Building a Better Future Plan - Representation Form

Part A - Personal Details

Please indicate whether you are completing this form yourself or if you are an agent completing this on behalf of a client

I am completing this form myself

Part A - Personal Details (Completing form on own behalf)

Please provide the following personal details.
Please note that these details are required for all representations and your information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate.
The personal data you provide will be used to ensure that representations comply with government guidance and that they can be used as part of the Local Plan examination process. More information on how we use your personal information can be found as part of the 'Planning Policy' privacy notice is available here.

Title	Mr
First Name	Andrew
Last Name	Hunnibal

[redacted]

Please provide the following details where applicable and/or relevant

[redacted]

Part A - Personal Details (Agent on client's behalf)

If an agent is appointed, please provide the following information:
Please note that these details are required for all representations and your information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate.
The personal data you provide will be used to ensure that representations comply with government guidance and that they can be used as part of the Local Plan examination process. More information on how we use your personal information can be found as part of the 'Planning Policy' privacy notice is available here.

No Response

Please provide the following information about the client for whom you are completing this form on their behalf

No Response

Part B - Your representation(s)

Which part of the Building a Better Future Plan does your representation relate to?
Please provide as much detail as possible.
If you wish to make a change to the Policies Map, please comment on the corresponding policy, and explain what change you would wish to make. If you would be helpful if you could show this in visual form
A full list of policies and allocations can be found in the contents page(s) of the Publication Plan - you can access this document here.

Policy Number	-
Allocation Number	2 (Land north of Long Copse Lane)
Paragraph Number	-
Page Number	-

Do you consider the Local Plan is ...
(Please select as appropriate)

	Yes	No
Legally compliant	X	
Sound		X

Please give details of why you consider the Building a Better Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.
If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Council's own transport evidence records this as the least accessible site allocated anywhere in the Plan, and the site that scored worst received the least analysis. The strategic model and the connectivity scoring both address 260 dwellings; the allocation is for 325. And the mitigation on which the Sustainability Appraisal's conclusion of acceptability depended has not been carried into the allocation.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.
You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Allocation 2: Land north of Long Copse Lane should be deleted from the Plan in its entirety, together with the consequential amendments to Policy 6, the sources of housing supply table, the housing trajectory at Appendix 1 and the Policies Map. The safeguarding of the existing Gypsy and Traveller site at Long Copse Lane under Policy 43 is unaffected and should be retained.
>
Deletion makes the Plan sound because the unsoundness is in the allocation of this site and cannot be cured within it. The Council's own evidence records this as the least accessible site allocated anywhere in the Plan; the distances to schools, shops, health services and bus stops are fixed by where the site is and no highway scheme alters them; and the transport evidence relied on addresses 260 dwellings, not the 325 allocated. That is a question of site selection, which falls to this examination.
>
Deletion is achievable without creating unsoundness elsewhere. This allocation is 325 dwellings of a total supply of 7,087, or 4.4 per cent, and the trajectory records no completions on it before 2032/33 — so its removal leaves the Plan's five-year supply untouched and more than ninety-five per cent of its total supply in place.
>
I put forward no revised wording for any policy or criterion, and none is sought. My objection is to the allocation of this land, not to the drafting of the criteria attached to it. No revision of those criteria would meet it, because the matters set out in my representation go to whether this site should be allocated at all rather than to how an allocation of it should be worded.

If you wish to upload any documents to support your representation, please do so below. Please note that there is a maximum file size of 50MB and you can upload a maximum of 10 files to include with your form.

- File: Representation-1-Transport.docx - Download

Examination Hearing Session Invitation

If your representation / representations are seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?
Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in examination hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.
No details on the examination hearing session(s) have yet been determined and will be made available upon the submission of the Building a Better Future Plan to the Planning Inspectorate.

Yes, I wish to participate in examination hearing session(s)

Examination Hearing Session Invitation (2)

You indicated that you wish to participate in the examination hearing session(s). Please out line why you consider this to be necessary.
Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear th ose who have indicated that they wish to participate in examination hearing session(s). Yo u may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the m atters and issues for examination.

Four matters need testing in exchange rather than on paper: the comparison between the appraisal's mandatory wording and the discretionary wording carried into the allocation; the finding that this is the least connected allocation in the Plan; the gap between the 260 dwellings assessed and the 325 allocated; and the conflict between the works described to a Planning Inspector in June 2026 and criterion (k) of this allocation.

Future Notification

Do you wish to be notified of any of the following milestones in the Building a Better Future Plan process?
These milestones include:

The Local Plan has been submitted for examination
The publication on the Inspector's Report
The adoption of the Local Plan

If you indicate that you wish to be notified, the email address you provided in Part A of the f orm will be used by the Council to notify you of these milestones.

