

Supplementary Planning Information

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
3 June 2021

I am now able to enclose, for consideration by the Planning Committee on 3 June 2021 , the following deputations received since the agenda was printed.

Agenda No	Item	
5	APP/20/00990 (East Hampshire District Council Ref 51680/001) - Havant Thicket, adjacent to Sir George Staunton Country Park, Reservoir and Pipe Line, Middle Park Way, Havant	1 - 42
Proposal:	Hybrid application seeking:	
	1) Full Planning permission for Development of a reservoir for raw water storage, A pumped storage reservoir, with the minimum required total storage capacity of 8,700 million litres (Ml), to support the planned bulk supply transfer of at least 21Ml/d in extreme (currently defined as 1:200 year) drought conditions; Construction of an earth embankment adjacent to Staunton Country Park ; Construction of an overflow discharge/spillway at the south-western side of the reservoir and associated works; Construction of a new junction on the B2149 Manor Lodge Road and a new junction on Swanmore Road. Provision of viewing areas on the southern embankment and western edge of the reservoir.	
	2) Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) control house partially incorporated within landscaped earth mounding adjacent to the south west embankment; together with provision of other earth embankments. Construction of a visitor centre / cafe, with storage areas and welfare facilities to the northwest of the reservoir to be used for recreational and education purposes; Provision of picnic area(s) and children's play area(s). Access routes from both junctions to the visitor car park; visitor car park comprising 193 car parking spaces and between 70 and 75 overflow spaces plus spaces for staff,	

coach/minibus and disabled drivers sited to the north west of the reservoir. Creation of a permanent wetland on the northern side of the reservoir and construction of bird watching hide/screen(s); recreational facilities for public amenity. Provision of perimeter tracks and a network of bridleways, cycle paths and footpaths; Construction of a slipway on the western bank of the reservoir for operational use only and a small section of the proposed pipeline (210m).

[Additional Information](#)

6 APP/20/00991 - Pipeline from Proposed Reservoir Site, Middle Park Way to land adjacent to, West Street, Havant 43 - 50

Proposal: Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) development of a new pipeline to transfer water from Bedhampton Springs to fill the reservoir in the winter and draw it off to treat and supply when needed in the summer comprising: Construction of an underground, bi-directional pipeline linking the reservoir with the existing pumping station at Bedhampton; Emergency drawdown discharge structure at Hermitage Stream; Upgrades to existing culverts; Washout and air valve chambers (typically below ground).

[Additional Information](#)

Deputations Received

APP/20/00990 (East Hampshire District Council Ref 51680/001) - Havant Thicket, adjacent to Sir George Staunton Country Park, Reservoir and Pipe Line, Middle Park Way, Havant

This page is intentionally left blank

Deputation Submitted by Anonymous Local Resident

Dear planning committee,

As a local resident and daily visitor to Staunton Country Park, I strongly object to the reservoir, that will without doubt, cause the death or severe injury to at least one of our children!

Our children will be drawn to swim here, no matter how many obstacles are placed in their way! Gates and fences will not be adequate to ensure safety.

We live in an under privileged area with NO amenities to keep youngsters from entertaining themselves, unfortunately this leads to mis-adventure and them risking their lives.

The concrete platform will be used as a fantastic diving board, used the same way as the hot walls tower and South Parade pier in Southsea are used during the summer months. As responsible adults WE should all be protecting our children and NOT increasing the dangers around them. Leigh Park has 8,418 children under the age of 19. All will be within easy reach of the proposed reservoir which will no doubt, at some point prove an appealing option for an evenings entertainment.

The water will be deep and extremely cold, this has proven to be deadly in other locations and NOT something that should be welcomed into the Leighpark area.

I was fortunate enough to have been able to attend a physical meeting 3-4 years ago at Staunton Farm, this was held by Portsmouth Water with their female representative leading it.

During this meeting I highlighted my concerns about the risks to lives, her reply was "CAN'T THEY SWIM". I was and am still utterly disgusted with her lack of empathy & concern towards our children.

Portsmouth Water have shown zero concern over any potential fatalities or disabilities, that are a possibility if this goes ahead. I only wish that I had the name of this representative.

Leighpark have been the easy targets, many residents are not aware of what is planned within such close proximity to their properties. Portsmouth Water have miss sold this as a facility as somewhere to swim and fish, this has now been disregarded in the plans but residents have not been notified adequately due to COVID restrictions, which has worked in favour of Portsmouth Water and allowed the changes to go virtually unnoticed by many. Fortunately there are a truly passionate group of residents that want to STOP THE CHOP and keep the only area locally to get back to nature, which allows us to teach our kids and grandkids about their local wildlife. Once these trees and wildlife are killed, they will not return in our lifetime in my opinion that is 1st degree murder !

If this reservoir is granted planning permission, Portsmouth Water and Hampshire County Council should be held accountable for any accidents. The welfare of

residents has NOT been considered adequately and this reservoir which holds zero benefit for our community should not be considered.

Yours sincerely

A concerned resident

HAVANT THICKET – RESERVOIR PROPOSALS

DEPUTATION TO MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE – 3 JUNE 2021

1. This deputation is produced on behalf of Borrow Investments Ltd (Borrow) in response to the application by Portsmouth Water for reservoir proposals at Havant Thicket. Borrow own land immediately to the north of the application site, known as Land East of Horndean (LEOH). The northern part of LEOH is subject of an outline planning permission for a large mixed use development granted by East Hampshire District Council in February 2016 and a more recent 'resolution to grant permission' in June 2020. The southern part of the LEOH adjoins the reservoir application site.
2. As adjoining landowner, Borrow has had a number of discussions with Portsmouth Water in relation to the reservoir proposals. To some extent these discussions have been positive, but there are a number of significant matters which remain outstanding and which continue to be of concern.
3. The proposed northern access will lead to the loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland. Any compensation will not outweigh the significant harm.
4. Strong concerns about the loss of ancient woodland arising from the proposed northern access is shared by a number of other consultees, notably Natural England, Forestry Commission, Woodland Trust and CPRE Hampshire. Particularly relevant is the view of Natural England (see letters dated 19 December 2020 and 22 April 2021) that the local planning authority need to be satisfied 'that there are no alternative access road design options that would result in less damage to the loss of ancient woodland' and that 'this issue needs to be fully explored with key landowners.' On this point, an alternative option for the northern access route is available through the Borrow land to the north, approximately 100m north of the proposed access.
5. The principal benefit of the alternative option through the Borrow land is that it does not involve the loss of ancient woodland. Plus it is known that this alternative access point is suitable in highways and transport terms, as confirmed by Portsmouth Water's own transport consultants back in March 2019. Indeed, the consultants concluded that the alternative access was to be preferred. Borrow is aware of the consideration of access options, as set out in the Environmental Statement (see Volume 4, Appendix A13/A13.1, Appendix C). However, Borrow is concerned that this assessment does not give appropriate weight to the loss of ancient woodland nor to other constraints as explained further below. Accordingly, Borrow question whether the Environmental Statement is a fair and reasonable means of judging the respective merits of the access routes.
6. In any event, there exists constraints in relation to the proposed northern access point as currently proposed, which may have a bearing on implementation and timing. First, the proposed northern access route runs through land that is subject of a restrictive covenant. Secondly, a small parcel of land will need to be acquired from Borrow so as to provide sufficient visibility splays for the proposed access. These constraints are not recognised in the Environmental Statement assessment of alternative access points.
7. In summary, a number of important consultees have requested that the Councils explore the possibility of an alternative northern access, so as to avoid the loss of ancient woodland. An alternative access is available on land immediately to the north, which avoids the loss of ancient woodland and which is suitable in transport and highways terms.

1 June 2021

Deputation June 2021.docx

This page is intentionally left blank

Deputation Submitted by Mrs Bell

Re. Planning Application APP/20/00990 Havant Thicket, adjacent to Sir George Staunton Country Park, Reservoir and Pipe Line, Middle Park Way, Havant

I am writing to try to save The Avenue, which is included in the Grade II listing by Historic England and the other areas of semi-natural ancient woodland that will be removed to create the reservoir. There are also areas of ancient wood pasture.

The public consultation was held online because of the Covid situation which may have prevented a lot of people from being able to participate. I did not find out until afterwards so could not take part.

This beautiful landscape should be the jewel in the crown of the park which received money from the Heritage Fund to improve facilities and already has a new paying car park, a café, children's play area and a gift shop and a lot of work has been done to improve the area around the lake. With careful management and renovation of the wilder areas the whole park could be restored.

The wilder areas are where interesting flora and fauna are found and evidence of coppicing work that has taken place in the past.

Some of the new trees that have been planted have already died showing the difficulty of trying to replace this ancient landscape and a flight of steps can in no way compensate for this lovely woodland walk.

Six people went to jail in 1969 to gain greater access and the park became free for the people in the area. In such a built up area it is a great local resource for relaxation; exercise, walking, running and cycling and now it will be changed completely.

No recreational facilities such as water sports or angling will be added to the site and these areas of ancient woodland and ancient wood pasture will be lost forever and cannot be replaced.

As a secure site it will need to be protected by security cameras which does not make it feel relaxing. There will also be disruption for local people during construction.

The Avenue is a wildlife corridor between areas of woodland and supports a variety of species that will need to relocate. I often see deer on my walks. Unfortunately it also sits on a large bed of clay which will be used to create the reservoir.

