

For the above and many other reasons there are no grounds for upholding the appeal and the enforcement notices should be enacted without any further delay.



## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201565**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Appeal Reference | APP/L1765/C/18/3201565   |
| Appeal By        | MR JIMMY LEE   |
| Site Address     | Plot 3 & 4 Pony Paddock<br>6 Hipley, Hambledon<br>Waterlooville<br>Hampshire |

#### SENDER DETAILS

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| Name    | MRS DENISE SEARLE   |
| Address | Meadowsweet, Hipley Road<br>Hambledon<br>WATERLOOVILLE<br>PO7 4QG |

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

## YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I object most strongly to this application being passed. It has been refused by the public, local council, Winchester County Council and has been refused on appeal by the Inspectorate last year.

Nothing has changed - these travellers have moved on to a 1.25 acre plot which has always been used as a pony paddock, turned it into a housing estate and are demanding the right to do whatever they want, irrespective of covenants on the land or the fact that it is agricultural land not deemed fit to live on.

In the past anyone wishing to operate a business from this plot has also been refused and/or fined for doing acts other than keeping horses on the land. This has and can be proved by documentation at previous planning hearings and appeals.

The travellers are contravening any attempts to stop them developing the land and they store their work vehicles on site and use the land to operate and enhance their businesses.

I strongly believe that they should be held accountable by the same laws as I am, I am the only house built on this site before the land was divided up into 10 horse paddock plots.

If the travellers want to settle down in one place they are no longer 'travellers' and have no special privileges. The local council has provided plenty of sites for travellers, as laid out in the local plan which are openly on offer to this group of people. This means they have plenty of options on where to live.

A site with no water, main sewerage, adequate electric, gas, public transport, pathways, lighting, and accessibility to play areas for children is not fit for multiple families to live on.

In the time that the travellers have lived on the site, I have never seen, heard or smelt any cesspits being emptied. In that time I would have seen at least one large cesspit vehicle on their site. Where is the sewerage going? The rest of the paddock owners keep horses on their paddocks which provide the horses with their daily grazing.

Since the masses of tonnes of scalping's have been laid on the site, which is on the flood plane, the displacement of rain water alone has been enough to affect neighbouring paddocks and to cause flooding on the road in places it hadn't previously flooded. They have not made any provision on their individual pitches to accommodate this problem, thereby once again causing adverse conditions to the countryside.

At present the site is lit up like Blackpool illuminations, each static home is edged with lights plus all the additional buildings on each pitch have their own lighting then they've added motion lights to each pitch. At one point the lights were so bright I couldn't see to get my horses in! The Hamlet is very conscious of Light pollution and there are no street lights, their site does not fit in to the natural environment of the Hamlet.

In addition the noise from the site has dramatically altered the peace and tranquillity of our Hamlet. Just the continuous barking of the dogs is a distraction/annoyance, let alone the machinery which seems to be continually in use on the site and people shouting/arguing at all times. Once again what was once a quiet place to live is full of unnatural (uncountryside) noises.

This small hamlet and its roads cannot support the additional vehicles the travellers bring with them. There is at least 3 vehicles per pitch each trying to leave the plot by a shared gateway on to a fast/busy road from a partially concealed entrance. There have been more accidents along this road in recent years.

The travellers, I have noticed, also keep moving the boundary lines to their property and continually trying to claim ownership of the track and the gateway. The track and gateway is shared equally

between ALL the paddock owners, they are 1 plot in 10. They are 1 owner amongst 10 owners, a fact which seems to escape them. We find their presence intimidating to the point where it can be awkward and intolerable to use our own entrance.

May I draw your attention to the first application put in to the council which shows an additional track to be put in, on the travellers plot to give them access to each pitch. The whole 8 pitches were to use the one original gate to their plot. They have not put that additional track in. The boundary running alongside the existing track has always been straight. The plan with this appeal documentation shows pitch 7/8 now having a wider pitch than all the rest. This is not accurate.

During the 3 years that the travellers have been here they have cut down our gates and removed them from site. On complaint they have erected a new entranceway and gate but altered it to be large enough to accommodate their static homes.

They have ignored every enforcement notice, injunction and high court orders. They have ignored all comments/suggestions/orders from the Winchester Enforcement Team and Local Authority.

They have demonstrated that they cannot be trusted to do what they say they will do, so therefore cannot be given any leeway in the appeal application. Only an outright refusal with a strict timeline to vacate the land and restore it to its previous state can be an option. As, has already been issued to them by Winchester Council.

I could make this objection a lot longer by quoting all the references from the previous applications, refusals, appeals and arbitrations that have already been heard but the points I have raised above are to the point and true. Proof can easily be provided and is available to you on request.