Yes, I wish to be notified

Representation 6 — Landscape, cross-boundary matters and relative performance

Regulation 19 representation — Havant Borough Council, Building a Better Future Plan

Declaration of interest. I should record two interests. [redacted] *it lies outside both SHELAA parcels comprising Allocation 2 and no part of this representation concerns it. I am also the coordinator of the Save Long Copse Lane campaign group, which is submitting its own representation prepared with professional planning input; this representation is made in my own name and does not speak for the group.*

Why the allocation is unsound

The River Ems wildlife corridor is deferred rather than dealt with

I do not put this as a breach of the Duty to Co-operate; the Written Ministerial Statement of 27 November 2025 records the Government's position that the Duty is not retained as a distinct legal test. I put it under justified, and under the NPPF's requirement for maintaining effective co-operation, applying the test the Statement of Common Ground sets for itself at paragraph 1.3: cross-boundary strategic matters must be "dealt with rather than deferred". That paragraph also records that the December 2025 draft NPPF's replacement test of "realistic" is identical in wording to the current definition of "justified", so the test does not fall away with the change.

The June 2026 SoCG lists wildlife corridors as a strategic cross-boundary matter. Paragraph 6.30 records that the River Ems forms the boundary between the two authorities and that Chichester's Local Plan designates a strategic wildlife corridor on its eastern bank, the western bank lying within Havant Borough. The entirety of the recorded agreement, at paragraph 6.31, is that both parties recognise the river's importance as a wildlife corridor.

Havant's own Sustainability Appraisal identifies, for both EM01 and EM02, "Potential for impacts to green corridor linking Southleigh Forest with River Ems and coastal zone". SA Appendix E identified mitigation of those impacts as part of the purpose of the ecological and landscape buffer.

So: Havant's evidence base identifies that this allocation may affect the corridor; Appendix E made mitigation of that effect part of the buffer's purpose; Chichester has designated a strategic corridor on the opposite bank; and the agreed position amounts to a shared recognition of importance, with no assessment, no agreed mitigation and no agreed position on the effect of this allocation. Allocation 2 does not name the River Ems corridor at all, and criterion (m) omits the corridor from the buffer's stated purpose. Criterion (j) addresses only connections between the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour National Landscape. Allocation 1, by contrast, requires at criterion (l) that a named green corridor be maintained and enhanced.

I note fairly that a single 325-dwelling allocation is not automatically a strategic matter. The point has force because the Councils themselves list wildlife corridors as strategic, and because Havant's own site appraisal identifies the effect.

		73)
Public transport	47	Lowest
Health	33	Lowest
Leisure	42	Lowest
Walking	40	Joint lowest
Education	40	Joint lowest
Shopping	43	Joint lowest
Driving	75	Its strongest relative measure

The Plan's stated transport vision, reproduced at Figure 2 of the Strategic Transport Assessment and elaborated at its paragraph 3.1.5, is to reduce car dependency and enable local living without over-reliance on the private car. The Council has selected for around 325 dwellings the site with the worst access in the Plan to health, leisure and public transport, and the joint-worst access to education and shopping, and whose best relative attribute is how well it is connected for driving.

The site that scored worst received the least analysis. At paragraph 5.3.4 the Strategic Transport Assessment records that connectivity scores were extracted in detail only "for the borough as a whole and for the largest residential and non-residential site allocations at Southleigh and Dunsbury Hill Farm". Southleigh accordingly receives six paragraphs of analysis and three mapped figures at paragraphs 6.3.12 to 6.3.17, and Dunsbury Hill Farm four paragraphs and three figures at 6.3.18 to 6.3.21. The allocation that scored worst in the entire Plan receives a single sentence and a row in a table. The analysis was scoped by the size of the site rather than by the significance of what it found.

I note also that the tool's own limitations, set out at paragraph 5.3.6, include insufficient data on route quality — expressly naming pavement quality, lighting and cycling safety. Those are precisely the characteristics of the routes serving this site, and the tool is blind to them.

This is not a matter capable of resolution at the planning application stage. The distances from this site to schools, shops, health services and bus stops are fixed by where the site is. No highway scheme alters them. The question is therefore one of site selection, which falls to be determined at this examination.

Nor can the deficit be designed out. The Council's answer to the site's accessibility scores is the walking and cycling package contemplated by criterion (s), which asks a developer to "Maximise opportunities to provide continuous cycle routes into Emsworth" by reference to LCWIP routes 373, 277 and 270. The Strategic Transport Assessment defines those routes: route 373.1 is Emsworth — North Street (B2148), Seagull Lane to Palmer's Road; route 270.1 is Emsworth to Havant along the A259 Havant Road; and route 277.3 is Petersfield Road (B2149) to Westbourne via Southleigh Road.