I understand the need for water but there must be an alternative site that will not destroy this unique landscaped park.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Deputation to Havant Borough Council Planning Committee on 20th May 2021
on Hybrid Planning Applications APP/20/00990 and APP/20/00991
Havant Thicket Reservoir and associated Pipeline
on behalf of Havant Climate Alliance and Havant Friends of the Earth**

We object to this scheme as it stands, although we accept the need for another reservoir in southern Hampshire to deal with increasing population, climate change and the need to protect our rare chalk streams from overextraction.

We call for the Reservoir to be smaller and for decisions to be delayed until firm commitments on emissions and biodiversity have been resolved.

1. Capacity

The reservoir will have an operational capacity of 8,700 million litres which will support a planned supply of 21 million litres per day during extreme drought. This will be 414 days supply. Why is so much needed? Couldn't the reservoir be smaller, retaining more ancient woodland and reducing the risk to Leigh Park in the event of the embankment failing?

2. Loss of biodiversity

13.67 hectares of irreplaceable ancient woodland and 17 veteran trees will be lost. (More will be lost unless the northern road access route is changed). 80 hectares of new woodland and pastureland will not adequately compensate. The Woodland Trust has highlighted that new planting cannot support the same level of biodiversity because the complex web of habitats within ancient woodland can take hundreds of years to develop. The cumulative loss of ancient woods across the UK is closely linked to the decline of biodiversity and loss of species, despite new woodlands being planted.

The UK has signed up to the Aichi Targets, agreeing to halt biodiversity loss by 2020 as part of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Plans to compensate for loss of habitat should be assessed against these targets, but their implementation has been delayed by Covid 19. As wholesale retrospective changes reflecting new regulations are not allowed once a planning application is approved, we would like to see this planning decision delayed until late 2022 to allow for this.

3. Carbon emissions.

From the Atkins Report, construction of the reservoir and pipeline will generate approximately 178,331 tonnes of CO₂ over 3 years. Over the reservoir's 60 year design life a further 42,984 tonnes will be generated. Atkins say that this will have a minor effect, but the emissions from each of the first 3 years of construction will be equivalent to the total emissions from 5,700 homes. This runs counter to the government's target of cutting emissions by 78% before 2035. The emissions will have a cumulative effect with others locally and nationally. Planning approval should be delayed until there is a viable plan to mitigate/compensate for these emissions e.g. extensive tree planting elsewhere, in addition to that already planned to compensate for trees lost.

4. Long term environmental mitigation

Environmental mitigation must be greater than what it replaces. Tree planting to mitigate for carbon emissions must allow that young trees can absorb far less carbon, on average 6 kg per year, compared to trees over 10 years old, which can absorb an average of 22 kg of carbon per year. A commitment to the long term ecological monitoring and management of new woodland and pasture habitats is essential to its maintenance and encouragement of biodiversity.

5. Planning conditions for the Visitor Centre

a) Its present planned location is too near the wetland site which will result in disturbance to wildlife. It should be placed further away to the south where it could still be by the water's edge for views.

b) It should be built as an example of the highest standards of sustainability with net zero carbon emissions.

6. Electricity generation

Water flowing downhill through the pipeline could be used to generate electricity.

7. Cycle and pedestrian paths.

So called wheelchair accessible footpaths can provide too uncomfortable a ride, preventing their use by disabled people. They should be surfaced with tarmac which not only will last longer but will be more comfortably usable for wheelchairs and pushchairs. Joint use paths should also clearly separate cyclists and pedestrians.

Patricia Brooks

Deputation Submitted by Mr Childs.

Application Summary

Address: Havant Thicket, adjacent to Sir George Staunton Country Park, Reservoir and Pipe Line, Middle Park Way, Havant

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Deputation;

There are many reasons why this should not proceed. Many of the local residents have no idea what is going to happen, despite the poorly advertised and attended covid affected public consultation. Some have been horrified to discover the embankment height is way above the height of their rooftops and only a few 100 metres from their front door. Why have the local community not been informed of the impact, have they seen the floodmap?

- **OFWAT: January 2021: raw water pipeline from Havant Thicket to Winchester**

There will be a new £176 million pipeline joining Havant to Otterbourne water treatment works at Winchester. Purpose - use the storage at Havant Thicket reservoir to supply an additional 61Ml/day raw water transfer during drought in addition to the proposed 21Ml/day potable water transfer.

This 40 km pipeline is a game changer, allows for two or more smaller reservoirs and must be investigated thoroughly. Options for a smaller, less damaging reservoir at Havant Thicket or surrounding area have already be proposed by PW.

A smaller local reservoir would provide water for the local area (when required) and provide staging for additional smaller reservoirs along the 40 km pipeline route to contain water for Winchester, Southampton and beyond. These additional reservoirs can be located on arable land reducing or negating the destruction of ancient woodland and wildlife in our Borough and beyond.

- **No wildlife corridors have been proposed in the reservoir plan.**

Without them Staunton Park and the surrounding meadowlands will be effectively cut off from Havant Thicket further increasing the damage to our wildlife. At a minimum PW should have allowed for an 80 x 620 metres wildlife corridor along the east of the site with fully restored woodland joining Havant thicket to Staunton Park. Why has this not been included?

BUT – this will not save the approx. 3.2 km of established meadow and marshland. This land has never been used for agriculture and supports many endangered species such as Skylarks, Lizards, Adders, Slowworms to name but a few. It provides feeding grounds for Bats, Nightjars and possibly great crested newts. It is the jewel in the crown for Havant

Borough Council and the beating heart for the wildlife of Havant Thicket and Staunton Park.

- **With reference to the conservation officer report appendix A**

The officer states in essence the lost habitat is not and cannot ever be replaced. Not just the ancient woodland - also the 3.2 square km ephemeral surrounding meadowland. This amounts to criminal damage to our environment and is against all current environmental directives including recent announcements from our government.

Supposed Mitigation is either out of our local area or linked to the wet lands which are in no way guaranteed to be a success.

He states that coastal bird species 'should' benefit. This is not a clear and positive confirmation. Therefore, the statement that there will be a net gain is not valid.

He says there is no doubt that biodiversity gains can be made through better management of the surrounding woodlands. WE DO NOT NEED A RESERVOIR to do this. We can do it anyway.

None of this damage would occur if PW had based the site selection on the environment and community and not on cost. Ofwat reports state Havant reservoir is the cheapest option. They do not say it will have the least impact on our environment.

PW have sold this to our community with pictures and videos of a dark blue full reservoir yet they know it will be much lower in the summer/autumn months. We will inherit a massive 1/2 full clay dust bowl. How will this benefit our community?

- **No to the proposed visitor centre, roads or car parks in the centre of Havant Thicket**

Havant Thicket has remained a secluded wildlife refuge due to the fact there is no vehicle access. People have to walk meaning it is enjoyed by ramblers, dog walkers, cyclist etc. the foot fall is low allowing species such as bats, nightjars and reptiles to survive with the woodland undisturbed (apart from the awful motorcyclists).

YET PW have plans for a 'low impact' visitor centre - requiring two new access roads, including a 250+ car and 3 coach parking area, further impacting the rich biodiversity of Havant Thicket and reducing/destroying the little remaining space left for our wildlife.

Any visitor centre (if required) must be built on land to the east of the sight. There are existing fields available for this.

We already have an established successful and very highly rated leisure and family facility at Staunton Country Park. Why do we need a competing visitor centre?

Deputation Submitted by Ms Codling

Deputation objection to Havant thicket reservoir

Are Portsmouth Water taking us all for fools?

This application can't be considered on its own. It's just one piece of the jigsaw of what Portsmouth and southern water are planning. WESE water resource south east report is very clear what's in store - 40km pipeline to Otterbourne waterworks and plans for future handling of water - not necessarily even raw water.

Total lack of transparency-

Portsmouth water PR assured many of us that it was for local use to free up water. This proposed pipeline exposes this as untrue.

How will all these future planning proposals, which will be trotted out as soon as planning permission is granted, affect Havant and Bedhampton once they start digging up the area for pipes?

Havant and Leigh park residents are being hoodwinked.

Many still think they r getting a water park. Previous glossy brochures with pictures of fishing, swimming and water sports are still given as reasons by residents why this is a good project for the area. PW have done little to dispel these myths. How furious people will be when they realise the reality.

WE ARE GETTING AN INDUSTRIAL RESERVOIR! To make it more appealing they are making it out to be attractive and full of woodland walks and a wetland area. In reality the reservoir will be half empty most of the year, the new saplings will take years to grow (if they r looked after) and the wetland will dry out when the reservoir is low. It will

present a safety risk to kids who will flock to it and it will have a huge fence around it.

Loss of ancient woodland:

I'm not a tree hugging swampy type - but I'm beginning to wake up to the fact that we are in an ecological crisis. But all the voices warning of this have almost become background noise. If the council allows these 12/14 hectares of this ancient woodland of ours to be destroyed they will be committing an ecological crime in my opinion. They will be way out of step with recent pronouncements from the government (and the Queen) for the need to protect our last remaining areas. You as our council must take it seriously.

Our waterways.

Does anyone know the effect taking this much water out of the Havant and Bedhampton springs will actually have on the flow of ALL waterways and their wildlife in Havant, Bedhampton and old Bedhampton and the Ems?

They are part of the character of the area and their flow is vital to keeping our waterways alive. Don't sacrifice our environment to save another.

Safety - are they mad?

So the best place that they can find for a high risk 8.7 billion gallon reservoir out of the 72 sites they looked at - is amongst a massive housing estate? Really ? Yes it's cheaper because they own the land - but that doesn't make it in the best interests of the people of Havant and Leigh Park. Abingdon council turned down their proposed reservoir precisely as it was considered too dangerous - the effect of a, not unheard of breach , here would be too awful to contemplate.

