From: R's iMac

Sent: 04 December 2018 18:17

To: Team E2

Subject: APP/L1765/W/18/3197434 (TEXAS, TEXAS DRIVE, OLIVERS BATTERY,

WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE, SO22 4HT)

Dear Sirs

My wife and I wish to object the appeal tabled with you at the following reference and postal address: APP/L1765/W/18/3197434 (TEXAS, TEXAS DRIVE, OLIVERS BATTERY, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE, SO22 4HT).

In addition to our original objection to the local District Council in Winchester (attached in full, below), I attended a Planning Meeting of the Council at which, to my own and many others amazement, one of the planning officers had recommended that the application might be approved!

There ensued a long debate amongst members of the Planning Committee, other Councillors and numerous other members of the public who had given prior notice of their wish to raise personal objections at the meeting. Planning officers were asked to account for the seemingly 'wrong' recommendation, especially in the light of longstanding experience of the applicant's evident avoidance to conform with planning expectations in other properties he owns within the District Council's area.

At the end of the discussions in the public meeting, there was an overwhelming majority in favour of rejecting the applicant's wishes. Moreover, the applicant was told that he would be expected to restore the area to its previous state.

Our experience in the subsequent many months since that meeting is that: the Applicant has done little to restore more than a superficial appearance of compliance; considerable re-grassing of most of the whole site seems to have been achieved, as Google Earth' Satellite maps have shown; several very deep excavations and long channels were made across the site in a SW to NE direction, which appeared to be potential drainage, or slurry pits — these have now been filled in but there has been no evidence of removal of the potential of other foundations such as for a Menage, now concealed by the grassing over. Moreover, we have seen no evidence of the reduction of the footprint of the site of the dwelling proposed, nor the removal of the now-concealed similar foundations, which were formerly in view. These were said to be for a large Menage for the care of horses, their related requirements and equipment, together with the potential of a riding school.

In the light of this, we strongly object to the applicant's appeal to proceed with what has the potential of massive development in a very sensitive area.

Yours sincerely

Comments for Planning Application 17/02190/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 17/02190/FUL

Address: Texas Texas Drive Olivers Battery SO22 4HT

Proposal: Alterations to extant planning permission ref: 16/00320/FUL: Repositioning

of dwelling.

alterations to site levels and exterior materials, amendments to landscaping and

boundary treatment

Case Officer: Lorna Hutchings

Customer Details

Names: Mr Reg Fletcher and Mrs Brenda Fletcher Address: 8 Olivers Battery Gardens Winchester

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Local Residents

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons: The property is primarily a Residential Amenity

Comment Re: 17/02190/FUL

We wish to object to the Alterations, which the applicant has chosen to apply to the extant planning permission ref 16/00320/FUL. During the greater part of a year since that permission was granted, there have been extraordinarily large and very extensive excavations of this extremely sensitive part of the South Downs, which could easily warrant, if it does not already have the designation of an Area of Outstanding Scientific Interest, thanks to the ancient variety of flora and forna which can readily be found in the area. At the same time, similarly large foundations appear to have been laid that in no way conform to the original nature of the site plan or the permission formerly granted. This smacks of a flagrant disregard for planning regulations and a blinkered determination to flout the proper expectations and obligations of the local District and County Councils' authority. The evidence of this judgement is to be found in the Listed Documents submitted, where the ground plan shows the newly built house in a different position from that originally approved – another flagrant avoidance of the approval granted.

Furthermore, there is no evidence of any attempt to remove the foundations laid for other massive buildings and facilities, about which there is no evidence in the present application.

We believe that the present application should be refused and the applicant should be required to restore the area to its original state.

Brenda and Reg. Fletcher

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit http://www.symanteccloud.com