Each of the three lies within Emsworth, between Emsworth and Havant, or on the Southleigh Road corridor. None of them runs along Long Copse Lane, and none reaches the allocation. The connecting section — the length that would have to be built for a cycle route from this site into Emsworth to be continuous — is not identified, costed or assessed anywhere I have been able to find in the evidence base.

Two of the three are further recorded by the Council's own consultants as unable to accommodate compliant provision. Table D1 in Appendix D states of LCWIP 373.1.4 that space between the railway

bridge and the A259 junction is limited by property boundaries, that the road will need to be made suitable for mixed traffic with a 20mph limit and traffic calming, and that "to reach compliance, a modal filter would be required to reduce the level of motor traffic on this road, although there is no obvious alternative traffic route". Of LCWIP 270.1.1 it states that "there is insufficient width to provide protected space for cyclists" along Queen Street, High Street and West Street.

And one of the three routes the allocation relies on has been left out of the delivery programme altogether. Route 373 appears neither in the Strategic Transport Assessment's list of priority routes at paragraph 7.4.3, nor in its costed schedule at Table 9. It is also absent from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IT01, June 2026). Appendix 2A of that document, at printed page 166, sets out the Council's cycling and walking schedule: refs T027 to T033 cover LCWIP routes 270.1, 270.2, 275.2, 275.3, 277.3, 363.1 and 372.1 — the same seven routes the Strategic Transport Assessment lists as priorities, and no others. Route 373 is not among them, and I can find no other reference to it in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan's 179 pages. So of the three routes by which the allocation proposes to answer the worst connectivity score in the Plan, one is not in the delivery programme at all; and the two that are, T027 (270.1) at £1,083,000 to £2,068,000 and T031 (277.3) at £3,546,000 to £4,025,000, are recorded with a funding source of "Developer contributions (S106)", a timing of "TBA with Highway Authority", and a comment which reads, in its entirety, "In parallel with development". The scheme in the programme nearest this site, T033, LCWIP route 372.1 Southleigh Road to Warblington Railway Station, is costed at £9,000 to £14,000.

This bears directly on the appraisal and on Policy 1(e). The Sustainability Appraisal scored both EM01 and EM02 Negative on criterion 4e (equal and safe access to facilities and services) and on criteria 6a and 6b (accessibility by sustainable transport modes). Policy 1(e) promotes development where good accessibility between homes, jobs and services by a wide choice of modes "exists or can be achieved". On the Council's own transport evidence, at this site it does not exist, and the routes identified as the means of achieving it do not reach the site.

The destinations are themselves constrained, on the County Council's own evidence. Criterion 4e is concerned with access to facilities and services, and the education measure above is joint lowest of the thirty-four allocations. In its response of 21 August 2026 on the Southleigh application (APP/26/00324), Hampshire County Council as education authority recorded that "St James' Church of England (Controlled) Primary School is forecast to be full and Emsworth Primary School is forecast to be full", and that "Warblington School is forecast to have limited capacity". Those are the three nearest schools to this allocation. I do not assert that this site shares the catchment the County Council was addressing, which was the catchment serving Southleigh, and I invite the County Council to confirm the position for this site. But the schools named are the same, and the difficulty is not only that this is among the least accessible allocations in the Plan for education: it is that the schools it is least able to reach are recorded by the education authority as full or nearly so.

The strategy narrative and the site appraisal describe different sites. The Plan states at paragraph 2.23 that the pattern of development proposed aligns with the strategic aim of ensuring good accessibility by non-car modes. The Council's own appraisal records this site as currently poorly accessible and scores it Negative on both 6a and 6b, and its own transport evidence ranks it last of thirty-four.

Section B — The transport evidence assesses 260 dwellings, not 325

The transport evidence relied on for this site addresses a smaller development than the Plan proposes.

The strategic model. Paragraphs 1.1.7 and 5.2.28 of the Strategic Transport Assessment confirm that all references to allocations in the report and in the model reflect the Regulation 18 version of the Plan. Table 4 records the Regulation 19 change to this site as an increase of 65 dwellings. Appendix C lists the site at 260 dwellings.

The Council's answer, at paragraphs 5.2.30 and 10.3.5, is to net that increase against dwellings removed elsewhere in the borough — reaching a net reduction of 48 — and to conclude that the modelling remains a worst case. The sites removed, however, are Coldharbour Farm, the Former Dairy Crest Depot and Land at Cowplain School, which lie in Havant, Waterlooville and Cowplain, on networks that bear no relationship to the roads serving this site. The reasoning at paragraph 10.3.5 turns expressly on the change "not altering the major growth locations". At the location where the impact would fall, the model tested twenty per cent fewer dwellings than the Plan allocates.