Please council don't be fooled by Portsmouth Water's slick answers and be mindful that this is a money making venture for a private company. They haven't really got the interests of our residents at heart - just their investors. Yes we need a reservoir somewhere but don't sacrifice our local environment for SW customers elsewhere. I ask you to refuse this application on the grounds that the harm it will cause outweighs the advantages to our area. Thank you

Deputation Submitted by Ms Comerford

Good evening,

As a local resident and daily visitor to Staunton Country Park, I strongly object to the reservoir, that will without doubt, cause the death or severe injury to at least one of our children!

Our children will be drawn to swim here, no matter how many obstacles are placed in their way! Gates and fences will not be adequate to ensure safety.

We live in an under privileged area with NO amenities to keep youngsters from entertaining themselves, unfortunately this leads to mis-adventure and them risking their lives.

The concrete platform will be used as a fantastic diving board, used the same way as the hot walls tower and South Parade pier in Southsea are used during the summer months. As responsible adults WE should all be protecting our children and NOT increasing the dangers around them. Leigh Park has 8,418 children under the age of 19. All will be within easy reach of the proposed reservoir which will no doubt, at some point prove an appealing option for an evenings entertainment.

The water will be deep and extremely cold, this has proven to be deadly in other locations and NOT something that should be welcomed into the Leighpark area.

I was fortunate enough to have been able to attend a physical meeting 3-4 years ago at Staunton Farm, this was held by Portsmouth Water with their female representative leading it.

During this meeting I highlighted my concerns about the risks to lives, her reply was "CAN'T THEY SWIM". I was and am still utterly disgusted with her lack of empathy & concern towards our children.

Portsmouth Water have shown zero concern over any potential fatalities or disabilities, that are a possibility if this goes ahead. I only wish that I had the name of this representative.

Leighpark have been the easy targets, many residents are not aware of what is planned within such close proximity to their properties. Portsmouth Water have miss sold this as a facility as somewhere to swim and fish, this has now been disregarded in the plans but residents have not been notified adequately due to COVID restrictions, which has worked in favour of Portsmouth Water and allowed the changes to go virtually unnoticed by many. Fortunately there are a truly passionate group of residents that want to STOP THE CHOP.

If this reservoir is granted planning permission, Portsmouth Water and Hampshire County Council should be held accountable for any accidents. The welfare of residents has NOT been considered adequately and this reservoir which holds zero benefit for our community should not be considered.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Comerford

Deputation Submitted by Mr John Davis – Councillor for Warren Park in 2016 to 2021

REF: Deputation re: Havant Thicket Reservoir Planning Application APP/20/00990

To the Chairman and Councillors of the Havant Borough Planning Committee.

I was the Warren Park Ward Councillor and, in that capacity,, I attended the Havant Thicket Reservoir Stakeholder Group meetings. In December I reviewed the application for the reservoir with interest and I was surprised that some of our concerns from the Stakeholder group had been ignored. I would like the members of the planning committee to be aware of my comments made as the ward councillor.

I wish to point out that I am in favour of the Reservoir, but it must be done safely for the residents of Warren Park.

Cllr John Davis response sent 11/12/20

I was surprised that some of our concerns from the Stakeholder group have been ignored.

1. Access roads. The Stakeholder group was concerned the original plans showed only the southern access road from Swanmore road.

They now show two access roads but the Southern road shows a 2 way road but the Northern road shows a Single track road with Passing bays. This is of great concern as it implies the northern route is a minor road, yet we, the Stakeholder group, were told it would take ALL the construction traffic. Clearly the Northern route needs beefing up and the Southern route should be the Single road with Passing bays. Swanmore road is on a built up estate with a primary school of 450 children. To contemplate construction traffic using Swanmore Road is a threat to the safety of the public and our children.

These two roads must have fencing either side to prevent any possibility of cars pulling over to have picnics before reaching the Visitor centre, also to prevent any possibility of Travellers parking their vans/caravans on these roads.

2. Rat Run? These two roads are now shown as a straight through road inviting traffic to and from London and Havant to use it as a quick short cut. A Rat Run. There is no barrier shown or indicated on either road which could be locked off at night. These two roads need to be staggered through the car parks or a similar way of stopping/slowning down any such hope of a quick route through.

Lockable gates at Sunset and Open in the morning would also help reduce the possibility of Vandalism of the site.

3. Visitor Centre. This is quite rightly a centre point of interest to visitors. However, its location must and should be in the North West corner with a frontage onto the Reservoir but not on stilts, intruding into the Wetland area. The Maintenance of the centre will be a lot safer and more efficient on solid ground with the terrace overlooking the Reservoir. The design of the centre should be compatible and blend into the ambiance of the reservoir. Not a glass faced, modern imagination of a crazy architect.

The centre must not intrude into or onto the wetland which must be an area of peace and tranquillity.
4. All dogs must be kept on a lead whenever on the site to stop any harassment of the wildlife.
5. This Reservoir should be a great asset to the Borough but only if it is safe during construction and later in operation..

Thank you.

John Davis

Deputation Submitted by Councillor Francis

I strongly support the creation of the reservoir. With global warming it will be needed in the future. The plans should create a lovely country park and nature reserve.

I raised a number of concerns in my original comments on the Planning Application and I am pleased to report that the case officer has addressed many of these by requiring planning conditions. I think he has done a good job on his report. However some issues which I raised have not yet been addressed and require further action.

The Site Management Plan which is to be secured by a S106 legal agreement (see page 107) should be required to detail how anti-social behaviour will be managed and addressed. The police response referred to this to remove their objection (see page 37 and 135).

The Southern Access Road plan is in outline and the dimensions are not fixed by this permission. Before a reserved matters application is submitted there should be work with the applicant to develop a narrower southern access route with passing places, more in line with the design for the design for the northern access, which is narrower, even though it is the main access for the construction (HGVs) and operation of the site. A narrower southern road would slow down the traffic and help to maintain the rural character.

Measures are needed to control off road motorcycle access across the site, especially from Swanmore Road, where this is a major problem already. A horse/cycle friendly barrier is to be provided in Rowlands Castle and one should be provided as soon as possible at the bridleway 121 entrance northeast of Swanmore Road..

With reference to keeping the supervised activities for children open, such as canoeing, it would be helpful if the visitor centre should be sited on land so that it can easily be extended in the future, should that prove necessary.

I would like to endorse the deputation by Tracey Viney and commend it to you for action.

Beryl Francis

Councillor for Warren Park Ward

This page is intentionally left blank

Rebecca Harvey Deputation for Ref: APP/20/00990

Dear Councillors,

This isn't an either or decision. Portsmouth Water and Southern Water have many options and numerous sites available to them, that can All be utilised, either singularly or simultaneously in ensuring that the projected water shortages across the South East are met. The decision is not 'we need this reservoir as we have no alternative', because there are opportunities available. So I ask you today- please listen and think carefully about your decision- as there has never been a more prevalent time to do the right thing.

The challenge of tackling climate change is THE global problem that effects everyone of us right now, and there's no escaping it, nor is there a safe place on the earth where you can ride it out. We all have to do work together to halt it.

From individuals to governments, G7 to Biden, Climate Change is top of their agenda, as the threat becomes real and action is deemed absolutely necessary. The Arctic ice is already melting, the earth's temperature is hotting up, sea levels are rising, this isn't poppycock anymore ...

And You think there's nothing you can do to help.

Well there is... today

We can help protect mature woodlands. Why? Well it is worth noting that when it comes to carbon capture "bigger really is best" when it comes to trees. A mature tree massively out performs that of a newly planted sapling. The fight to stop the world's rising temperature is happening now and we do not have 30 years for those sapling trees to reach maturity.

Every business is now addressing this issue, re-evaluating how they can reach zero carbon emissions swiftly, even the Queen is addressing the issue with her 'Queen's Green Canopy' project, which just began in May21 to protect and conserve ancient British woodland.

The current trend of offsetting the destruction of mature forests with the planting of new trees just isn't working. These compensation packages can never adequately replace ancient ecosystems that sustain unique biodiversity, not in our lifetimes anyway.

You may think that Havant Thicket is just a small inconsequential pocket of local woodland and it doesn't matter that much if it didn't exist anymore - but this is happening all over the UK . According to the Woodland Trust, 1,400 small woods are fighting for their survival. From HS2 to Skernimgham Woods, to our Havant Thicket, they are all under threat. England's green and pleasant land will soon be very grey and not so pleasant.

We know that the rainforests in the other hemisphere are essential to climate control and they are seriously under threat from deforestation, but whilst we focus on those,

our own precious British rainforests, 'the ancient woodland' of this land is being ripped up and monetised under our noses.

Havant Thicket is an ecosystem of very great interest, (Woodland Trust, Chris Packham, throughout the Ecological Community) which includes a vast array of established fauna and flora, including protected and endangered species. It is well understood that these fragile systems take aeons to be created and cannot be replicated somewhere else or simply moved on.

So I am kindly asking you that you insist that Portsmouth Water and Southern Water like The Queen, take responsibility in preserving the ancient woodland on their site.

The loss of any ancient woodland is a human tragedy.

Secondly Leigh Park, is already a deprived area and shouldn't bear the brunt of this. The reservoir will push its residents further into poverty by forcing them to live in a flood zone with escalating insurance costs and plummeting house prices. Please press PW to do a fresh consultation with local residents, including all the changes that have occurred recently, the size of the embankment, the closeness to housing, and the fact that waterspouts, swimming and fishing will not be allowed although initially suggested. On talking to local residents it is unbelievable how many of them do not even know that this is happening.

