

# Supplementary Information

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 1ST DECEMBER, 2022

Please note that the attached supplementary information was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

**Agenda No    Item**

- |             |  |               |
|-------------|--|---------------|
| <b>5(a)</b> | <b>APP/21/01310 - Tournerbury Woods, Tournerbury Lane, Hayling Island</b>  | <b>1 - 34</b> |
|             | Proposal: Change of Use of land and woodland (retrospective) as a wedding and events venue, including retention of permanent ancillary buildings and structures, the erection of removable structures (including marquees and temporary facilities), and the use of the land as a campsite in association with events. |               |

[Additional Information](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Deputations Received

This page is intentionally left blank

## Deputation Submitted by Professor Raper

I am strongly objecting to this planning application representing a group of over 40 neighbours.

Firstly, we strongly oppose the granting of a retrospective planning permission. The applicant has known perfectly well for almost a decade that he had no planning permission for his wedding venue. Several previous applications have been refused, and the Council served an Enforcement notice in 2020, which should normally mean the end of illegal planning developments. The Council then made a secret non-prosecution agreement with the applicant by which the Enforcement notice was set aside and this further application for the same site was allowed - in breach of the Council's Enforcement policy.

In an interview in the Portsmouth News last week the applicant said 'the venue grew organically until such time that we agreed with Havant Borough Council that it was appropriate to regularise the business'. As council tax payers we know this is not how the planning system works: everyone else applies for permission first. We are shocked that the Council are facilitating breaches of its own Enforcement policy and we ask you to send a strong message to developers that breaking the rules does not pay.

Secondly, we are concerned by how the applicant has been able to flout the legal protections of the Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) including Tournerbury. The applicant submitted details of sixteen wedding venues on the Planning Portal as being equivalent to this development, but in reality not one venue was actually built on SSSI designated land.

However, when you look at the Planning Officer's report on the question of development in the SSSI, you find only muted criticism of the applicant's development in the most protected area in the country. Why is this? You will note the strong objection by the Chichester Harbour Conservancy to this application on nature protection grounds based on meticulous research and a site visit. Natural England, however, did not object to this application and it is instructive to consider why.

Natural England told us when we met them on 2<sup>nd</sup> November that they believe they cannot object because of the poor state of a 25 year old management agreement with the applicant. The original agreement dated 17<sup>th</sup> April 1997 and stored in the Natural England archives does not permit the spreading of gravel on the forest floor, the filling in of pools and water courses, the bulldozing of earthworks, or the cutting down of trees – all of which have been done at Tournerbury. The applicant produced another almost identical version of the 1997 SMS without a date in 2014 with one additional line saying that all of the SSSI protections were lifted for the wedding venue site in a section only referring to the Woods Cottage garden. Legal advice says there cannot be two versions of a consenting document and we are now applying to Natural England's regulators to ensure that the original version is restored as the only valid version. It is a matter of great concern that all this information has been forced out of Natural England by FOI applications and none of it has been placed on the Planning portal for you to see.

Finally, we submit that it is unwise to give this developer forgiveness for the past because of the way they conduct their business in the present. The Portsmouth News article last week

is followed by many poor comments on the experience of holding events at Tournerbury. We see that the applicant has a poor record of stewardship of his own business, as we note that his business was listed to be struck off the Companies House register in July this year. Finally, we have discovered that at a Hampshire Fire Service safety audit conducted last month, serious fire risks have been found including the lack of safe alternative exit from the all-too-solid marquee.

I would like to end by saying that this is not the politics of envy and we strongly support the development of businesses on the island (as an entrepreneur myself). However, this business requires thousands of people to pass through a farmyard, along a narrow gravel track over an ancient monument and under a rare heronry. We believe in rewilding this location and rebuilding its biodiversity to develop new income sources consistent with the Council's Local plan and the SSSI designation. We ask you therefore to refuse retrospective permission that could set a far-reaching precedent and lay out a roadmap for developers to de-designate our protected areas.