For official use only (date received): 13/01/2019 13:29:12

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201565**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201565

Appeal By: MR JIMMY LEE

Site Address:  
Plot 3 & 4 Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name: MR RICHARD SEARLE

Address:  
Meadowsweet, Hipley Road  
Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QG

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

## YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I strongly disagree to this application for the following reasons:

Planning has already been refused by Winchester Council , further on appeal and then by independent committee. This decision to refuse planning was then completely ignored by the Gypsies who moved onto the site without authority and have since ignored all halts to carry out further works and developed the site into homes for a large number of Gypsy families and businesses.

The land is agricultural land and enclosed by other agricultural land and it does not warrant a change of use for the development of the 8 pitches for gypsy / traveller families.

The entrance to the site is not owned by the Gypsies and the track that leads to each of the 8 pitches is jointly owned by each of the 10 paddock owners. These paddocks are for horse grazing. Before the gypsies entered the site, the front gate (5-bar gate) was always kept closed to protect animals, predominantly horses, that may have escaped from paddocks and prevented them from entering the busy road. It was the last line of defence in effect. The gypsies now refuse to close the front gate as they need constant access with their vehicles and due to this, there has already been instances where horses have escaped into the road. I have personally been involved in such an instance which fortunately led to the recovery of the horse from the main road without injury or further accident.

The gypsy site has children resident and there are already difficulties in how these children will be kept occupied on their own plots and also there is a very high level of concern for their safety in access to the site without the use of vehicles. There are no play areas for children beyond the area where the caravans are situated so this does now extend to children playing in the shared access drive. Further there was an instance where a young toddler made their way to the main road which could have been catastrophic. There are no pavements on the main road, the verges are some 2-3ft above the road and undulating and access to the paddocks is situated on a 60mph road with no street lighting and sharp bends. This is certainly not a children-friendly area and is in fact very dangerous. There is also no public transport in the local area and therefore children or non-drivers, would find it very difficult to leave the site without walking on the main road itself.

Considering the size of the very small village of Worlds End, more a hamlet, the gypsy site significantly detracts from the tranquillity of the area and now suffers from very high light pollution, constant noise of vehicle movements on and off the Gypsy site, constant dogs barking on the site and larger commercial vehicles now being stored at the site. The light pollution consist of many large spotlights lighting up the whole caravan site through the night and affecting the horses in adjacent paddocks. We were also very disappointed to have fireworks being let off on bonfire night by the Gypsies in amongst the horses in adjoining paddocks. This is just not acceptable.

I remain very concerned about increased flooding in adjacent paddocks as the Gypsies continue to bring lorry loads of scalpings onto the site to try and elevate the ground above the water table in wet weather. I am also very concerned about where sewerage is going from the site as whilst there are some portaloos around, they are not in use and we know that large pits have been dug with excavators. With the high risk of flooding and a river and a bore hole local to the site, I have concerns that a make-shift soak away will cause sewerage contamination.

In conclusion, with all considered, I feel this is most certainly not the place to have a Gypsy site and the continual disregard of the Planning team, planning decisions and court injunctions only goes to prove that the people now living at the site will only continue to do exactly what they want to do and with no regard to anyone else.

I believe there are other designated sites that the Gypsies could go to within the area and approved by Winchester Council so let them do that.

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201565**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Appeal Reference | APP/L1765/C/18/3201565   |
| Appeal By        | MR JIMMY LEE   |
| Site Address     | Plot 3 & 4 Pony Paddock<br>6 Hipley, Hambledon<br>Waterlooville<br>Hampshire |

#### SENDER DETAILS

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| Name    | MR MICHAEL SETTLE   |
| Address | Thatched Cottage, Worlds End<br>Hambledon<br>WATERLOOVILLE<br>PO7 4QU |

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

#### **YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I object to this appeal for the following reasons:

It is a site which was pony paddocks in a quiet hamlet with one pub and no other facilities and is unsustainable.

The access is from a busy, de restricted road with a speed limit of 60mph which is very dangerous. There are no pavements and all trips off the site have to be made by vehicle.

The area is prone to flooding which will now be worse as such a large area has been covered with concrete and tarmac.

There are no facilities for children on site or in the local area.

There is a nuisance from noise pollution. There is constant noise from barking dogs and frequent loud shouting between residents. This is very disturbing for local residents.

There is light pollution from very strong lights which are on for all hours of darkness giving the ponies in the adjacent fields no night time rest and must be a nuisance for those living next door to the site.

For official use only (date received): 12/01/2019 11:59:39

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201565**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Appeal Reference | APP/L1765/C/18/3201565   |
| Appeal By        | MR JIMMY LEE   |
| Site Address     | Plot 3 & 4 Pony Paddock<br>6 Hipley, Hambledon<br>Waterlooville<br>Hampshire |

#### SENDER DETAILS

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| Name    | MRS SARAH SETTLE  |
| Address | Thatched Cottage, Worlds End<br>Hambledon<br>WATERLOOVILLE<br>PO7 4QU |

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

#### **YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I object to this appeal for the following reasons:

It is a site which was pony paddocks in a quiet hamlet with one pub and no other facilities and is unsustainable.

The access is from a busy, de restricted road with a speed limit of 60mph which is very dangerous. There are no pavements and all trips off the site have to be made by vehicle.