With this current proposal Portsmouth Water are taking the easiest option, putting profit above ecology and human welfare, and being out of step with the global efforts to fight climate change with woodland conservation. Let me reiterate - Ancient woodland, with its complex ecosystems, once gone, is truly gone and cannot be replaced! Once chopped down, stored carbon is released, and those wide branches no longer filter our air for us. Please think deeply about your decision. Stop The Chop

**Deputation on Hybrid Planning Applications APP/20/00990 and APP/20/00991
Havant Thicket Reservoir and associated Pipeline
on behalf of Havant Borough Tree Wardens (HBTW)**

The description of “Ancient Woodland” and “Veteran & Ancient Trees” as “irreplaceable” is in danger of becoming a glib cliché, as easily used but as misunderstood as the word “sustainable”.

The contentious situation surrounding construction of HS2 points to the very high environmental and social costs of large infrastructure projects: deforestation, habitat degradation, biodiversity loss and social disruption.

So why are Ancient Woodlands irreplaceable, and why does it matter if it is sacrificed to necessity of, in this case, a reservoir?

Even though AW occupies just 2.4% of the UK landmass, it is unique. It offers a plethora of habitats that cannot be found elsewhere, making it vitally important for wildlife and biodiversity.

Ancient Woodland is the country’s richest terrestrial wildlife habitat, home to 256 ‘species of conservation concern’ as listed on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Each AW is incomparable: each has its own local soil, environment, wildlife and cultural history. Each AW is a rich, complex ecosystem that has taken many hundreds of years to develop, but is easily degraded.

Ancient Woodlands are rich in complex communities of trees, plants, fungi, micro-organisms and insects that rely on these unique, undisturbed ecosystems. Each tree and the species they support, whether lichens, invertebrates, birds or mammals, is unique. In many cases, ancient woodlands are the last strongholds of threatened species such as hazel dormice, nightjars, glow worms, stag beetles, rare bat and moth species, plants and lichens.

The soil created by AW also has its own rich nutrient character which makes it the perfect environment for everything that lives within it – it cannot simply be dug up and relocated, any more than the rich flora and fauna of AW can be mitigated for by planting saplings nearby in plastic tubes.

This project claims that ecosystems damaged and destroyed by the project can be recreated and compensated for.

But this focus on mitigation for AW loss or, as a last resort, compensation methods such as translocation or new woodland creation, considers only the very basic benefits of the woodland.

The project's aim to have ‘no net loss of biodiversity’ ignores the loss of particular ecosystems and skews the statistics, which makes compensation plans look more effective on paper than they really are – AW habitat cannot be re-created.

There is also failure to take account of additional damage from ‘Edge Effects’ (e.g. woodland opened up to additional intrusion, lighting & trampling) and pollution from construction, additional traffic etc. Neither does it take into account the cumulative impacts of this further fragmentation of Ancient Woodland in the area.

A mere 7% of Britain’s native woodlands are currently in good ecological condition, including many AW. Conservation of AW and restoration of those in poor condition is an urgent national priority that aims to develop future ecosystems with greater ecological integrity and resilience. (1)

The reality is “Biodiversity is declining faster than at any time in human history. Current extinction rates, for example, are around 100 to 1,000 times higher than the baseline rate, and they are increasing. Such declines are undermining Nature’s productivity, resilience and adaptability, and are in turn fuelling extreme risk and uncertainty for our economies and well-being” (2)

We have two major criticisms of the project:

Havant Thicket woodland is a **public asset** that should be protected for future generations.

The proposed reservoir will become a **private asset**:

A consortium, Greensands Holdings Ltd, owns Southern Water.

The parent company of Portsmouth Water is Ancala Partners, an independent mid-market infrastructure investment manager.

- ◆ A more inclusive approach is needed to bring together stakeholders; and,
- ◆ Decision makers should take into account the loss of benefits and multiple values provided by Ancient Woodland, grasslands and local streams.

There is no overriding reason for the permanent loss of Ancient Woodland, particularly since:

- ◆ The reservoir capacity is excessive, intended to export water elsewhere in the Southeast
- ◆ Local Communities will not benefit from the new water supply, but suffer the impacts of increased traffic, woodland loss etc.
- ◆ The depth of stored water will prevent recreational use.
- ◆ There are no details as to how Leigh Park will be protected from flooding
- ◆ It will not protect local chalk streams such as The Ems from current over-abstraction.

These points need frank assessment.

In addition, HBTW ask that plans to compensate for habitat loss should be assessed against all the Aichi Targets (3), and request any planning decision is delayed to allow for disclosure of detailed information, Aichi Target assessments and a full agreed implementation plan.

Notes

1. <https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/state-of-uk-woods-and-trees/>
2. [The Economics of Biodiversity The Dasgupta Review ... - Gov.uk](#)
3. <https://www.iucn.org/theme/species/our-work/influencing-policy/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/aichi-targets>

Deputation Submitted Mr Luck

Planning Permission is dependent on whether 'wholly exceptional reasons' exist for the construction of Havant Thicket Reservoir under paragraph 175(c) of the NPPF, due to the loss of ancient woodland.

A beautiful and accessible landscape - designated under Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation - will be massively changed and despite the extensive and best efforts of the Biodiversity Mitigation and Compensation Scheme (both on and off site) to address the ecological losses, a biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved, due to the loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland. This places a strong moral responsibility on attendees of the planning committee to maximise and protect the changed biodiversity reality. Consequently I believe planning conditions are needed for:

Visitor Centre.

It is clear in the submitted NW CORNER map (HTR-ATK-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-0015 REV P02) that the applicant has proposed to construct the visitor centre within the footprint of the conservation wetland on stilts surrounded by water. Value has been placed on a sense of visitor awe through a prestige location, above non-disturbance of the bird and wildlife, in which the wetland is being created to mitigate biodiversity loss. This is detrimental and ethically wrong.

It is of serious note that objections have also been made by experts on the Wetland Specialist Stakeholder Sub-group concerning the position and design. The width of the wetland from the north shore to the containing clay bund walls will vary between 60 - 100 metres (a narrow strip). In context, the proposed location of the visitor centre, occupying a very large area of 35 x 55 metres, does have an overly imposing impact on the conservation/biodiversity objectives of the wetland and the rural aesthetic character of the site and is far too close to the bird hide. It is bound to cause serious negative impacts in the honey pot pressure area. After closing hours the terraced patio could attract anti-social behaviour as a diving platform (the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust experienced similar problems at their Testwood Lakes nature reserve, along with significant material damage in 2020 under lockdown).

The impractical Island concept design doesn't take into account the need to future proof the facilities, to allow for additional activities or infrastructure to be changed/added at a later date. Although the applicant has rejected the possibility of light low impact water sports, e.g. such as a regulated canoeing school - seasonally restricted within zone limits to protect sensitive conservation areas - the opportunity should be kept open as a possibility in the future; especially when taking into account a relatively disadvantaged community on the edge of the proposed reservoir. Other water companies manage access balances on their reservoirs

Consequently, I believe conditions should be applied to ensure that the visitor centre is restricted to the shore on solid land in the north west corner, as far back as possible (not within the sensitive footprint of the wetland as currently proposed) so that at the detailed design stage, it can be developed to avoid wildlife disturbance and promote the public good. A condition should also be applied to prevent the visitor centre outdoor cafe terrace/patio area from facing the wetland, which would dramatically increase potential for disturbance and litter entering the wetland.

Motorbike Barriers, Lockable Entrance Gates and Fencing.

I have been informed that a planning condition will be incorporated to prevent motorcyclist access to bridleways and the site via other access points. Having repeatedly experienced motorcyclists riding the bridleways and paths around and on the proposed reservoir site, including through Havant Thicket Forest, the Staunton Country Park, Blendworth Common and Dunsbury Hill Farm, this is most welcome and essential. However, I believe conditions should also be introduced to ensure that entrance gates on the northern and southern access routes are installed and locked at night to reduce anti-social behaviour and adequate and appropriate fencing is used to protect the ecology of the site; particularly sensitive areas and to protect public safety and enjoyment.

Capital Grants Scheme.

The Capital Grants Scheme of £1.2 million for proposed off-site mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures is welcome but given that irreplaceable ancient woodland and grassland will be destroyed very early in the construction programme, it is ethically wrong that the funds won't be available until 2029. Funds should start to be released and compensation started before felling begins or as soon as pragmatically possible and should be bound in an S106 legal agreement.

Mr S.Luck.

Deputation Submitted by Ms Morgan

Imagine...

it's a wonderful spring day - to take away the stresses of the day / the pandemic; you want to go out to watch spring blossom, hear the 1st the skylarks, the swallows arrival

enjoying the sunshine on a glorious summers day, seeing the sunshine sparkle through the leaves, spotting an adder slipping into the undergrowth; bats flying at dusk; glowworms in the hedgerows

a crisp autumn day, you're amazed at the incredible colours of the magnificent ancient oaks; the fascinating fungi

the silhouettes of awe-inspiring snow covered trees, glimpses of woodland mammals, the call of an owl

These are all things you don't have to imagine.

We have them today, on our doorstep, in this unique **SINC designated** ancient woodland site.

Experts have advised this area qualifies to be granted an 'upgrade' in status from SINC a SSSI or indeed a SAC as it does have enough rare breeding populations of bats to qualify.

Whilst the climate emergency & the increasing need for water is recognized, the parallel biodiversity crisis must not be overlooked, in particular in respect to the choice of location of this reservoir.

Woodlands make up just 9% of Englandⁱ. England is the 2nd lowest wooded country in Europe. Hard to believe when we're fortunate to have this **exceptional place on our doorstep**.