The connectivity assessment. The finding at paragraph 6.3.10 that this is the worst-connected allocation in the Plan is recorded against a 260-dwelling scheme, as Appendix C records. The distances it measures do not change with the quantum; the number of households living at those distances does.

The model cannot in any event produce a site-specific answer. At paragraph 5.2.9 the Strategic Transport Assessment explains that only Southleigh and Dunsbury Hill Farm are represented by their own zones in the Sub Regional Transport Model, every other allocation being folded into zones that already generate their own travel demand, because adding a zone per site was not judged proportionate to cost. Paragraph 5.2.10 then states that this "does not allow analysis of impacts from individual Local Plan developments".

Paragraph 5.2.8 records that although Havant Borough sits within the model's Core Fully Modelled Area, it lies at the boundary with a "'marginal' modelling area covering parts of neighbouring West Sussex", where the road network and the way travel demand is estimated and assigned are less detailed, and that trips originating in or passing through those areas may be represented less accurately as they enter Havant — which "can affect the precision of predicted traffic flows at the borough boundary". The eastern end of Long Copse Lane, its junction with North Street and the route through Westbourne are at or beyond that boundary.

Appendix B, the modelling report, records at paragraph 5.2.6 that "only flow differences of 20 PCUs (per hour) or greater are displayed in the plots".

The screening measures do not address this kind of route. Paragraphs 6.2.10 and 6.2.11 set out the thresholds agreed with the highway authorities: volume-to-capacity ratios and delay at junctions. Every measure is a junction capacity ratio. None addresses carriageway width, forward visibility, passing opportunity, footway provision, or the safety of shared use by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians on an unsegregated rural lane. Not one of the nineteen junctions taken forward at Table 7 lies east of Emsworth.

What the model does show, on a comparable lane. At Appendix B paragraph 5.2.8 the modellers record that approximately 100 PCUs travelling east from Southleigh divert north along Woodberry Lane in the morning peak to avoid delays at Durrants, and observe that "the nature of Woodberry Lane is a relatively narrow country lane". Paragraph 5.2.11 records the same effect in the evening peak, and the main report repeats it at 6.2.14. No mitigation for Woodberry Lane appears anywhere in the document — not in Chapter 7, not in the costed schedule at Table 9, and not in the package at paragraph 10.4.10.

The diversion of traffic onto narrow rural lanes to avoid congestion is therefore a modelled outcome on this network. Long Copse Lane, having no zone of its own, could not have produced the equivalent finding whether or not the same thing would occur.

And the strategic network this traffic joins is to receive nothing. At paragraph 1.1.9 the Strategic Transport Assessment records that "there are no highway works planned on the sections of Strategic Road Network (SRN) that pass through the borough (the A3(M) and A27 corridors)", the model assuming only that National Highways schemes elsewhere in the South East, mainly the M27 Junction 10 improvements, will be complete within the plan period. The only two highway interventions the document identifies within the borough, at paragraphs 7.2.4 to 7.2.5, are bus priority schemes — at the A27 Warblington Interchange and at the Hulbert Road/Fitzwygram Way roundabout.

The Warblington Interchange is the junction through which traffic from this site reaches the strategic network, and the Council's own assessment records at paragraph 6.2.13 that it "is operating close to or over capacity for traffic joining and leaving via Emsworth Road resulting in users choosing an alternative route". That is the same mechanism the modellers observed on Woodberry Lane, described in the Council's own words, at the junction that serves this allocation. The Plan's response to a junction it says is already at or over capacity, and from which drivers are already diverting, is a bus priority scheme.

Nor is the one further connection safeguarded in that direction programmed. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan's entry for it, T012 in Appendix 2, is the "provision of walking and cycling links south to Emsworth and the A259, including provision of a shared use bridge over the railway line to provide a traffic-free route". Its cost is recorded as "TBC", its delivery agent as "Developer", and its trigger as "TBA with Highway Authority".

Nor does the Infrastructure Delivery Plan supply what the model does not. Its only entry capable of bearing on highway capacity at this site is T001 at printed page 162, "Mitigation at individual key junctions set out in Transport Assessment", boroughwide, £60,000,000, timed only as "Linked to delivery of sites". Its comment records that "Interventions range from £3,700 to £30,000,000. Updated TA outstanding. Mitigation proposals in TA not definitive solution; further work and site specific testing needed." The Council therefore relies at once on a Transport Assessment it describes as outstanding, and on mitigation proposals it describes as not a definitive solution and as requiring further site-specific testing.