The area is prone to flooding which will now be worse as such a large area has been covered with concrete and tarmac.

There are no facilities for children on site or in the local area.

There is a nuisance from noise pollution. There is constant noise from barking dogs and frequent loud shouting between residents. This is very disturbing for local residents.

There is light pollution from very strong lights which are on for all hours of darkness giving the ponies in the adjacent fields no night time rest and must be a nuisance for those living next door to the site.

**Appeal Reference: AAP/L1765/C/18/3201565**

**Plots 3, 4, 7 and 8 Pony Paddocks**

**Rear of Chairmaker's Arms, Hipley, Denmead.**



Further to our Planning Committee meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2019, it was resolved that Denmead Parish Council should support Winchester City Council and that a written representation of Objection should be submitted in relation to this appeal.

Denmead Parish Council had raised Strong Objections in 2014 and 2017 to previous appeals and cited the reason, amongst many others, that the use of site was an unsuitable location for the material change of use and would harm the character of the countryside. In 2015 The Planning Inspectorate refused planning permission for this site, as evidenced by the Report at a Public Enquiry, Ref: APP/L1765/W/14/2224363.

In relation to this present Appeal, Denmead Parish Council believes that the provision of 8 pitches in this countryside location would fundamentally alter the character of the surrounding paddocks and land and would significantly detract from the tranquillity of the locality by reason of noise, general activity, including numerous vehicle movements and lighting. Winchester District Local Plan Part 2, Policy DM14 states under Local Distinctiveness that "developments should respect the qualities, features and characteristics that contribute to the distinctiveness of the local area."

This area of countryside is already prone to flooding on the roads, which would be exacerbated by the material change of use on the site. In relation to the report by the Drainage Engineer, there is no provision for foul drainage and no mains locally that can be used.

Winchester District Local Plan Part 1, Policy MTRA 4, states that "Development proposed in accordance with this policy should not harm to the character and landscape of the area or neighbouring uses, or create inappropriate noise/light and traffic generation". As reported by the Highway Engineer at WCC, this proposal is also unacceptable in relation to highway safety as there is an absence of adequate visibility, which contravenes Policy DM18 of the Winchester District Local Plan.

It has been reported by the Principal Planning Officer at WCC that coniferous trees have already been removed from the western entrance to the site. These trees could have supported nesting birds and bats. As stated in Winchester District Local Plan Part 2, DM23 "Development should not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees and the space required to support them in the long term."

By permitting this development, damage would be caused to the rural nature of the area, which is valued for its ancient character. The area would thereby become suburbanised and harm the characteristic. It is therefore important to protect and enhance this area which is within the Ancient Forest of Bere, as stated in WCC's Landscape Character Assessment which seeks to "Retain the rural character of the local minor roads... resist development which further fragments the restoration of the former Forest of Bere..."

The appeal site itself is surrounded by trees and falls within mixed farmland and woodland landscape and so development of this type has no overriding jurisdiction and is contrary to Policy CP5 and CP20 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2.



## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By: MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address: Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name: MRS ASHLEY BANNING

Address: 1 Great Ervills Cottages  
Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QR

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

**YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I object to this appeal

For official use only (date received): 21/12/2018 12:27:16

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By: MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address: Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name: MR KEITH BROWN

Address: Spring Firs, Apless Lane  
Worlds End, Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QA

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

**YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I find it difficult to understand how we can still be in this situation. The matter was subject to a Public Enquiry two years ago which found against the applicants. Now they are having what amounts to a 'second go' at it by appealing against the enforcement notice. What a complete waste of public time and money. For the record, this has already been discussed at great length and the applicants should not be granted planning permission and 3 months should in my view be plenty of time to comply. Please see my original comments from the public enquiry consultations. The applicants probably won't comply with 5(iv) to (vii) anyway and us taxpayers will have to pick up the bill for returning the site to a reasonable condition. They should have been evicted from the site months ago. These comments apply to the other linked cases.

For official use only (date received): 22/12/2018 14:50:35

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By

MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address

Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name

MRS T BROWN

Address

World's End  
HAMBLEDON  
PO7 4QA

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

#### **YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

Nothing at all has altered since all the other documentation has been submitted many times over, relating to this exact same time wasting issue. The last application was denied by Winchester CC, it was denied at Appeal and then denied at independent Appeal:

The land is unsuitable as it is primarily water meadows

The access is unsuitable as the entrance is set on a bend on a very fast, unpaved road

The Appellants have settled on this land illegally

The area is unsuitable for the healthy development of children

There is excessive noise produced from dogs barking day and night, generators running and loud arguments taking place

Already, irreparable harm has been caused to the character and heritage of the countryside, as one part of the field appears to be used as a dumping ground for rubbish and many trees have been felled and ancient hedges destroyed. Hard core and scalplings have been laid, destroying the ground underfoot.

A considerable waste of time, effort and public money has already taken place and now we are forced to expend the same amount of exertion on what should have been resolved many, many months ago. In short, I object to this Appeal.