Woodland provides invaluable homes for wildlife, in particular ancient woodlands. The older the tree, the more vital it is. "They are irreplaceable, home to many vulnerable, threatened species. We believe there should be **no further loss of ancient woodland & ancient trees**."ⁱⁱ It takes centuries for ancient woodlands to establish, so any efforts to mitigate will not be effective in our lifetimes, if at all.

This is on top of an already dire situation - a quarter of UK mammals are at risk; 15% are threatened with extinctionⁱⁱⁱ

Compounding this, birds & mamals, rely on wildlife corridors to live of which Havant Thicket is significant. With the increasing number of local developments impacting woodlands, the **wider cumulative impact on these wildlife corridors, is disastrous**.

Any remaining / displaced mammals, that are lucky enough to survive, will be condensed in the remaining woodland, itself impacted by the significant building works, & new roads buildings & infrastructure.

But don't take protection unique areas like Havant Thicket, from me.
Here are some of the experts:

Today's HBC Planning Committee agenda:

"very obvious significant impacts"... "The permanent loss of ancient woodland & veteran trees is essentially impossible to mitigate"

very rare Bechstein Bat, - “associated with areas of Special Areas of Conservation”, so impact here ‘would affect SAC supporting habitat’
Bats, Hazel Dormouse, skylarks, song thrush, dunnock, linnets, warblers & tits reptiles, rare/notable aquatic invertebrate – have all been reported as having

“... **substantial impacts to a suite of protected & notable species**, resulting in the loss of a considerable extent of semi-natural habitat. Given the scale & timescale of impacts there is essentially **no scope for retention of meaningful habitat** within the site”

The **Queens Green Canopy** May 2021:

“Ancient Woodlands have been around for **centuries long enough to develop into complex ecosystems**. They are some of our **most precious habitats**, with incredible communities of plants, fungi, insects & other fauna.

These habitats are also **historical treasure troves**. **..Ancient woodland is priceless**”.^{iv}

Woodland Trust chief executive, last year has “emphasised the central role that trees & woods play in the life of the nation”...“giving people **access to our natural heritage**, to do something **positive for the environment, & helping to safeguard it for our children in the face of a combined climate & nature crisis**.”

“Our economies, livelihoods & well-being all depend on **our most precious asset: Nature**”. “Our **unsustainable engagement** with nature is endangering the prosperity of current & future generations”. “At the heart of the problem lies deep-rooted, widespread institutional failure.”^v

Sir David Attenborough:

“The natural world is in serious trouble; it **needs our help as never before**...Our planet is unique...It’s **also fragile**.”^{vi}

“The fact is that no species has ever had such wholesale control over everything on earth, living or dead, as we now have. That lays upon us...an **awesome responsibility**. In (y)our hands now lies ..that of...other living creatures.”

“We can now destroy or we can cherish, the choice is ours.”^{vii}

i & iii State of Nature 2019 report

ii The Woodland Trust

iv The Queen’s Green Canopy

v HM Treasury: The Economics of Biodiversity : The Dasgupta Review Feb 2021

vi NYE 01/01/2021

vii [A Life on Planet Earth](#), 2020

Deputation Submitted by Ms Saunders

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the vast amount of time and resources that have been invested in this application. It is a highly controversial environmental issue and therefore deserves a significant amount of scrutiny prior to gaining approval.

Water Scarcity

The need for the reservoir has been framed as water scarcity (water resource deficits). It would be easy to assume that the data underpinning the application is unassailable, I urge councillors to look carefully at the data provided by PW before accepting and granting permission for the reservoir. Economic justification often prevails over environmental and social impacts. Rather than respond to the increased demand by increased supply, PW should be tasked to respond with demand management. In PW's Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019, p.7-11) they outline that over the next 25 years the plan will provide the following: -

Reduce Leakage (30% by 2040) **	7 MI/d	12%*
Water Meters (~66% or 2/3rds by 2045)	3 MI/d	5%*
Havant Reservoir	21MI/d	35%
Ground Water Improvements	7.8 MI/d	13%*
Enhanced Ground Water Source	12.5 MI/d	21%*
Drought Permit	8.5 MI/d	14%*

MI/d = Million Litres of water Per Day

*A total of 65% of the water provided by the plan will not be from the reservoir, if these targets were increased, they could cover the 35% expected from the reservoir offering an alternative solution.

** PW's FAQ's dated December 2020 state "*We've set ourselves challenging targets to reduce leakage by 20% by 2025 and by 50% by 2050*"

The 2020 Consultation Process

I am in agreement that an in-depth consultation process took place in previous years (2004, 2008) however the content is out dated. In the Spring Consultation Report (Portsmouth Water, 2020, p.6), PW claim to have reached 50,000 households and received a total of 1,953 (~4%) items of feedback (p.7). 301 people responded via the feedback form. PW state that 80% strongly agree or agree with the proposal; in reality this is the opinion of **239 people** (p.11).

Portsmouth Water have stated that the majority of public engagement was via online viewing and social media 'impressions'. A more rigorous process is needed to understand the full view of the community now, in 2021. At the time of writing nearly 3,850 people have signed the petition 'Prevent the Destruction of Ancient Woodland at Havant Thicket and Surrounding Areas'. Objections noted in the application from the Woodlands Trust were a total of 1,375. Both of which outweigh the 239 positive responses documented in the PW 2020 consultation process.

I strongly recommend that councillors request PW initiate a face-to-face meeting to offer the community an opportunity to ask questions **prior** to planning application approval.

Loss of Ancient Woodland and Biodiversity

Perhaps the most controversial part of this application is the loss of ancient woodland and biodiversity which is irreplaceable. As highlighted by many other respondents, paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework indicates: -

*(a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), **adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused***

*(c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of **irreplaceable habitats** (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) **should be refused**, unless there are **wholly exceptional reasons** and a suitable compensation strategy exists*

I strongly object to the application on the grounds that there is simply no adequate mitigation or compensation for loss of ancient woodland; it is irreplaceable. The mitigation and compensation package are inadequate; £40,000 per year (HTR Technical Note, p.4) for 30 years is a nominal price compared to the extremely high loss to the community.

Furthermore, based on my comments under 'Water Scarcity' there is no wholly exceptional reason; alternative solutions **are available via demand management**.

This application requires a high level of scrutiny given its controversial status that is likely to attract national and international attention. There is a huge responsibility on you as councillors' you will be accountable for years to come and it is important that you have satisfied yourselves that there are no alternative solutions; please think critically about the data and content of this application.

Shelley Saunders

Havant Resident and Member of The Green Party (all views expressed are my own)

References

FAQ Document Portsmouth Water https://planningpublicaccess.havant.gov.uk/online-applications/files/19EA8B006AB59F7426DB994F0636B9C7/pdf/APP_20_00990-

[FAQS_PROVIDED_BY_PORTSMOUTH_WATER-1447939.pdf](https://planningpublicaccess.havant.gov.uk/online-applications/files/19EA8B006AB59F7426DB994F0636B9C7/pdf/APP_20_00990-FAQS_PROVIDED_BY_PORTSMOUTH_WATER-1447939.pdf) accessed on 1st June 2021

HTR Technical Note, Portsmouth Water, https://planningpublicaccess.havant.gov.uk/online-applications/files/F5B074D7F598F8F948782F475D4E64B0/pdf/APP_20_00990-IMPLEMENTATION_PLAN_FOR_OFF_SITE_BIODIVERSITY_MITIGATION_AND_COMPENSATION-1473295.pdf accessed on 1st June 2021

Portsmouth Water, Spring Consultation Report Portsmouth Water
https://www.portsmouthwater.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Havant-Thicket-Reservoir-Spring-Consultation-Report_2020_FINAL.pdf accessed on 4th May 2021

WRMP, Portsmouth Water, Water Resource Management Plan,

https://www.portsmouthwater.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/WRMP_2020_FINAL.pdf accessed on 17 May 2021.

Deputation Submitted by Ms Schwager

Re: Planning Permission for Havant Reservoir APP/20/00990

The theme of last week's Mental Health Awareness week was nature. Research by the Mental Health Foundation into the impact of the pandemic on UK residents showed how going for walks outside was one of the top coping strategies while 45% of respondents cited being in green spaces as vital for their mental health¹. When plans for the Havant Reservoir have been reported I have frequently seen a claim that the development will provide local residents with a safe green space to visit. We already have this at the proposed site which includes nearly 14 hectares of ancient woodland defined as irreplaceable by the Government. It is unfortunate that photographs are not allowed as part of deputations because the scenery we are lucky enough to have on our doorsteps is stunning, from the tree-lined walk along The Avenue down to the Second Lake (both important parts of Staunton's history) to the views across the fields including sightings of wildlife. I hope that during the site visit the councillors took the opportunity to walk through the trees, listen to the birdsong and gain an understanding of how important this site is to local residents, many of whom have been enjoying this countryside since childhood. Besides providing vital access to the countryside for us, this site provides habitat to wildlife including rare and endangered species – we have more species of bats here than are found at the New Forest and the potential to recognise Havant Thicket and the surrounding countryside as a nature reserve would both greatly benefit the environment, provide the Borough with a tourist attraction and could help regenerate the area.