## DEputation Submitted by Mr and Mrs Phillips

Good Evening Chairman and Members

Our problem is that the route to and from the site of this application, is on a track through our farmyard and passes our homes. It is, for the most part, a single track which is unfit for the purpose of this application.

The council appeared to accept this, when they granted approval of Mr Snell's 2017 application for a new track, on the grounds of Health and safety risks and our properties security.

We have built the bones of that asked for track. It is far superior to the route through the farm. It is wide enough for 2-way traffic and has passing places for coaches, double decker buses, pedestrians, and cyclists. Its fenced, so no one can get lost, and it completely eradicates the stress and worry about those wedding guests under the influence of alcohol driving/walking past the deep water, smoking in the barns, defecating on route, and leaving gates open etc, but sadly it is not part of this retrospective application.

We are a farm and there are Tractors and heavy farm equipment moving through and around the yard most days. Members of the public show little awareness of the dangers, with one impatient driver driving under a half ton bale on the front spikes of the tractor. We have had unaccompanied children playing in the hay/straw barns while their parents' enjoy the wedding. This is dangerous and unacceptable; every year children are killed on farms and the worry of this is overpowering at times.

TWE's responsibility for their guests ends, once they leave the woods, and the liability becomes ours. The right of way is too narrow for pedestrians to easily get clear of vehicles if they meet in places. Especially by the ponds, Vehicles there would have to reverse to allow another car to pass. There have been accidents. An extremely drunk guest coming out of the wood venue left the track and drove headfirst into a ditch. The police were called as she was intending to drive home after her car was recovered. There were no officers free, so she drove home. On several other occasions, we have called the police, and they are always sympathetic, but we are low on the list for attending officers, as these offences are happening on private land, which just adds to our anxiety and feeling of vulnerability. There are no measures to stop what is happening to us on a regular basis from people that are past reading notices or following instructions. They should be entitled to a safer route. Not all incidences happen at night, and some are not caused by drink, but just bad judgement. Plenty of evidence has been supplied to back this up. Farmyards can be busy, noisy places in the day, and ours is no exception. But our evenings are quiet. There is no lighting and no noise of anything except the wildlife, that is, on non-wedding days.

In the 2017 application for an alternative track, it was stated that the events in the woods fell under permitted development tolerances so did not need planning permission. Push forward to TWE's latest claim of 70 weddings a year, you can see, from our evidence, the massive impact this huge increase has had on us. Before the weddings, visitors staying in the cottage would come and go and Forestry works would be done in daylight hours and alcohol would unlikely be part the equation. The right of way was used, as we understood it would be used when the deeds were signed in 1987 when we bought the farm from the Snell family. Should this application be approved then our right to peace and security in our own homes will be lost for ever.

Thank you for reading to our deputation. We be attending the meeting and available to answer any questions you may have.

Grahame and Sue Phillips





## Deputation Submitted by Mr Knappett

GOOD AFTERNOON CHAIRMAN & MEMBERS

Mr & Mrs Phillips, the owners of Tournerbury Farm, fully support the recommendation by Officers, which is that the application for this site should, once again, be refused.

My clients do not object to the activities taking place at the Estate, only the requirement for access through their farmyard and along the Right of Way.

The presence of an alternative track is a relevant consideration, although it is not part of this application. This track was first applied for by Mr Snell in 2017. It has the benefit of planning permission; conditions have been discharged and it is still under construction. No-one is suggesting that it is in a condition where it can currently be used. It can soon be completed and brought into use for the benefit of all users, by Mr Snell and his wife, patrons to the Estate and to access adjoining fields by Mr & Mrs Phillips.

Were Mr Snell to submit a future planning application which incorporated this alternative track and avoided the farmyard, it would have the full support of Mr & Mrs Phillips.

The Council granted planning permission in 2017 for the alternative access track to the Estate, acknowledging that the current route through the farm was causing an issue with the ongoing operations within the farm itself by way of additional traffic passing through.

Whilst in this application there is now a proposed cap on the number of events in any one year, the potential number of guests, up to 200, attending some events would not be reasonable given the number of likely vehicle movements through the farmyard at all hours. The limitation on guests and events does not include staff working at an event and passing through the farmyard into the early hours of the morning or, on other days, those attending planning and supplier meetings in connection with weddings and events, shooting events or those staying at Woods Cottage.