For official use only (date received): 13/01/2019 16:05:59

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By

MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address

Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name

MS JR CORNEY

Address

Lavender Cottage, Worlds End  
Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QU

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

**YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

Continue breach of planning law by living in mobile homes on agricultural/equestrian land  
Appear to be running business out of the premises and many vehicles exiting and entering the premises

Many hedgerows and trees removed from the premises and fencing put up

Lights blazing at the premises adding to light pollution

Complete disregard to planning law

If permitted I will feel free to build static caravan pitches on my land in the same area

For official use only (date received): 12/01/2019 13:25:42

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By

MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address

Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name

MR DONALD CRAWFORD

Address

Hill House  
Hambledon  
Hambledon  
PO7 4QP

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

#### **YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I made an objection in April 2014 when the travellers applied for occupation of the site. Since then it has gone through due process of appeals etc. This culminated in a three day hearing in which all arguments were discussed in depth and at length. It resulted in a categorical refusal of occupying the land under any circumstances. The reasons for refusal have not changed.

The travellers decided to flout the law by moving onto the site and despoiling it. Eviction should be as soon as possible, especially as alternative sites have been made available to them.

Please follow through.

For official use only (date received): 12/01/2019 12:39:37

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By

MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address

Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name

MRS LESLEY CRAWFORD

Address

Hill House  
Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire  
PO7 4QP

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

## YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I wish to record my objection to the appeal against eviction from what was a pony paddock.

In my previous objection I made these points:-

The current access does not comply with regulations for services. Refuse collection lorries, fire engines, ambulance etc. all need large turning circles, some up to 16.8 metres which cannot be obtained.

The entrance to the site is off a very fast, sometimes dangerous road. It may be a country road but it is well known by locals to be a 'rat-run' between Fareham and Waterlooville. Problems are exacerbated when rain water floods the road before reaching the water meadow. Planning permission for an entrance on the opposite side of the road was previously refused after appeal (APP/L1765/A/09/2094415/NWF) partly due to the dangers of coming in and out on this de-restricted stretch of road. The traffic has substantially increased since then. The dangers have intensified by more vehicles using the existing track servicing the paddocks, turning it into a roadway and coming out into fast moving traffic

The site is directly opposite the water meadows which is listed in 'Hampshire Treasures'. The application site itself is prone to be marshy especially in winter. Marsh grasses and reeds used to be evident but are no longer since the illegal importation of hardcore over the entire plot. There are many springs in this area and this hard base has created issues for the other pony paddocks as the water does not flow freely across to the water meadows. There is also a mature hedgerow bordering onto the busy main road and the site. The biodiversity checklist has been completed stating 'No' to being within 100 metres of all these things. Clearly this is erroneous.

This rural paddock has been subdivided into eight plots and has already been ruined by illegal occupation.

The paddock, approximately 1.25 acres, has been totally covered with hardcore/scalplings, (impeding the natural flow of water from the nearby springs making the other pony paddocks much wetter/muddier). This accommodates four 'bungalow type' buildings, 12 caravans, sheds, day rooms, various vehicles and assorted domestic utilities leaving very little room for anything else.

They have made eight separate access points from each plot directly onto the communal track leading to all paddocks and are calling it their own. The latest plans show they are trying to commandeer extra land.

The children play on this track as there is no room on their land. One three year old went onto the main road from here and was fortunately unharmed.

They have illegally tapped into water pipes obtaining free water at the cost to others.

Southern Electricity took one electricity cable to the entrance of the site but were unable to take it further. It was taken from here by unqualified people to service the entire site which is now illuminated with light pollution throughout the night.

Rubbish collections from 6/8 bins are made Free of Charge by the Council. The collection vehicles have to park on this busy/fast main road holding up traffic creating potential hazards.

There are portable toilets on site but despite these, there is foul smelling sewage seeping on to the land, contaminating it making grazing animals sickly. This effluent will eventually find its way to the water meadows opposite polluting wildlife and their environment.

The noise of dogs barking incessantly and frequent 'colourful' language from screaming arguments are all the more piercing in the countryside.

Peoples enjoyment of their ponies/paddocks is spoilt by all of this and an uneasy air of intimidation.

It has been said (at great length) that aims are to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers to facilitate their way of life whilst respecting the interest of the settled community.

In the deeds of all the pony paddocks, it was written there should be no business run, not to live on site, no premises and no stallions. The other paddock owners observe this but the travellers have broken every rule. The settled community are also indirectly paying for the utilities/services that the travellers take. This is not respecting the settled community!!

An appeal hearing (APP/L1765/A/14/2224363) held over several days in June 2015 was summed up in depth. The judge stated "Nevertheless, these schemes would not overcome my concerns with pedestrian safety, social integration and access to services".

Please uphold the previous decision and refuse legal occupation of this pony paddock and continue with eviction plans.