The highway authority has since said the same thing about the largest allocation in the Plan. On 28 July 2026, six weeks before this consultation closes, Hampshire County Council responded as highway authority to the Southleigh outline application (APP/26/00324), reference 6-3-13-341, over the signature of Gemma McCart, Transport Team Leader — Highway Development Planning. It advised that "at present, the information provided is considered insufficient to adequately support the assumptions and design parameters underpinning both the proposed site access arrangements and the off-site mitigation measures", required further clarification on multi-modal trip generation, trip assignment and trip distribution, and stated that "in the absence of sufficient information on these matters, the Highway Authority is not currently in a position to reach a conclusion regarding the acceptability of the proposals or the extent of the transport impacts arising from the development". It concluded: "The Highway Authority therefore requests that a holding objection be maintained on the application on the grounds of insufficient information."

I put that at its proper weight. It is a consultation response on a different allocation's planning application, not a finding about this one, and holding objections are routinely resolved by the provision of further information. But it is the highway authority, during this consultation, declining to reach a conclusion on the transport impacts of the site on which this Plan's supply principally depends — and saying so in the same terms the Council itself uses at T001 about the borough-wide mitigation. The transport evidence base is incomplete on the Council's own account at T001, and on its highway authority's account as to the largest allocation. This allocation's own network, as set out above, was never modelled at the quantum proposed.

The consequence. In their Interim Findings on the previous Local Plan, the Inspectors dealt with transport modelling for Hayling Island that was compliant with national guidance but had not covered the conditions that mattered. Their conclusion at paragraph 9 was that "without an understanding of the potential impacts from the proposed development in the Plan during the tourist periods and weekends we are unable to conclude that as a result of the Plan, there would be no unacceptable impacts on highway safety, or that the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe."

I invite the Inspector to reach the same conclusion here. Without an assessment that addresses this quantum of development on this local network, the Council cannot demonstrate that residual cumulative impacts would not be severe.

I note in this connection that section 10.5 of the Strategic Transport Assessment, headed "Highway Authorities Endorsement", records engagement rather than endorsement, refers to "additional sensitivity tests" carried out to address the highway authorities' concerns — a phrase appearing once in the document, with no scope, description or results given anywhere — and recommends at paragraph 10.5.2 that the Council continue to engage with the authorities "following their response to this document". The Inspectors' Interim Findings required at paragraph 10 that any sensitivity testing offered in answer must be "robustly demonstrated through suitable modelling that there would be no severe impacts on the highway network during these times, including the deliverability of any potential mitigation."

Section C — The mitigation the Sustainability Appraisal required is not secured by the allocation

This remains the principal drafting ground of objection.

SA Appendix E sets out the mitigation on which the SA relied in concluding that this site's negative scores on accessibility could be made acceptable. Appendix D scores both EM01 and EM02 as Negative on criterion 4e (equal and safe access to facilities and services), 6a and 6b (accessibility by sustainable transport modes).

For EM01, against criteria 6a and 6b, and for EM02 against criterion 6b, Appendix E states in identical terms that to accord with LTP4 policies on reducing car dependency there "must be high quality walking and cycling routes" from the site to Emsworth town centre and other key destinations, together with an enhanced bus service serving the Southleigh Road area, and that "any allocation must require the provision of these" and any other improvements identified through a site-specific transport assessment, to be delivered to make the site acceptable.

Against criteria 4e and 6a for both sites, Appendix E adds that the necessary infrastructure improvements "will need to be agreed with the Highway Authorities prior to development commencing".

The allocation does not do this. Its relevant criteria are:

- (e) "Explore opportunities to enhance bus service provision to the Southleigh Road area"
- (s) "Maximise opportunities to provide continuous cycle routes into Emsworth" (LCWIP routes 373, 277 and 270)
- (q) "Explore opportunities to connect to existing PRoW" linking north to Southleigh Forest
- (f) Access and associated improvements "to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority"

"Explore opportunities" and "maximise opportunities" impose no obligation. A developer who explores an opportunity and declines it has complied. Criterion (f) secures the means of access, which is a highway capacity and safety matter; it does not secure the sustainable transport package that the SA identified as the reason the site's negative accessibility scores were acceptable. No criterion imposes the pre-commencement trigger Appendix E specified, and the allocation contains no requirement for a site-specific transport assessment at all, although Appendix E's requirement was expressly framed by reference to one.

The Sustainability Appraisal distinguished mandatory from discretionary, and the allocation inverted it. Appendix E does not use a single register. For the transport package it says "must". For the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, in the same cell block for EM02, it says only that delivery of LNRS opportunities "should be explored". The authors of the appraisal knew the difference between a requirement and an invitation, and marked it.

The allocation then applied that discretionary verb to the item Appendix E marked mandatory. Criterion (n) — "Pursue opportunities for habitat creation and enhancement in accordance with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy" — matches Appendix E's discretionary register for LNRS. Criterion (e) applies the same register to the enhanced bus service, which Appendix E did not treat that way.