Instead, however, Portsmouth Water has submitted an application which will destroy our green space and use the site as a raw water storage area. According to OFWAT, who are overseeing the agreement between Portsmouth Water and Southern Water, Portsmouth Water already has a water surplus which, without a reservoir in place, enables it to supply Southern Water with up to 30m litres of water a day. This development will enable them to increase this supply to 60 million litres of water a day. To quote from a consultation document dated February 2021² "*Portsmouth Water is building the Havant Thicket reservoir for the benefit of Southern Water's customers and Southern Water's customers will be paying for the reservoir. It is important to protect Portsmouth Water's customers from having to pay for a reservoir that they do not need*" This makes it clear - water provided by this reservoir, which will cause years of disruption to local residents (including hundreds of HGVs per day and noisy construction work beginning at 6am) and change our countryside forever, is not needed in our region.

¹ <https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/campaigns/mental-health-awareness-week/why-nature>

² <https://www.ofwat.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/s13-Havant-Thicket-Feb-2021.pdf>

Besides the impact on the environment, wildlife, and local residents there are other important considerations. According to government guidelinesⁱⁱⁱ landowners who are considering applying for planning permission to build a reservoir on their fields are advised to avoid sites close to residential areas on safety grounds. The proposed site for Havant reservoir borders The Warren - a densely populated part of the borough - and also has a primary school in close proximity. This raises concerns over safety during the construction of the reservoir, which will involve digging a massive crater a mile long and half a mile wide with a depth of up to 18 metres and also once it is filled with 8.7 billion litres of water. Preventing children and young people from entering the construction site, particularly at night, will be a huge challenge. It is not unreasonable to predict that, during hot summer months, people will attempt to swim in the reservoir despite safety warnings. Reservoirs are particularly hazardous due to the coldness of the water – according to the United Utilities *Don't Let Them Go In* safety campaign, cold-water shock can kill even the strongest swimmer in just 60 seconds.^{iv}

If it is not considered safe for farmers and landowners to construct reservoirs close to residential areas then it cannot be safe for Portsmouth Water to do so.

Hilary Schwager
Local Resident

ⁱⁱⁱ www.gov.uk *Guidance - Planning, designing and building water storage reservoirs :A guide to planning, designing, constructing and commissioning a water storage reservoir May 2008*

^{iv} www.waterpowermagazine.com *Beautiful but deadly – public safety at reservoirs 7 April 2020*

Deputation Submitted by Ms Stevenson

DEPUTATION REQUEST PLANNING APP/20/00990

I am very much opposed to this plan. It involves the cutting down of many established native trees; many of which are (apparently) protected under individual tree preservation orders. This will result in the loss of significant area of habitat for wildlife, in addition to destroying the last remaining substantial meadowland which supports hundreds of bird, reptile, mammals and insect species. The replanting of saplings is of little compensation and the site will take decades to recover from the devastation caused.

This application should not be considered in isolation from other development plans, which will consume the attached land ie Hazelton Farm Housing estate, the commercial site to the north side of the Warren earmarked by PCC for the free ports storage site. It is only a matter of time before the intervening space is sold to allow for other developments. The Warren will then be utterly boxed in by houses, with no green spaces. The reservoir will consume the remaining pocket of accessible countryside servicing Leigh Park.

There are numerous paths which cross the meadow and woodland which will be lost and replaced with one path around the outside. This will be a health & safety risk as the one path around the outside of the new will be very crowded. There will be no tranquillity in the countryside and meadows that we presently benefit from. The same path will be there to service the needs of car users, walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Accidents are likely to occur.

The one good path which currently exists through the Thicket near Horndean will be tarmacked to bring cars onto the site. Essentially this will be destroying established woodland in order to permit vehicular access to a woodland! ~WE DONT NEED CARS IN THE WOODS - THEY DESTROY THE TRANQUILLITY AND DISTURB WILDLIFE.

People will be forced into their cars to get to the site. In order to enjoy this facility most people will have to drive to it because the walk itself around the reservoir will be too long to complete. Apart from losing the trees which are converting CO2 to oxygen, this plan will increase emissions by actively encouraging more car journeys. I am opposed to both entrance proposals which will cause congestion in the Warren, whilst reducing air quality due to slow moving vehicles.

There will be conflicting interests between walkers, horse riders, cyclists and car drivers. I am also opposed to the option of the entrance from Horndean Road, as this is a fast flowing road and will result in congestion and accidents if slower moving traffic is turning into or out of the site. The destruction of thousands of large, valuable trees for the construction of the entry roads is entirely unacceptable.

Carbon footprint v responsible planning. The UK is losing forests at a faster rate than the Amazon rainforest. We need to plant 1.5 billion trees by 2050, so it is not acceptable to consent to the wholesale destruction of significant areas of woodland in our town.

Leisure activities. The original plans implied that access would be given to improved leisure and this has subsequently proved to be untrue. The walking and cycling currently available are superior to what will subsequently be available. There will be no leisure access to the water, ie no boating or fishing. There has been a deliberate attempt to deceive the residents in order to gain support and positive comments in initial representations.

I do appreciate the need for longer term planning for security of water supplies, but given that there are many brown site alternatives to this location those should be investigated fully prior to giving consent to this devastating application. PWC should perhaps consider a desalination plant, especially as their headquarters are less than a quarter of a mile from Langstone harbour. Alternatively, as this water is planned to supply neighbouring local authority areas, the reservoir should be located accordingly.

Yours sincerely

Julie Stevenson

Deputation: Tracey Viney

Re: Havant Thicket Reservoir Planning Application APP/20/00990

I previously worked on the reservoir project for 12 years, initially as Project Manager and later as Environment/Biodiversity Specialist. I support the plans for the reservoir and commend them to you. However, I ask that in the interests of the environment the committee request the following details be addressed before the planning permission and S106 agreement are signed, as permitted under recommendation 9A & B of the report (page 112).

I support the provision of a visitor centre (VC) but not the **Visitor Centre Location Zone (VCLZ) box** shown on the NW Corner Plan (page 195), as it would allow the VC to be located along way out into the wetland at the reserved matters stage, where the movement of people, noise and litter blow would cause disturbance to the wetland conservation area and reduce its value to wildlife. A pier extending into the wetland as illustrated with space for 50 people to eat outside would add to the disturbance and risk of antisocial behaviour (e.g. diving). The location of the VC should be restricted to the wetland edge, where with careful layout and design the impact on the wetland can be minimised, while maintaining stunning views over the water and providing excellent education opportunities. The applicants landscape architect previously demonstrated that a waters edge location can be accommodated along with the proposed car park and other facilities without having any impact on the adjacent woodland. A water edge location on land will be much easier to service and expand in the future if necessary.

The VCLZ box and maximum size of the building are fixed by this outline consent. Strong objections to the extent of the VCLZ box are not adequately covered in the committee report. Objections to the box extending out into the wetland conservation area were raised by local councillors, RCPC, Havant Climate Change Alliance and the public. Importantly wetland experts invited by Portsmouth Water to attend a specialist wetland stakeholder sub-group to develop the design for the wetland, **advised that locating the VC (honey pot for visitors/dogs where the greatest intensity of disturbance will occur) within the wetland was not appropriate, its location should be restricted to the NW shore.** Their responses to the LPA objecting to the VCLZ box extending out into the wetland conservation area were not included in the committee report. The Natural England (NE) wetland specialist on the sub-group, Wildlife Trust and water industry experts who run similar facilities **all advised that the visitor centre should be located on the wetland edge and not within the wetland**, this was supported by the wider reservoir Stakeholder Group.

To take account of the expert and stakeholder views **I would ask the committee to request the Head of Planning add additional text to Condition 7 to restrict the location of the VC and terrace to the reservoir shore, and for the applicant to have to specifically demonstrate at the reserved matters stage that the layout and design minimises the risk of disturbance to the wetland conservation area.**

Other issues that need to be specifically addressed by the LPA to protect the ecology at the site;

- Newts/frogs living in the Upper Lake should be translocated to nearby ponds before the habitat is removed (PW previous commitment). At present the Outline Biodiversity Mitigation & Compensation Strategy (OBMCS) only refers to translocating notable plants. **The LPA should ensure that translocation is included as a specific action.**

- Action is required in relation to loss of skylark territories. The OBMCS acknowledges that off-site mitigation will be needed as it is unlikely that the compensation grassland within the site will off-set losses. It proposed that be achieved through the Capital Grant Scheme, but that no longer starts until 2029 and the loss of skylark territories will be immediate. The **NE proposal on page 43 for a Skylark Conservation Plan should be required by the LPA.**
- The requirement for a **long-term Ecological Management Plan** requested by the County Ecologist, NE and HCC be specifically added to the list of issues to **be secured through the S106 legal agreement. The review/update period for the plan should also be stipulated by the LPA.**

Motorcycling is a major issue at the site. While I welcome the wording in Condition 18 there **needs to be a specific requirement in Condition 16 for a horse/cycle friendly motorcycle barrier with pedestrian kissing gate to be located at the entrance to bridleway 121 northeast of Swanmore Road asap**, where most motorcycle access to the site occurs. This is not currently included/proposed.