For official use only (date received): 12/01/2019 12:02:51

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address  
Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS CORINNE DAVIES

Address  
2 Apless View, Forest Road  
Worlds End, Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QX

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

## YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Case number APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Location: Plot of land to the rear of the Chairmakers Arms Forest road Denmead PO7 4QX

I would like to oppose this planning application for the following reasons:

The exit of the site is situated near a junction and a bend in a road. The road is used as a short cut between Waterlooville and Fareham. A previous application in 2008 had been refused - in part because of the intention of creating an exit within a short distance from the exit of the paddocks in question. Bearing in mind the large housing development between Waterlooville and Denmead, the traffic on this road has increased significantly since 2008. Regular large and small vehicles used by a community of an additional 34 would make it dangerous for people using the road.

Furthermore, there are no pavements or street lighting in this area due to the very rural nature of this area and there is no room for pedestrians to walk safely on that road.

In the Department for Communities and Local Government

Planning policy for traveller sites, Policy B of the Government Plan Making states that:

'The Government's aim in respect of travellers sites are that Local Authorities should enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health welfare and employment infrastructure' (quote).

Furthermore, Policy CP5 - Sites for Gypsies (DPD draft) also states that sites should be 'be accessible to local services such as schools, health and community services but avoid placing an unreasonable burden on local facilities and services' (quote)

However, amenities in Denmead are over 2 miles from the proposed site. Denmead is a small village and employment infrastructure is also limited.

There are no bus services available in World's end. The site is not sustainable as far as transport mode is concerned.

Policy C of the same plan, states that the local planning authorities should, when assessing the suitability of sites in rural and semi rural setting, ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.

In this case, the proposed site has a considerable effect on our very small community as well as its wildlife and natural environment. The occupants have destroyed the paddocks and neighbouring flora, hedges and trees. The government national planning policy framework aims to achieve sustainable development by outlining the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental:

Economically - the site has no economic role.

Furthermore, there is a large amount of rubbish which can be seen from the road which is likely to attract rodents and vermin as well as being a health hazard.

Socially - the proposed site is disproportionate in size to our small community and is not in a geographical situation which leads to encourage social integration.

Policy CP5 also lists that the site - should avoid harmful impacts on nearby residential properties by noise and light, vehicle movements and other activities. (quote).

The lighting is reminiscent of an industrial unit at night and is a definite light pollution to the local residents, adjoining paddocks.

Environmentally - the site does not contribute nor enhance the natural aspect of this area. The previous illegal occupants of the site have caused a lot of damage to the site as it is, making a mockery of the existing biodiversity report.

The absence of public transport increases the carbon imprint by the use of vehicles.

The area where the paddocks are situated have natural springs and regularly flood in the winter. Covering the paddocks with concrete is likely to have an adverse effect on the adjoining road and pollution and could affect Portsmouth water pump station and could potentially incur damage and cost to the Highways and possibly to the Portsmouth Water authorities. My comments on the rubbish pile

mentioned above also apply to this section.

The Denmead Neighbour Plan cites that:

That proposals for the development of two new sites for travellers accommodation will be supported, provided that:

(i) each comprises a self-contained site of no more than two or three pitches or plots;

The joint applications does not comply with the recommendation.

(ii) are located on land in close proximity to the settled traveller community in Old Mill Lane and adjacent to the existing traveller site at West Fork in Bunns Lane.

World's end is not in close proximity of Bunns Lane nor Old Mill lane.

; and

(iii) will accord with all the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Winchester development plan.

Neither applications do.

The previous planning application was refused and subsequently turned down following an appeal APP/L1765/A/14/2224363. This was ignored by the previous occupants who moved to the site several months ago, causing much damage. The only difference with this application is that the site has been sold to other parties, thus avoiding any punitive measures by the previous occupants and manipulating the system in order to re-apply.

I would like to conclude my opposition to this application by underlining the fact that this is a rural area included as part of the Policy MTR4 4 (Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – joint Core strategy) – Development in the countryside. This clearly states that this area is defined as land outside the built up areas of Winchester, Whiteley and Waterlooville and that development of the land has very clear limitations to the way it can be used and will only permit certain types of development. I appreciate the need for travellers sites but also very much appreciate the need for preserving our countryside. I understand that there are already

3 official traveller sites in existence in Denmead.

The Waterlooville and Denmead area has already extensively provided to the housing need of Hampshire. It is important to emphasise the need to preserve the remaining countryside in this area in order to provide a natural habitat for wildlife and a green environment for the benefit and well being of the local population. World's end is a very much enjoyed and appreciated by the local and neighbouring communities.

I understand that Winchester City Council has identified a 5 year supply of land for gypsies, travellers and show persons development plan. This application is not part of this plan. I would urge the Inspector to turn down the appeal not only because of the above but also for the fact that both Winchester City Council Planning department and Hampshire County Council have been totally ignored by the applicants with regards to the decisions made by both authorities and their efforts to enforce their decision.



## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address  
Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name MR TIM DUTSON

Address  
Meadow Farm House, Worlds End  
Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QU

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

**YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I objected to this application on the grounds of it being totally unsuited to the local area and essentially just a rehash of the 2013 application 14/00180/FUL which was declined, taken to appeal and subsequently dismissed, ref: APP/L1765/A/14/2224363. I note that none of the fundamentals which led to the planning inspectorate's decision have changed.

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By

MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address

Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name

MRS KATIE ENEAS

Address

Yew Tree Cottage, Worlds End  
Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QU

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

**YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

Myself and my husband object to this appeal

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By

MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address

Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name

MR ALAN FREEMANTLE

Address

3 The Orchard  
Denmead  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 6YG

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

**YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I find it totally incomprehensible that the Appellants can convert our green and pleasant land and lovely pasture/countryside/ agricultural land into an area to site static /mobile homes with all the necessary infrastructure ,:- Cesspits, electricity supply, toilets ,hard standing and sheds ETC.ETC. WITHOUT PLANNING PERMISSION.

Apart from the above, I don't consider the area suitable for permanent dwellings or any form of structures that would mean a significant change to the current character of the land, tranquility of the area by the noise generated by the individuals habiting the structures 24/7and constant vehicle movements, not to mention light pollution.

For official use only (date received): 13/01/2019 20:25:53

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Appeal Reference | APP/L1765/C/18/3201566   |
| Appeal By        | MR BOBBY KNIGHT  |
| Site Address     | Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock<br>6 Hipley, Hambledon<br>Waterlooville<br>Hampshire |

#### SENDER DETAILS

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Name                            | MRS CAROLYN HARGREAVES  |
| Address                         | Meadow Farm Cottage<br>Worlds End, Hambledon<br>Waterlooville<br>Hampshire<br>PO7 4QU |
| Company/Group/Organisation Name | Worlds End Residents Association  |

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence

Other

**YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

This representation is from the Worlds End Residents Association.

This site has already been the subject of an appeal to assess its suitability as a site for the development of pitches for gypsy / traveller families. The planning inspector said "the site is not well located in relation to services and would fail to provide an acceptable standard of amenity for future occupants. The proposal would also harm the character of the countryside." Reducing the number of pitches to 4 or 6 was examined but she considered "this would not overcome my concerns with pedestrian safety, social integration and access to services."

Nothing has changed in the intervening years to improve the standard of amenity offered by this site.

Worlds End is a small hamlet of about 70 residents. There are 7 adults and 9 children living on this pony paddock, with additional people visiting. This is a considerable increase in the population. The amenity of local residents and the character of the area has been negatively affected by increased lighting, noise and a greater volume of traffic using the entrance to the paddocks.

Worlds End has no public transport, and access to schools, shops and health facilities requires the use of private transport. Fareham Road has no pavement and a survey in 2014 recorded 500 vehicles per hour using the road at peak times. It is not a sustainable site for residential use, nor a safe site for children and young people.

The site is on clay with poor surface water drainage. Rainwater will run into the ditch next to the road and cause increased flooding on Fareham Road. There is no information about how foul drainage is being managed.

The application includes land at the entrance to the site belonging to Fullers, Smith and Turner plc, the owner of The Chairmakers public house. Their property has been damaged by the movement of mobile homes onto the site.

For all the above reasons we ask that this appeal be refused.

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By

MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address

Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name

DR MARK HARGREAVES

Address

Meadow Farm Cottage, Worlds End  
Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QU

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

#### **YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I wish to register my objection to this planning application and request you reject the appeal under Section 174 to the Enforcement Notice.

This planning application represents an unjustified residential development in an unsustainable location in the countryside which is harmful to the rural character of the area.

In addition, the available length of frontage to the C50 Fareham Road is insufficient to enable a satisfactory and safe road junction with adequate visibility splays. Furthermore, the Local Planning Authority are not satisfied that foul and surface water can be drained from the site in a satisfactory manner thereby avoiding adverse impacts on the water environment.

A previous similar application (14/00180/FUL ) was dismissed at appeal because "such schemes would not overcome concerns with pedestrian safety, social integration and access to services".

There are now 16 people living on this site and in addition others who visit regularly. The resulting impact on local residents through increased noise , light pollution and traffic is substantial.

In light of all this it is clear that this application has no merit and the appeal should be dismissed.

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Appeal Reference | APP/L1765/C/18/3201566   |
| Appeal By        | MR BOBBY KNIGHT  |
| Site Address     | Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock<br>6 Hipley, Hambledon<br>Waterlooville<br>Hampshire |

#### SENDER DETAILS

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| Name    | MR CEDRIC MATTOCK   |
| Address | The Priory, Worlds End<br>Hambledon<br>WATERLOOVILLE<br>PO7 4QU |

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

**YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

For the reasons given in the dismissal of previous planning applications and subsequent appeals, I object to the proposed use of this land  
For residential use.