Mr Weaver's Report advises in relation to the Right of Way: *"it is not considered appropriate for the wedding and events venue to rely on this route, bringing as it does the risks of noise and disturbance in residential amenity terms, and the risk of conflict between visitor movements and the safe and satisfactory functioning of the farmyard."* Mr & Mrs Phillips share these concerns.

Visitor movements and activities along the track are considered likely to give rise to an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance to occupiers of the Farm, as well as prejudicing the safe and satisfactory operation of the Farm for workers and visitors to the wedding/events venue alike.

Specific issues of concern include noise and disturbance late at night by visitors and traffic going to/from the Estate; the lack of security, occasional antisocial behaviour, taxis waiting in the Farmyard, vehicle headlights late at night towards the Farmhouse; the narrowness of the track and lack of opportunities for vehicles to pass; the close proximity

of water bodies and lack of forward visibility; and the conflict of vehicles passing through the Farmyard with livestock, farm vehicles and workers.

Mr & Mrs Phillips are grateful for the Council's recommendation that the application be refused planning permission with an acknowledgement of the harm that is currently being caused (and will continue to be caused) to the enjoyment of their land whilst traffic continues to pass through the Farmyard to access the Estate.

We hope that you concur with the recommendation of your Officers and refuse this application.

Thank you for your time!

This page is intentionally left blank

## Deputation Tournerbury Woods 1<sup>st</sup> December 2022. Issy Scott

### Track going through farm

#### 1. Track

The decision was made at the previous planning meeting regarding Tournerbury Woods Estate wedding application was that the track going through the farm yard and with the pond one side and water the other side, was not fit for purpose, this was Mr Steve Weaver the planning officer opinion. The councillors voted against the planning application. Mr Snell appealed the decision which is why we have reconvened. The track has not changed it is still not fit for purpose, very dangerous for cars and large vehicles to cross such as busses, vans etc. Why have we reconvened to discuss a planning application for Tournerbury Woods which has a track leading to it which has already been decided is not fit for purpose and is still not fit for purpose?

#### New Track

2. A new track has been built and paid for by Mr and Mrs Philips which illustrates they are not averse to the wedding venue, the aim is to save the farm business and allow wedding parties to have a safe, more enjoyable route to the wedding venue. Mr and Mrs Philips built the new track to Mr Snell's application February 2017, and although not quite finished will be built to spec, hedged and tree lined.

Mr Snell applied for planning APP/12/01333 February 2017 for a new track which avoided going through the farm. Mr Snell's rational for preferring the new track and not going through the farm are as follows:

- (a) I (Mr Snell) am entitled to 24 hour a day, unencumbered right of way through the middle of Tournerbury Farmyard. This right of way is causing difficulties for Mr Phillips in running Tournerbury Farm, especially in regard to his Beef livestock herd (part of the successful local produce initiative-The Three harbours Beef scheme).
- (b) Mr Phillips is not allowed to prevent free passage to and from Tournerbury woods; this causes extreme difficulties and raises Health and Safety issues, both for farm workers and for the well-being of the cattle during the times of movement both to and from the barns and when veterinary procedures are taking place in the farmyard. This leads to stressful situation for both farm workers and cattle with unnecessary delays to which should be normal farm operations.
- (c) The right of way makes no allowance for locking or padlocking of gates across the Right of Way. This causes Mr Phillips extreme difficulty in that he is unable to secure the farmyard during the night or when on holiday, leaving valuable equipment and livestock potentially vulnerable to theft. In addition, the right of way makes no

allowance even for gates to be erected. I am sympathetic to Mr Phillips needs in running a small farming operation and the difficulties my right of way causes.

- (d) Part of Tournerbury Woods is the Tourner Bury, a scheduled ancient monument consisting of a unique earthwork fortification believed to be up to 2000 year old. The existing access road runs right across it and through it. English Heritage recently inspected the monument (Feb 2017) stated it would be better for the long-term conservation of the monument if the Woods access road ceased to run through it.