Deputation Submitted by Mrs Young

APP/20/00990

I strongly object to the proposed reservoir at Havant Thicket. This will destroy a unique and precious ecosystem and thousands of mature trees, whose carbon capture can never be replaced by planting young saplings. An oak tree, for example, takes 50 years to mature enough to produce acorns. These thousands of trees help protect us from flooding unlike saplings which don't. Killing and all this woodland, flora and fauna, thousands of animals and invertebrates, which includes endangered Bechstein's bats and 14 other species, endangered Nightjars, Hazel dormice, Adders to name just a few is inexcusable! I imagine the beautiful deer will be culled too. They will be displaced with nowhere to go, so sadly are likely to be culled to prevent them running out onto roads nearby. Without trees people and the planet won't survive. This is well documented too. Ancient woodlands now only cover 2.4% of the UK! Our UK woodlands are being destroyed constantly for numerous housing developments already. Portsmouth Water have 70 sites to choose from but this is the cheapest and more lucrative as they own the land! The 9 year build will cause noise pollution, air pollution and huge traffic issues too. The removal of the trees will have a detrimental impact on air quality for everyone in the vicinity. It's well known that all these trees actually help protect us from flooding. Removing them increases the flood risk. A May 2014 Woodland Trust article 'Stemming the Flow' explains this well. God forbid if it ever fully breached all of Havant down to Langstone would be flooded. Thousands could die from the deluge that would engulf homes, schools and a dementia care home all a very short distance from the site! The full breach scenario is detailed in the plans. The dam will tower above the lower lying houses in Winterslow Drive, very near me. At 20 metres tall it will tower above the rooftops! It's only 160 metres from the of the nearest home too. We will be in a flood risk zone permanently, with insurance rises likely. Whaley Bridge, 2 years ago was almost a disaster, so these things do happen occasionally. They only had 1500 people to evacuate who lived about a mile away, not a huge population such as ours. A thousand body bags were delivered to the town as they estimated 1000 people would drown! They lived downstream about a mile away though, unlike thousands of people round here in perilously close proximity to it! This was originally promoted in 2008 as an amazing place where fishing, boating and other water activities would happen. Unfortunately, the PR campaign was so good, people still believe this and many want to swim in it! It will be so dangerous if they do. Portsmouth Water have not made it clear that that all the watersports advertised back then won't be happening. People still remember this all as it was so well publicised! I have had to correct several people about how this is not the case! I predict that there will be a number of drownings of young people keen to jump off of the viewing platform in Summer months when the water will be like a magnet to them. They will stand no chance in the freezing 18 metre deep water, unless there was a motorboat, throw lines etc on site to rescue them! Throw lines are not available at all reservoirs, which is such a basic thing! Every year there are about 7 accidental drownings in reservoirs in the UK. Bored youths, with nowhere to go, will be drawn to it with friends This reservoir will be a death trap! We are in a very

deprived area, and kids and teens with social problems will gather here and egg each other on to jump in. It is usually young people and teens who die from misadventure, as I have researched it. I fear young people become collateral damage if this reservoir is installed! In a 12 month trial in 2019 throw lines were placed at 20 locations around 8 reservoirs in Greater Manchester and each one was dedicated to people who had drowned in reservoirs! I read this from a reliable source: 'Water Power and Dam Construction'. The reservoir needs to be somewhere else. Portsmouth Water have 70 potential sites as detailed in a map they have produced. Some of them are in no doubt suitable, or they wouldn't have been considered otherwise. It should be sited nearer to where it's needed, the 160,000 Southern Water customers in Southampton and Winchester who will be benefitting from it, as Southern Water are paying for the build. Eventually, Southern Water will apply for planning permission for a direct 40km pipeline from the reservoir to it's Otterbourne Waterworks, and a high level pumping station to facilitate this, in a completely separate application, to the current one. This isn't public knowledge yet though. Ofwat have said in the agreement made this year 'It is important to protect Portsmouth Water's customers from the cost of a reservoir that they do not need' This makes it clear that it isn't required here. Please think about all I have said vote with your conscience about this. It's not a done deal yet!

1st June 2021

By email to:
democraticservices@havant.gov.uk
mark.gregory@havant.gov.uk

Mark Gregory
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX



Registered Office:
Portsmouth Water Ltd
PO Box 8
Havant
Hampshire PO9 1LG
Tel: 023 9249 9888
Web: www.portsmouthwater.co.uk
Please ask for
Our Ref
Your Ref

Dear Mark

Written submission to Havant Borough Council Development Management Committee from Portsmouth Water - in support of hybrid planning application APP/20/00990 for Havant Thicket Reservoir

Thank you for this opportunity to further highlight the significant need for, and the benefits of, Havant Thicket Reservoir. I would particularly like to focus on our long-standing track record of delivering for the local communities we serve and our continuing commitment to engage to shape what we deliver.

The Government has classed the South East as water-stressed and is calling for investment in regional water resources to support the country's increasing need for resilient supplies. This need is particularly pressing to meet the challenges of climate change and a growing population, as well as commitments to take less water from sensitive environments.

Havant Thicket Reservoir is an environmentally-led scheme with a vital role to play in securing these resilient supplies and safeguarding two of Hampshire's world-famous chalk streams – the River Test and River Itchen – by enabling less water to be taken by Southern Water.

It would allow us to store an excess of sustainable water from Bedhampton Springs during winter – which would normally flow out to sea. The water would be used to supply our customers nearby and enable a transfer of up to 21 million litres a day to Southern Water.

Importantly, the project would also bring a host of additional benefits, especially for local communities and wildlife.

It would create a new green leisure hub, including a visitor centre, accessible facilities for community and education activities and a 5km network of paths for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. It has great potential to improve the physical and mental health of communities.

We are also looking to provide local job opportunities – as well as apprenticeships, volunteering and wide-ranging education.

The reservoir also provides a unique opportunity to create a wetland on the northern edge, providing a tranquil haven for a wide variety of birds, including threatened species. We're also

exploring an initiative run by the Mental Health Foundation at an existing wetlands centre, which is showing great benefits for mental health.

In addition, we have committed to create or restore up to 180 hectares of woodland and woodland pasture on the reservoir site and nearby, with a focus on increasing biodiversity and species-rich habitats. We will also improve 5.5km of local streams and get local environmental projects off the ground with a grants scheme.

We acknowledge the nature of the site will change and, regrettably, this includes the loss of woodland. We've adapted our plans to reduce this to an absolute minimum and engaged closely with Natural England, the Environment Agency and Hampshire County Council to develop our extensive mitigation plans, which they support.

We have a strong history of involving local communities and organisations and they've played a key role in shaping our plans. This has been key to building and maintaining strong support, especially locally. The dedicated Havant Thicket Reservoir stakeholder group, established in 2008, has been vital in gaining input from a wide range of community representatives and interest groups on key issues, and making sure wherever possible they are represented in our plans. This forum will continue to be at the heart of shaping proposals for visitor facilities on the site (including the final design and siting of the visitor centre), creation of the wetland and the wider environmental programme.

We have carried out detailed independent customer research in recent years to gauge the views of local people and hear suggestions – including with a younger audience at Park Community School. The research has consistently shown strong levels of support among local communities.

Our latest public consultation was promoted with a maildrop to 50,000 households to make sure people were aware it was happening and we engaged with hundreds of people through email, letter, phone, online and via webinars. We adopted a 'You said, we did' approach – updating our plans to reflect people's views and telling people how we have responded. We regularly keep people updated through the media, social media and through community group talks and have a dedicated reservoir newsletter.

We appreciate a small number of people do not support the scheme and our door remains open, as always, to share the details and hear feedback.

We remain firmly committed to working with local communities, particularly during construction to minimise the impact and maintain access as much as possible. Safety is our number one priority both during the planning, the development and in the years ahead.

We would welcome your support to deliver this much-needed resilience for water supplies, protect rare chalk streams and deliver the wider scheme benefit and, indeed, create opportunities to build on in years to come.

Yours sincerely



C R TAYLOR
Chief Executive Officer

Deputations Received

APP/20/00991 - Pipeline from Proposed Reservoir Site, Middle Park Way to land adjacent to, West Street, Havant

This page is intentionally left blank

**Deputation to Havant Borough Council Planning Committee on 20th May 2021
on Hybrid Planning Applications APP/20/00990 and APP/20/00991
Havant Thicket Reservoir and associated Pipeline
on behalf of Havant Climate Alliance and Havant Friends of the Earth**

We object to this scheme as it stands, although we accept the need for another reservoir in southern Hampshire to deal with increasing population, climate change and the need to protect our rare chalk streams from overextraction.

We call for the Reservoir to be smaller and for decisions to be delayed until firm commitments on emissions and biodiversity have been resolved.

1. Capacity

The reservoir will have an operational capacity of 8,700 million litres which will support a planned supply of 21 million litres per day during extreme drought. This will be 414 days supply. Why is so much needed? Couldn't the reservoir be smaller, retaining more ancient woodland and reducing the risk to Leigh Park in the event of the embankment failing?

2. Loss of biodiversity

13.67 hectares of irreplaceable ancient woodland and 17 veteran trees will be lost. (More will be lost unless the northern road access route is changed). 80 hectares of new woodland and pastureland will not adequately compensate. The Woodland Trust has highlighted that new planting cannot support the same level of biodiversity because the complex web of habitats within ancient woodland can take hundreds of years to develop. The cumulative loss of ancient woods across the UK is closely linked to the decline of biodiversity and loss of species, despite new woodlands being planted.

The UK has signed up to the Aichi Targets, agreeing to halt biodiversity loss by 2020 as part of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Plans to compensate for loss of habitat should be assessed against these targets, but their implementation has been delayed by Covid 19. As wholesale retrospective changes reflecting new regulations are not allowed once a planning application is approved, we would like to see this planning decision delayed until late 2022 to allow for this.

3. Carbon emissions.

From the Atkins Report, construction of the reservoir and pipeline will generate approximately 178,331 tonnes of CO₂ over 3 years. Over the reservoir's 60 year design life a further 42,984 tonnes will be generated. Atkins say that this will have a minor effect, but the emissions from each of the first 3 years of construction will be equivalent to the total emissions from 5,700 homes. This runs counter to the government's target of cutting emissions by 78% before 2035. The emissions will have a cumulative effect with others locally and nationally. Planning approval should be delayed until there is a viable plan to mitigate/compensate for these emissions e.g. extensive tree planting elsewhere, in addition to that already planned to compensate for trees lost.