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Appeal Reference | APP/L1765/C/18/3201566   |
| Appeal By        | MR BOBBY KNIGHT  |
| Site Address     | Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock<br>6 Hipley, Hambledon<br>Waterlooville<br>Hampshire |

#### SENDER DETAILS

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| Name    | MRS DENISE SEARLE   |
| Address | Meadowsweet, Hipley Road<br>Hambledon<br>WATERLOOVILLE<br>PO7 4QG |

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

## YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I object most strongly to this application being passed. It has been refused by the public, local council, Winchester County Council and has been refused on appeal by the Inspectorate last year.

Nothing has changed - these travellers have moved on to a 1.25 acre plot which has always been used as a pony paddock, turned it into a housing estate and are demanding the right to do whatever they want, irrespective of covenants on the land or the fact that it is agricultural land not deemed fit to live on.

In the past anyone wishing to operate a business from this plot has also been refused and/or fined for doing acts other than keeping horses on the land. This has and can be proved by documentation at previous planning hearings and appeals.

The travellers are contravening any attempts to stop them developing the land and they store their work vehicles on site and use the land to operate and enhance their businesses.

I strongly believe that they should be held accountable by the same laws as I am, I am the only house built on this site before the land was divided up into 10 horse paddock plots.

If the travellers want to settle down in one place they are no longer 'travellers' and have no special privileges. The local council has provided plenty of sites for travellers, as laid out in the local plan which are openly on offer to this group of people. This means they have plenty of options on where to live.

A site with no water, main sewerage, adequate electric, gas, public transport, pathways, lighting, and accessibility to play areas for children is not fit for multiple families to live on.

In the time that the travellers have lived on the site, I have never seen, heard or smelt any cesspits being emptied. In that time I would have seen at least one large cesspit vehicle on their site. Where is the sewerage going? The rest of the paddock owners keep horses on their paddocks which provide the horses with their daily grazing.

Since the masses of tonnes of scalping's have been laid on the site, which is on the flood plane, the displacement of rain water alone has been enough to affect neighbouring paddocks and to cause flooding on the road in places it hadn't previously flooded. They have not made any provision on their individual pitches to accommodate this problem, thereby once again causing adverse conditions to the countryside.

At present the site is lit up like Blackpool illuminations, each static home is edged with lights plus all the additional buildings on each pitch have their own lighting then they've added motion lights to each pitch. At one point the lights were so bright I couldn't see to get my horses in! The Hamlet is very conscious of Light pollution and there are no street lights, their site does not fit in to the natural environment of the Hamlet.

In addition the noise from the site has dramatically altered the peace and tranquillity of our Hamlet. Just the continuous barking of the dogs is a distraction/annoyance, let alone the machinery which seems to be continually in use on the site and people shouting/arguing at all times. Once again what was once a quiet place to live is full of unnatural (uncountryside) noises.

This small hamlet and its roads cannot support the additional vehicles the travellers bring with them. There is at least 3 vehicles per pitch each trying to leave the plot by a shared gateway on to a fast/busy road from a partially concealed entrance. There have been more accidents along this road in recent years.

The travellers, I have noticed, also keep moving the boundary lines to their property and continually trying to claim ownership of the track and the gateway. The track and gateway is shared equally

between ALL the paddock owners, they are 1 plot in 10. They are 1 owner amongst 10 owners, a fact which seems to escape them. We find their presence intimidating to the point where it can be awkward and intolerable to use our own entrance.

May I draw your attention to the first application put in to the council which shows an additional track to be put in, on the travellers plot to give them access to each pitch. The whole 8 pitches were to use the one original gate to their plot. They have not put that additional track in. The boundary running alongside the existing track has always been straight. The plan with this appeal documentation shows pitch 7/8 now having a wider pitch than all the rest. This is not accurate.

During the 3 years that the travellers have been here they have cut down our gates and removed them from site. On complaint they have erected a new entranceway and gate but altered it to be large enough to accommodate their static homes.

They have ignored every enforcement notice, injunction and high court orders. They have ignored all comments/suggestions/orders from the Winchester Enforcement Team and Local Authority.

They have demonstrated that they cannot be trusted to do what they say they will do, so therefore cannot be given any leeway in the appeal application. Only an outright refusal with a strict timeline to vacate the land and restore it to its previous state can be an option. As, has already been issued to them by Winchester Council.

I could make this objection a lot longer by quoting all the references from the previous applications, refusals, appeals and arbitrations that have already been heard but the points I have raised above are to the point and true. Proof can easily be provided and is available to you on request.



For official use only (date received): 13/01/2019 13:34:57

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address  
Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name MR RICHARD SEARLE

Address  
Meadowsweet, Hipley Road  
Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QG

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

## YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I strongly disagree to this application for the following reasons:

Planning has already been refused by Winchester Council, further on appeal and then by independent committee. This decision to refuse planning was then completely ignored by the Gypsies who moved onto the site without authority and have since ignored all halts to carry out further works and developed the site into homes for a large number of Gypsy families and businesses.

The land is agricultural land and enclosed by other agricultural land and it does not warrant a change of use for the development of the 8 pitches for gypsy / traveller families.

