director, Manor Farm (Denvilles) Management Company Limited, 2019 - present