This cannot be explained as a drafting convention, because the same allocation uses mandatory wording for every other Appendix E requirement. Appendix E set five requirements for this site beyond the transport package. Four are in the allocation in mandatory terms, and the fifth in mandatory terms but for a different purpose:

Appendix E required	**Allocation 2**	**Register**
Surface water systems restricting runoff to greenfield rates (EM02, criterion 4g)	(i) "Incorporate surface water management systems which restrict runoff to greenfield runoff rates"	Mandatory
Retention and enhancement of boundary vegetation along Long Copse Lane (EM02)	(k) "Retain and enhance boundary vegetation along Long Copse Lane"	Mandatory
An ecological and landscape buffer	(m) "Provide an ecological and landscape buffer"	Mandatory
Retention of on-site habitat and	(o) "Retain and integrate the	Mandatory

woodland	woodland, and protected and notable trees on site"	
A sensitive lighting strategy	(c) "Provide a sensitive lighting strategy"	Mandatory (but re-purposed)
High quality walking and cycling routes and an enhanced bus service, required by the allocation and agreed with the Highway Authorities before commencement	(e), (q), (s) — "explore" and "maximise opportunities"	Discretionary

The Council plainly knew how to translate Appendix E into a requirement, and did so five times in this allocation. It did not do so at all for the one item on which the SA's acceptability conclusion for accessibility rested.

And the bus service Appendix E required does not appear in the Council's infrastructure evidence at all. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IT01, June 2026) is the document that records what infrastructure is needed to support the Plan, who will deliver it, what it will cost, from what source it will be funded and when. Its bus provision, at printed page 167, consists of three entries for the whole borough: T005, "Improvements to the bus network (Hampshire Bus Service Improvement Plan (June, 2024))", boroughwide, cost "TBC", timed "Medium (5-10 years)"; T006, Bus Rapid Transit, £1,000,000; and T007, refurbishment of Havant Bus Station, £2,000,000. **There is no Emsworth entry, and no entry anywhere in Appendix 2A for bus provision to the Southleigh Road area.** The only bus provision in the document for that area is in the separate Southleigh appendix, at printed page 172: ref T010, "Bus stop shelters at Local Centre", Hampshire County Council, cost **£0**, funding source "Funded through advertising", timing "Medium (5-10 years)". That entry belongs to Allocation 1 and consists of shelters.

The document's own narrative shows this was a choice rather than an oversight. At printed page 87 it sets the standard: new development "should ideally be planned to ensure proximity to bus services with distances to the nearest stop being no more than 400m". At printed page 88 it records that "following withdrawal of the former Emsworth and District commercial service (28) through Emsworth via Denvilles to Havant this route is only served by a currently subsidised service by First (27) which also runs to Rowlands Castle", with timetable disruption from Warblington level crossing. At printed page 91 it states that "subsidy through S106 developer funding for 'pump priming' is necessary to provide services from the outset and avoid new residents developing a reliance on the car, a habit that is hard to break". And at printed page 89 it says of Allocation 1 that the Southleigh site "will offer opportunities for contracted (pump priming) and commercial opportunities to provide new or amended bus services linking to Havant and Emsworth at relatively high frequencies from the earliest stages of the development", with a bus strategy described at printed page 90 as "fundamental" to that site.

Immediately above that passage, on the same page, is the Council's whole statement of what is anticipated for Emsworth: "The focus will be improving accessibility by walking, cycling and bus to Emsworth Town Centre and the railway station including reducing severance of the village caused by the A259 Havant Road. The LCWIP route along Havant Road will be upgraded to link in with the DfT

Emsworth to Chichester Cycle Route." No new or amended bus service is proposed for Emsworth. None is costed. None is programmed. None is attributed to this allocation.

So the position is not merely that the allocation invites a developer to explore a bus enhancement instead of requiring it. It is that the enhancement the appraisal said must be required has not been identified, costed, funded or programmed in the document whose function is to do exactly that, in a plan whose evidence base states that pump-priming subsidy is necessary if new residents are not to become car-dependent from the day they move in.

The adjacent allocation confirms the point. Allocation 1, Southleigh, is the only allocated site scoring more negatives in the SA than this one. Its transport requirements at criterion (k) are mandatory — a comprehensive access and movement strategy, itemised across ten sub-clauses, expressly including the provision of a bus route to serve the site and improvements to LCWIP routes within and beyond it. Its supporting text at paragraph 3.17 requires a site-specific Transport Assessment prepared with the highway authorities and an agreed mitigation package. The same plan, the same drafting team, the same category of requirement — written as an obligation there and as an invitation here.