The entrance to the site is not owned by the Gypsies and the track that leads to each of the 8 pitches is jointly owned by each of the 10 paddock owners. These paddocks are for horse grazing. Before the gypsies entered the site, the front gate (5-bar gate) was always kept closed to protect animals, predominantly horses, that may have escaped from paddocks and prevented them from entering the busy road. It was the last line of defence in effect. The gypsies now refuse to close the front gate as they need constant access with their vehicles and due to this, there has already been instances where horses have escaped into the road. I have personally been involved in such an instance which fortunately led to the recovery of the horse from the main road without injury or further accident.

The gypsy site has children resident and there are already difficulties in how these children will be kept occupied on their own plots and also there is a very high level of concern for their safety in access to the site without the use of vehicles. There are no play areas for children beyond the area where the caravans are situated so this does now extend to children playing in the shared access drive. Further there was an instance where a young toddler made their way to the main road which could have been catastrophic. There are no pavements on the main road, the verges are some 2-3ft above the road and undulating and access to the paddocks is situated on a 60mph road with no street lighting and sharp bends. This is certainly not a children-friendly area and is in fact very dangerous. There is also no public transport in the local area and therefore children or non-drivers, would find it very difficult to leave the site without walking on the main road itself.

Considering the size of the very small village of Worlds End, more a hamlet, the gypsy site significantly detracts from the tranquillity of the area and now suffers from very high light pollution, constant noise of vehicle movements on and off the Gypsy site, constant dogs barking on the site and larger commercial vehicles now being stored at the site. The light pollution consist of many large spotlights lighting up the whole caravan site through the night and affecting the horses in adjacent paddocks. We were also very disappointed to have fireworks being let off on bonfire night by the Gypsies in amongst the horses in adjoining paddocks. This is just not acceptable.

I remain very concerned about increased flooding in adjacent paddocks as the Gypsies continue to bring lorry loads of scalpings onto the site to try and elevate the ground above the water table in wet weather. I am also very concerned about where sewerage is going from the site as whilst there are some portaloos around, they are not in use and we know that large pits have been dug with excavators. With the high risk of flooding and a river and a bore hole local to the site, I have concerns that a make-shift soak away will cause sewerage contamination.

In conclusion, with all considered, I feel this is most certainly not the place to have a Gypsy site and the continual disregard of the Planning team, planning decisions and court injunctions only goes to prove that the people now living at the site will only continue to do exactly what they want to do and with no regard to anyone else.

I believe there are other designated sites that the Gypsies could go to within the area and approved by Winchester Council so let them do that.

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Appeal Reference | APP/L1765/C/18/3201566   |
| Appeal By        | MR BOBBY KNIGHT  |
| Site Address     | Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock<br>6 Hipley, Hambledon<br>Waterlooville<br>Hampshire |

#### SENDER DETAILS

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| Name    | MR MICHAEL SETTLE   |
| Address | Thatched Cottage, Worlds End<br>Hambledon<br>WATERLOOVILLE<br>PO7 4QU |

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

#### **YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I object to this appeal for the following reasons:

It is a site which was pony paddocks in a quiet hamlet with one pub and no other facilities and is unsustainable.

The access is from a busy, de restricted road with a speed limit of 60mph which is very dangerous.

There are no pavements and all trips off the site have to be made by vehicle.

The area is prone to flooding which will now be worse as such a large area has been covered with concrete and tarmac.

There are no facilities for children on site or in the local area.

There is a nuisance from noise pollution. There is constant noise from barking dogs and frequent loud shouting between residents. This is very disturbing for local residents.

There is light pollution from very strong lights which are on for all hours of darkness giving the ponies in the adjacent fields no night time rest and must be a nuisance for those living next door to the site.

For official use only (date received): 12/01/2019 12:02:50

## The Planning Inspectorate

### COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

**Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566**

#### DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/18/3201566

Appeal By: MR BOBBY KNIGHT

Site Address: Plots 7 & 8, Pony Paddock  
6 Hipley, Hambledon  
Waterlooville  
Hampshire

#### SENDER DETAILS

Name: MRS SARAH SETTLE

Address: Thatched Cottage, Worlds End  
Hambledon  
WATERLOOVILLE  
PO7 4QU

#### ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

#### **YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE**

I object to this appeal for the following reasons:

It is a site which was pony paddocks in a quiet hamlet with one pub and no other facilities and is unsustainable.

The access is from a busy, de restricted road with a speed limit of 60mph which is very dangerous.

There are no pavements and all trips off the site have to be made by vehicle.

The area is prone to flooding which will now be worse as such a large area has been covered with concrete and tarmac.

There are no facilities for children on site or in the local area.

There is a nuisance from noise pollution. There is constant noise from barking dogs and frequent loud shouting between residents. This is very disturbing for local residents.

There is light pollution from very strong lights which are on for all hours of darkness giving the ponies in the adjacent fields no night time rest and must be a nuisance for those living next door to the site.