Mr Snell rational for not coming through the farm is correct. In addition, the movement of machinery is hindered by wedding traffic. The Health and Safety issues raised by Mr Snell is correct, in addition there have been near misses between farm machinery and cars driving to the wedding venue. If/when a wedding guest car is hit by farm machinery, who will be liable? It will not be Mr Snell, nor those in this room who make the decision, it will be Mr and Mrs Phillips. Considering Mr and Mrs Phillips do not want the wedding guests coming through their farm due to disruption of farm activities, loss of amenity, and concerns for the safety of wedding guest this seems very unfair.

Mr Snell is right to have sympathy for Mr and Mrs Phillips regarding the difficulties his right of way causes. Wedding guest have been found smoking within the barns where hay and horses are kept, being sick and urinating within the farmyard. Wedding guests have been found driving around the golf course and urinating up against the golf course cafe door. At least two wedding guests' cars have ended up in a ditch due to leaving the right of way and the driver's being intoxicated. Mr and Mrs Phillips have numerous disturbed nights where Mr Phillips is required to investigate at all hours during the night due to disturbances within the farmyard caused by wedding guests, to check the animals and machinery are safe. Mrs Phillips due to the stress of the disruption to the farm and lack of sleep caused by traffic in the middle of the night has been under the Doctor for depression.

Mr Snell is right to be concerned that Mr Phillips is unable to have a locked gate, horses have escaped during wedding nights and have walked through built-up areas and onto roads.

Mr Snell is right to be concerned regarding Tourner Bury as National England stated in 2017 to preserve the Tourner Bury for the long term it would be better that the access of the woods was moved.

### **New Track**

This brings us back to the New Track which is far superior to the track going through the farm. The width of the new track is straight, 4.5m, widening to 6m at passing places with 3.75m either side. Mr Snell has the right of way of a single track going through the farm this means there are no passing places, therefore if a car was accessing the woods and a bus was egressing the woods there would be no passing points therefore the car would need to

reverse through the farmyard (farm traffic) or the bus would be required to reverse to the wedding venue which for obvious reasons is very dangerous.

### Conclusion

Mr Snell applied for planning Feb 2017 to build a new track with the aim to avoid going through the Mr and Mrs Phillips farm supplying very credible reasons why this should be granted. Mr Snell withdrew this application and applied for retrospective planning applications for the wedding venue with the traffic going through Mr and Mrs Phillips farmyard. If this application is granted there is absolutely no doubt Mr and Mrs Phillips farming business will be ruined due to the reasons mentioned above. In addition, there is a very high chance that a serious accident will occur due to movement of farm machinery and Wedding guests driving through the farmyard which, as already stated Mr and Mrs Phillips will be liable. All these issues can be avoided, and two businesses, Mr and Mrs Phillips farm, and the wedding venue, can work side by side and prosper, if Mr and Mrs Snell would agree to give up the right of way through the farm in return for exactly the same rights, over a new safe, far superior track.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Deputation Submitted by Lucy Barwick**

I have been employed by Tournerbury for almost 5 years now, it is my primary source of income and I am so lucky to have my dream job so close to home (I'm born and bred in Hampshire). Myself and my team (of up to 12 during peak season) are all local to the venue, and would otherwise have to travel outside of the Borough (or even county) for work. We have a dedicated team of Grounds people as well who work all year round. I'm a huge nature lover, and one of the things that drew me to working at Tournerbury was Chris & Alice's complete dedication to ensuring the preservation of the natural surroundings. This is a special place that has been looked after and loved by their family for almost 100 years. It is not a 'fly by night' development opportunity.

Without their investment, funded solely by the income from weddings, Tournerbury Woods would be failing rather than ecologically thriving as it is now.

Myself and the Tournerbury team are incredibly proud of the work we do to help so many couples (both local and from further afield) host their perfect wedding day. Tournerbury has supported so many small family Borough businesses in the area, with many relying on Tournerbury as a critical source of income. Many of these small business owners have become personal friends of mine, and we are all deeply concerned for our livelihoods should Tournerbury not continue in its current capacity, not only financially but also on a personal level.

