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	John
Last Name	MacEwan

[redacted]

Please provide the following details where applicable and/or relevant

No Response

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 p olicy, 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	Allocation 2
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 o r 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.

No Response

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally c ompliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have ide ntified above.
You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or so und. 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.

I request that Allocation 2 is removed from the plan

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 1 0 files to include with your form.

- File: Objection to HBC 2026 Local Plan.docx - Download

Examination Hearing Session Invitation

If your representation / representations are seeking a modification to the plan, do you consi der 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 exa mination hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to p articipate.
No details on the examination hearing session(s) have yet been determined and will be ma de available upon the submission of the Building a Better Future Plan to the Planning Inspe ctorate.

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.

No Response

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

Context of the objection:

Long Copse Lane lies on the Western edge of Emsworth forming an East-West ecological link between:

- Southleigh Forest and associated woodland (West)
- Brook Meadow Local Nature Reserve (Central)
- River Ems riparian corridor (East)
- Emsworth Mill Pond & Chichester Harbour SPA (South-East)

This chain constitutes a continuous woodland-hedgerow-wetland-coastal ecological network.

Long Copse Lane provides:

- Commuting routes for bats, including Bechstein Bats
- Foraging routes for small animals
- Movement routes for deer and Badgers
- Flightlines for hedgerow- dependent birds
- Hydrological connectivity for amphibians

It is the only East-West corridor linking inland woodland to Brook Meadow.

Councils' statutory duty (c.f. NPPF) requires:

- Safeguarding ecological networks
- Avoiding fragmentation
- Enhancing connectivity

Havant Borough Council Tree and woodland strategy commit:

- Protecting mature trees and hedgerows
- Maintaining linear green infrastructure
- Supporting ecological connectivity
- Preventing incremental loss of tree-lined corridors

Long Copse Lane requires all these commitments to be met.

Chichester District Policy NE4 requires:

- Protection of strategic wildlife corridors
- Enhancement of ecological connectivity
- Assessment of cross-boundary impacts

Long Copse Lane is the continuation of NE4 corridors.

The Habitats regulation assessment states:

‘For the purposes of the HRA, it is assumed that populations of Bechstein’s Bat in the Plan area are functionally linked to populations within the SAC (in this case, Singleton & Cocking tunnel) and that therefore any impacts to bat habitat (roosts, foraging/commuting habitat) could result in impacts alone or in combination’.

Objection:

I object to the allocation of land North of Long Copse Lane to build 325 houses. Developing the site for housing will:

- Fragment established wildlife corridors
- Damage the Long Copse Lane corridor 'spine because of road widening, construction of vehicle access and footpaths alongside and through any protective belt.
- Development requirement (o) does not require protection of the Long Copse Lane ecological spine.
- Development requirements (m &n) imply that disturbance caused by the development is recoverable by, for example, planting corridors of young trees. There is no clear evidence that wildlife corridors can be sustainably diverted. For example, Bats look for mature and older trees for roosts. Newly planted trees take many years to mature and may require physical protection from human and large animal protection for some 30-40 years.

- There is evidence that bats do not adapt to obstacles in their established corridors and prefer to disperse elsewhere to establish new environments
- The presence of Bechstein bats requires special protection. There appears to be no recognition of the presence of Bechstein bats and their roosts within the area.
- There is no HBC clear policy to respond to CDC NE4 - Strategic Wildlife Corridor policy.
- The CDC adopted policy NE4protects the same North-South ecological network that continues into Emsworth via Long Copse Lane. Any development that fragments established, and functioning Wildlife corridors creates a material cross-boundary planning conflict.
- Allowing multiple independent and privately sponsored developer will increase the risk of ecological irreversible damage even higher as there is no clear policy on how HBC could ensure NPPF policies are adhered to.

NOTE: after the withdrawal of land & Partners development proposal, landowners can pursue their own independent development partners and plans.

In Conclusion:

There are many reasons why Allocation 2 is an unsuitable site for development. This objection highlights that the potential risk of ecological damage from development is severe.

Policy 22, (c.f. 22c) or Policy 25 are not reflected in Allocation 2.

Or NPPF requirements of:

- Establishing coherent Networks resilient to current and future pressures
- Planning at a strategic, landscape-scale connectivity across boundaries
- Restoration and re-creation of ecological networks
- Strengthening ecological networks
- Measurable biodiversity net gain

I request that allocation 2 is removed from the plan