The Sustainability Appraisal itself says the mitigation belongs in the allocation, and makes its own conclusion depend on it. At paragraph 4.96 the SA states that the Appendix E mitigation measures should be reflected in any allocations drawn up for the Local Plan, to ensure that negative effects are avoided or mitigated. That is the SA's own expectation of the plan-makers, and the weight of this section does not rest on it: the mandatory language is the Appendix E wording quoted above, that "any allocation must require the provision of these". At paragraph 4.56 the appraisal goes further and makes its finding of acceptability conditional on the delivery of that mitigation. The finding and the mitigation are therefore not severable: the SA did not conclude that this site was acceptable and separately recommend improvements to it; it concluded that the site was acceptable if the improvements were secured.

The Council may answer, as the SA does at paragraph 4.97, that securing mitigation does not rest on the allocation policies alone and that the topic policies also require these matters to be addressed — Policy 53 in particular. It may add that mitigation of this kind is in practice secured by planning obligation at application stage. Three things count against that. A general topic policy cannot supply a site-specific package — bus enhancement to the Southleigh Road area, and LCWIP routes 373, 277 and 270 — nor a pre-commencement trigger. The Council's own choice to place the ecological buffer, the surface water requirement and the boundary vegetation requirement in this allocation rather than leave them to Policies 21, 27 and 31 shows that it did not regard topic policies as sufficient where it considered the matter important. And the objection is not that a developer would escape contributing: it is that the appraisal's conclusion of acceptability was itself premised on the package being required by the allocation, and that premise has not been carried into the Plan. The soundness of the site's selection therefore rests on a condition the Plan does not impose.

Nor, on the Council's own transport evidence, could a contribution be attributed to this site. At paragraph 9.2.1 the Strategic Transport Assessment states that the strategic nature of the modelling "does not allow the identification of a link between the potential mitigation and specific Local Plan allocation sites", and that it is "not possible at this stage to draw conclusions on possible development contributions" towards it. Paragraph 9.3.2 records the same in respect of phasing, other than for measures directly attributable to Southleigh and Dunsbury Hill Farm. The complete mitigation package

at paragraph 10.4.10 contains nothing on Long Copse Lane, nothing on Hollybank Lane and nothing east of Emsworth.

What is contemplated for Long Copse Lane is on the record, and it is not secured — and it contradicts a criterion of this allocation. In appeal decision 6002048, dated 24 June 2026, an Inspector dismissed an appeal against the refusal of five dwellings at Oklahoma, Long Copse Lane. At paragraph 12 he recorded:

> *"The land to the north of Long Copse Lane forms part of a masterplan area for residential development and it is understood that, as part of these masterplan proposals, Long Copse Lane will be widened to 5.7m, vegetation removed and a new footway laid, which the Council suggest would likely encourage higher vehicular speeds than those recorded. It is understood that the outline application for the residential development has been withdrawn and there is no certainty these improvement works will be implemented."*

The land to the north of Long Copse Lane is this allocation. I do not know whether the description of the works came to the Inspector from the Council or from the appellant, and I do not put it higher than the decision does — but it was the account of what developing this land requires that was before the Planning Inspectorate in June 2026, the Council was a party, and the Council's own contribution to it was that the result would likely encourage higher vehicular speeds on the lane.

Two things follow for this Plan. First, the Inspector's finding is that **there is no certainty these improvement works will be implemented** — which is the same conclusion this section reaches from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Strategic Transport Assessment, reached independently, some two and a half months before this consultation closes, by a decision-maker who had heard from the Council. The access works on which this allocation depends are not costed in IT01, not attributable to this site on the Council's own modelling evidence at paragraph 9.2.1, and not certain on the Inspectorate's assessment.

Second, and separately, widening the lane and removing its vegetation cannot be reconciled with criterion (k) of this allocation, which requires in mandatory terms that boundary vegetation along Long Copse Lane be retained and enhanced. Either the works described to the Inspector are what this allocation requires, in which case criterion (k) cannot be complied with; or criterion (k) is to be complied with, in which case the access arrangement assumed by the masterplan is not available. The Plan does not address which. That is a question about whether this allocation is deliverable as drafted, and it is not one a planning application can resolve, because the conflict is between two things the Plan itself contains.

The Plan says it set out to embed LTP4, and here it has not. Appendix E framed the transport requirement expressly as what is needed to accord with LTP4 policies on reducing car dependency. The Plan records at paragraph 2.14 that Hampshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 influenced the development strategy, and at paragraph 2.19 that engagement with the County was aimed at embedding LTP4 into this Plan. On this allocation, the measure identified as necessary for LTP4 conformity is the one measure not required, and it is also the one measure absent from the delivery plan.