4. Long term environmental mitigation

Environmental mitigation must be greater than what it replaces. Tree planting to mitigate for carbon emissions must allow that young trees can absorb far less carbon, on average 6 kg per year, compared to trees over 10 years old, which can absorb an average of 22 kg of carbon per year. A commitment to the long term ecological monitoring and management of new woodland and pasture habitats is essential to its maintenance and encouragement of biodiversity.

5. Planning conditions for the Visitor Centre

a) Its present planned location is too near the wetland site which will result in disturbance to wildlife. It should be placed further away to the south where it could still be by the water's edge for views.

b) It should be built as an example of the highest standards of sustainability with net zero carbon emissions.

6. Electricity generation

Water flowing downhill through the pipeline could be used to generate electricity.

7. Cycle and pedestrian paths.

So called wheelchair accessible footpaths can provide too uncomfortable a ride, preventing their use by disabled people. They should be surfaced with tarmac which not only will last longer but will be more comfortably usable for wheelchairs and pushchairs. Joint use paths should also clearly separate cyclists and pedestrians.

Patricia Brooks

**Deputation on Hybrid Planning Applications APP/20/00990 and APP/20/00991
Havant Thicket Reservoir and associated Pipeline
on behalf of Havant Borough Tree Wardens (HBTW)**

The description of “Ancient Woodland” and “Veteran & Ancient Trees” as “irreplaceable” is in danger of becoming a glib cliché, as easily used but as misunderstood as the word “sustainable”.

The contentious situation surrounding construction of HS2 points to the very high environmental and social costs of large infrastructure projects: deforestation, habitat degradation, biodiversity loss and social disruption.

So why are Ancient Woodlands irreplaceable, and why does it matter if it is sacrificed to necessity of, in this case, a reservoir?

Even though AW occupies just 2.4% of the UK landmass, it is unique. It offers a plethora of habitats that cannot be found elsewhere, making it vitally important for wildlife and biodiversity.

Ancient Woodland is the country’s richest terrestrial wildlife habitat, home to 256 ‘species of conservation concern’ as listed on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Each AW is incomparable: each has its own local soil, environment, wildlife and cultural history. Each AW is a rich, complex ecosystem that has taken many hundreds of years to develop, but is easily degraded.

Ancient Woodlands are rich in complex communities of trees, plants, fungi, micro-organisms and insects that rely on these unique, undisturbed ecosystems. Each tree and the species they support, whether lichens, invertebrates, birds or mammals, is unique. In many cases, ancient woodlands are the last strongholds of threatened species such as hazel dormice, nightjars, glow worms, stag beetles, rare bat and moth species, plants and lichens.

The soil created by AW also has its own rich nutrient character which makes it the perfect environment for everything that lives within it – it cannot simply be dug up and relocated, any more than the rich flora and fauna of AW can be mitigated for by planting saplings nearby in plastic tubes.

This project claims that ecosystems damaged and destroyed by the project can be recreated and compensated for.

But this focus on mitigation for AW loss or, as a last resort, compensation methods such as translocation or new woodland creation, considers only the very basic benefits of the woodland.

The project's aim to have ‘no net loss of biodiversity’ ignores the loss of particular ecosystems and skews the statistics, which makes compensation plans look more effective on paper than they really are – AW habitat cannot be re-created.

There is also failure to take account of additional damage from ‘Edge Effects’ (e.g. woodland opened up to additional intrusion, lighting & trampling) and pollution from construction, additional traffic etc. Neither does it take into account the cumulative impacts of this further fragmentation of Ancient Woodland in the area.

A mere 7% of Britain’s native woodlands are currently in good ecological condition, including many AW. Conservation of AW and restoration of those in poor condition is an urgent national priority that aims to develop future ecosystems with greater ecological integrity and resilience. (1)

The reality is “Biodiversity is declining faster than at any time in human history. Current extinction rates, for example, are around 100 to 1,000 times higher than the baseline rate, and they are increasing. Such declines are undermining Nature’s productivity, resilience and adaptability, and are in turn fuelling extreme risk and uncertainty for our economies and well-being” (2)

We have two major criticisms of the project:

Havant Thicket woodland is a **public asset** that should be protected for future generations.

The proposed reservoir will become a **private asset**:

A consortium, Greensands Holdings Ltd, owns Southern Water.

The parent company of Portsmouth Water is Ancala Partners, an independent mid-market infrastructure investment manager.

- ◆ A more inclusive approach is needed to bring together stakeholders; and,
- ◆ Decision makers should take into account the loss of benefits and multiple values provided by Ancient Woodland, grasslands and local streams.

There is no overriding reason for the permanent loss of Ancient Woodland, particularly since:

- ◆ The reservoir capacity is excessive, intended to export water elsewhere in the Southeast
- ◆ Local Communities will not benefit from the new water supply, but suffer the impacts of increased traffic, woodland loss etc.
- ◆ The depth of stored water will prevent recreational use.
- ◆ There are no details as to how Leigh Park will be protected from flooding
- ◆ It will not protect local chalk streams such as The Ems from current over-abstraction.

These points need frank assessment.

In addition, HBTW ask that plans to compensate for habitat loss should be assessed against all the Aichi Targets (3), and request any planning decision is delayed to allow for disclosure of detailed information, Aichi Target assessments and a full agreed implementation plan.

Notes

1. <https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/state-of-uk-woods-and-trees/>
2. [The Economics of Biodiversity The Dasgupta Review ... - Gov.uk](#)
3. <https://www.iucn.org/theme/species/our-work/influencing-policy/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/aichi-targets>

1st June 2021

By email to:

democraticservices@havant.gov.uk
mark.gregory@havant.gov.uk

Mark Gregory
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX



Registered Office:
Portsmouth Water Ltd
PO Box 8
Havant
Hampshire PO9 1LG

Tel: 023 9249 9888

Web: www.portsmouthwater.co.uk

Please ask for
Our Ref
Your Ref

Dear Mark

Please find below our **Written submission to Havant Borough Council Development Management Committee from Portsmouth Water - in support of outline planning application APP/20/00991 for Havant Thicket Reservoir pipeline**

In addition to Havant Thicket Reservoir itself, we need to construct a pipeline to transport water from Bedhampton Springs to fill the reservoir, and, when required, draw the water out to treat at our Farlington treatment works before putting it into supply.

The water from the reservoir would be used to supply our customers and enable a transfer of up to 21 million litres of water a day to Southern Water at the boundary of our network when needed – this would allow Southern Water to supply its customers, while reducing the amount of water it takes from the rare and environmentally-sensitive chalk streams, the River Test and River Itchen.

The pipeline would run south from the reservoir, through Leigh Park before passing under the railway line at Bedhampton to finish at our Bedhampton works on the southern side of the tracks.

We have worked hard to develop the best possible route for the pipeline, taking into account a range of factors, including:

1. Environmental impacts and sustainability
2. Minimising disruption to local communities and traffic
3. Health, safety and well-being of the people building the pipeline and maintaining it
4. The engineering challenges to construct the pipe
5. Overall costs

This has enabled us to come up with a route that minimises the impact on the community, environmentally-sensitive areas and areas of open space with trees and grass. We have engaged with landowners and residents along the route to raise awareness, elicit feedback and minimise concerns wherever possible.

Most of the pipe would be installed using an 'open cut' method, where we dig down from the road or land, lay the pipe and then fill in the ground above. Of course, anywhere we dig will be

fully restored to the highest standard to blend naturally into the landscape, with planted areas maturing over time.

In some places, such as under the railway line at Bedhampton, we will tunnel underground using a 'pipe jacking' method, to push the pipe into place from one open cut hole to another. Where we cross the Riders Lane and Hermitage streams, we also plan to take the opportunity to improve these local watercourses.

We will carry out the work to install the pipeline as quickly as possible and with as little disruption as possible. We fully recognise there will be some impact, but we really want to emphasise our commitment to having ongoing close liaison with the local community, so we can take the best possible approach and make sure the pipeline can be put in as smoothly and efficiently as possible.

As always, safety will be our number one priority, both for local communities and for our teams working on the pipeline route. The industry has extensive experience on installing pipelines with the greatest regard to safety, communities and the environment and we will ensure best practice is employed here.

We are well placed for this, with excellent working relationships built up with key local community representatives via our Havant Thicket Reservoir stakeholder group. The contractors working on the pipeline will also liaise closely with the community, both before and during construction. In particular, we'll continue to engage closely with the local schools along the route and Bedhampton Community Centre to minimise any impact on them, working in these areas outside term-time, and we'll prioritise vulnerable customers along the route for additional support.

Using feedback and input from residents and stakeholders, we'll develop a comprehensive and detailed pipeline construction plan, which we will share for further feedback via the planning process and wider publicity – all to make sure we get things right. Our fully developed plan would be submitted as a detailed planning application, setting out in-depth information on construction and traffic management.

For this detailed plan, we will look at:

1. Limiting the working areas, to reduce disruption to footpaths, residents and local roads
2. Setting alternating routes for construction traffic to relieve congestion
3. Routing construction vehicles along main roads, such as the A3(M), to divert them away from residential areas for most of their journeys
4. Avoiding trips by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) in the morning and evening peak times and restricting the number of HGV journeys each day
5. Phasing work around other planned works to manage disruption
6. Staggering site activities to reduce traffic
7. Putting in noise insulation measures where appropriate.

We would welcome your support today to deliver this much-needed resilience for water supplies, protect rare chalk streams and deliver the wider scheme benefits.

Yours sincerely



C R TAYLOR
Chief Executive Officer