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	Sam
Last Name	Ingram

[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	95-97

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.

[redacted] I find it difficult to understand why the presence of bats in Long Copse Lane is being downplayed. Bats have been a regular sight around this site for as long as I can remember, and many other local residents have seen them too. In my view, there is no reasonable doubt that bats use this area.

What makes this even more confusing is the history of the site. During the last development proposal, there was an attempted arson attack that was widely believed to be linked to efforts to drive bats away because of the protections they would bring. If bats were never present, why would anyone have seen them as an obstacle to development in the first place?

The information being presented now does not seem to reflect either what local people have observed over many years or what has previously been acknowledged about the site's wildlife. Before any development moves forward, there should be a thorough and transparent assessment of the bat population and its importance to the local environment.

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.

I outline my multiple objections to the soundness of the site below:

I object on landscape grounds. This site sits immediately south of the South Downs National Park and has been assessed by the Council's own evidence as one of the least suitable sites for development from a landscape perspective. A landscape capacity study commissioned by the Council concluded that no part of this land should be taken forward for growth, yet the allocation ignores that recommendation.
As a local resident, I love the forest behind this site and have enjoyed it for many years. A development of the size proposed would permanently change the character of the area and the views enjoyed by local people. Once this countryside is built on, it cannot be restored. The scale of the development would urbanise a currently rural setting and make the area demonstrably worse for existing residents, reducing the natural landscape that makes this location so valued. Given the Council's own evidence about the site's landscape sensitivity, this allocation is not justified.

I have serious concerns about the impact this development would have on Chichester Harbour. The harbour is already struggling with pollution, yet the Council's own information indicates that this site would place a significant additional burden on the limited capacity that remains. There is currently no confirmed solution in place to deal with this impact, which raises questions about whether the allocation is realistic or environmentally responsible. I also object on the grounds that adequate wastewater capacity has not been demonstrated. The evidence shows that funding to expand Thornham Wastewater Treatment Works has been identified only to support Chichester District's adopted Local Plan, not the additional housing allocations proposed in Emsworth. The Councils themselves acknowledge that delivering a wastewater solution is outside their direct control.
There is no clear evidence that sewage from the proposed development can be treated within the plan period without causing further pressure on existing infrastructure and the local environment. It is unreasonable to allocate significant numbers of homes when the necessary wastewater capacity has not been secured or guaranteed

I object to this allocation because it simply isn't realistic. The road serving the site is narrow and constrained, with very little scope for widening or major improvement. It is already heavily used by walkers, horse riders, runners and cyclists who value it as a safe rural route, and adding significant amounts of traffic would inevitably affect both safety and enjoyment for existing users.
The location is also poorly connected. There are no nearby shops, limited public transport options, and residents would need to travel elsewhere for everyday services such as schools, GP surgeries and other essential facilities. As a result, most journeys would have to be made by car.
Despite these obvious limitations, the proposal does not guarantee any meaningful improvements. It only suggests that the developer should look into possible transport measures at some point in the future. That is not a commitment and provides no assurance that anything will actually be delivered.
In reality, the development has been assessed on the assumption that better transport links and infrastructure will be provided, but there is no clear mechanism to make this happen. Without firm, enforceable requirements, the proposal is based on promises rather than practical solutions and should not proceed in its current form.

I strongly object to this allocation. The amount of remaining green space in the local area is already under significant pressure, and this proposal would result in the loss of one of the last substantial undeveloped areas separating neighbouring communities. Once built on, this land will be lost forever.

The scale of development proposed is completely disproportionate to the character and capacity of the area. The Havant Gap is already expected to accommodate substantial levels of housing growth, and there is a compelling case that the Borough's housing requirements can be met through allocations elsewhere within the wider Havant Gap without concentrating such a vast development on this site. The size of the proposal is excessive and bears little relation to the local environment or the ability of existing communities and infrastructure to absorb it.

Local infrastructure is already struggling. Roads are congested, healthcare services are under pressure, schools face increasing demand, and concerns remain regarding wastewater and drainage capacity. Yet despite these existing constraints, the plan proposes a development of such magnitude without providing convincing evidence that the necessary infrastructure can be delivered, let alone in a timely manner. Development should follow infrastructure, not the other way around.

[redacted] I am deeply concerned about the irreversible impact this proposal would have on the area. The countryside, open views, wildlife, and sense of separation between settlements are what make this part of Emsworth special. A development of this scale would fundamentally alter the character of the area and urbanise land that currently provides an important green buffer. It would diminish the quality of life enjoyed by existing residents and permanently change the place many of us chose to live. Indeed, the scale and nature of this proposal are so extreme that it genuinely makes me question whether I would wish to remain in the area after its construction.

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.

Public opposition to this site has been overwhelming and sustained over many years. Local campaigns have repeatedly demonstrated the strength of feeling against development here. Residents have displayed placards outside their homes, attended consultations, submitted objections, and consistently voiced their concerns. The message from the community has been clear and unwavering: this site is not an appropriate location for development on the scale proposed.

This raises a fundamental question about the role of the Council. Surely the purpose of local government is to serve the interests of its residents, to listen to communities, and to protect the qualities that make an area worth living in. Instead, many residents feel that this allocation seeks to fundamentally alter the nature of the area against the clearly expressed wishes of those who live here. While difficult planning decisions are sometimes necessary, they should be evidence-based, proportionate, and respectful of local opinion. In this case, the proposal fails that test on every consideration.
For these reasons, I believe the allocation is unjustified, disproportionate, unsupported by adequate infrastructure, contrary to the wishes of the local community, and likely to cause permanent harm to the character and quality of the local area. I therefore urge the Council and the Inspector to reject it.

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.

No Response

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

[redacted]ong-standing knowledge of the site and its wildlife. My evidence raises concerns about the accuracy of the ecological assumptions underpinning the allocation, particularly in relation to bats and habitat use. I believe my participation would assist the Inspector in testing the soundness of the evidence base and ensuring that local knowledge is fully considered.

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