The consequence goes to two tests:

- Effective. The Plan is not deliverable on the basis on which it was appraised. Policies must be clear enough that a decision-maker can apply them; aspirational wording cannot deliver mitigation which the evidence base treats as essential and which the delivery plan does not programme.
- Justified. The SA is the evidence on which the site was selected. If the SA's acceptability conclusion depends on mitigation the Plan does not require and does not programme, the selection is not justified on the evidence relied upon.

The modification I seek

For the reasons above, and taken with the planning balance, I ask that Allocation 2: Land north of Long Copse Lane be deleted from the Plan in its entirety, together with the consequential amendments to Policy 6, the sources of housing supply table, the housing trajectory at Appendix 1 (printed p. 358) and the Policies Map. The safeguarding of the existing Gypsy and Traveller site at Long Copse Lane under Policy 43 is unaffected and should be retained.

Why this needs to be tested at a hearing

This representation turns on four matters that need testing in exchange rather than on paper alone.

The first is a precise comparison between the mandatory wording the Sustainability Appraisal used for the transport package and the discretionary wording carried into the allocation, the absence of that package from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and the contrast with Allocation 1. The Council is likely to answer that its topic policies, or obligations at application stage, secure the mitigation. Whether either can do so for a site-specific package, and whether the SA's "must" has been met, are matters for oral examination.

The second is the relationship between the Strategic Transport Assessment's finding at paragraph 6.3.10 that this is the least connected allocation in the Plan, the fact that the site was excluded from the detailed connectivity analysis, and the Council's conclusion that the site is nonetheless suitable.

The third is the gap between the 260 dwellings assessed and the 325 allocated, and whether the borough-wide netting at paragraph 5.2.30 can bear the weight the Council places on it at a local level.

The fourth is the conflict between the works described to the Inspector in appeal decision 6002048 — widening Long Copse Lane to 5.7 metres and removing its vegetation — and criterion (k) of this allocation, which requires that vegetation to be retained and enhanced. I ask the Council to state which of the two it intends.

I also ask that the following related matters be treated as live at examination and, so far as they bear on this allocation, examined orally. Each is a matter for Havant Borough Council to answer, and I ask that its answers be given in writing before the hearing sessions so that they can be tested:

- The treatment of this allocation in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IT01, June 2026). Appendix 2A identifies infrastructure by settlement area, and Appendix 2B deals separately with Southleigh. I ask the Council to state which entries in Appendix 2A it relies on as the transport infrastructure for this allocation; why LCWIP route 373, named in criterion (s), appears nowhere in the document; and where the enhanced bus service to the Southleigh Road area required by SA Appendix E is identified, costed, funded and programmed.

- Cross-boundary highway effects at Westbourne, including North Street, Monks Hill and the roads serving Westbourne Primary School. The Statement of Common Ground with Chichester District Council recites at paragraph 1.3 the requirement that cross-boundary strategic matters be "dealt with rather than deferred". On transport it addresses the A27, the A259 and the Warblington Interchange, and at paragraph 6.15 identifies those as the matters for continued collaborative working. Nothing in it addresses routing east into Westbourne. I note that West Sussex County Council took part in a workshop on 4 November 2025, recorded at paragraph 6.13, but that the issues discussed are recorded as being "of relevance to the Southbourne Allocation DPD, particularly the impact on the Warblington Interchange". I can find no reference to West Sussex County Council anywhere in the Strategic Transport Assessment. No agreed position on the effects of this allocation on the West Sussex network is recorded in the Statement of Common Ground or in the Strategic Transport Assessment.

I note that both councils agree at paragraph 6.14 of the Statement of Common Ground that "Local Plan modelling provides a strategic view of the cumulative impacts of development within the study area", that differences "might be expected when compared to standalone modelling undertaken for a particular development", and that developers remain required to undertake their own Transport Assessment. The Sustainability Appraisal records at paragraph 4.80 that although the Strategic Transport Assessment has shown development impacts may be mitigated, criteria 6d, 6e and 6f are all considered to remain uncertain pending the detailed transport assessments required to accompany any planning application, and Appendix D records all three as Uncertain for both parcels of this site.

Representation form entries

Field	Entry
Respondent	Andrew Hunnibal — individual response
Contact	Longacre, Long Copse Lane, Emsworth, Hampshire PO10 7UR · ahunnibal@gmail.com
Policy Number	—
Allocation Number	2 (Land north of Long Copse Lane)
Paragraph Number	—
Page Number	Printed pp. 95–97 (PDF pp. 99–101)
Legally compliant?	Yes
Sound?	No
Test(s) of soundness	Justified; Effective
Change sought	Deletion of Allocation 2 in its entirety
Appear at hearings?	Yes
Date	4 September 2026