Each wedding we host brings people into the area who may not have visited before, often not having heard of Hayling Island before. They then stay in local accommodation across the Borough, visit local restaurants, pubs, cafes and shops, often extending their trip for multiple days around the wedding. Many of our couples re-visit the Borough each year to celebrate their anniversaries and other life events, bringing more income and trade both to the Island and the Borough that would otherwise go elsewhere.

To come to a negative determination would be a huge loss for myself, my team, our couples and the local community and a multitude of supplier businesses. If Tournerbury is interrupted for the apparent benefit of a few residents with either misguided and ill-informed views or personal agendas, and who have never visited the venue, that would be catastrophic not only to me but to considerably more people and their families.

**Lucy Barwick**  
**Venue Manager, Tournerbury Woods Estate**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Deputation Submitted by Mr Ford**

Written deputation in support of APP/21/01310 for Planning Committee meeting  
01/12/22

I do not wish to address the committee but would like to submit the below written deputation:

My name is Daren Ford. With my wife Claire we own and run Focus Commercial Cleaning. We are a Borough based family business that serves the Havant, Hayling, Waterlooville, Rowlands Castle and Drayton areas. Tournerbury is one of our most important clients.

We employ 14 people and our employees enjoy fair wages, holiday pay, uniform, training and rewards. The venue at Tournerbury is extremely important to us and is a way that we can employ so many. Their business has been a critical part of our expansion and without Tournerbury we would not be able to provide as much work for local people who rely on us for their wages to feed their families. Our employees live in Emsworth, Waterlooville, Leigh Park, Hayling, all over the Borough.

Councillors, these are your hard working, dedicated residents and our Tournerbury contract makes their lives better. To turn down this retrospective application today says you do not back these residents. It says you do not back local businesses in our brilliant Borough.

Havant and Hayling Councillors should be proud of this amazing venue and all it does to support the local economy through provision of jobs and support to other businesses. We must collectively take pride in our regeneration, not kill it.

Tournerbury is a sustainable place, employment opportunities at Tournerbury are helping to create successful people and through that opportunity better businesses are being built, such as us, in line with your regeneration strategy.

In the current economic climate, we should be supporting businesses and employment not considering limiting them or closing them.

We must recognise the importance of local family run businesses to the success of the Borough's prosperity – Tournerbury does that at the same time as investing significantly in protecting the environment of the site – it addresses our Boroughs economic priorities and is entirely aligned with Havant's bold and ambitious statement of intent.

Not supporting Tournerbury today sends us and indeed all business decision makers - both those that are established here and those that might look to locate here a very negative message about how Havant Borough views businesses and job prospects.

Madame Chair and Councillors I urge you to support your residents, support your Borough's economic prosperity and environmental good management. You do that by supporting the Tournerbury wedding venue. Thank you.

### **Deputation Submitted by Ms Barnett**

Tournerbury has always been a big part of my life and is a place I feel a strong connection to. I live off of Tournerbury lane meaning it's just a stones throw away and it's a blessing to have it right on my doorstep. I love the peacefulness and tranquillity of the grounds and when I saw a job opening at Tournerbury a few years ago I knew I had to have it to be a part of this magical place. Tournerbury is now my main source of income throughout the summer months and it has been an absolute pleasure to experience the joy and benefit it brings to so many peoples lives. It is amazing to build long lasting relationships with all the local business that we work with. It creates a large portion of work for local people like myself and is a key part of Hayling island.

Ella Barnett

This page is intentionally left blank

Deputation Submitted by Ms Batchelor

I was born and bred on Hayling Island and grew up in West lane. I returned to Hayling in the late 90's having spent a decade in London nursing.

I got married in 2005 and had 3 children in quick succession. Tragically, in 2016 the father of my children died from pancreatic cancer within 5 weeks. Tournerbury Woods offered to host my husbands wake and they were unbelievably empathetic towards me and my children (9,7 & 5 at the time). They were so sensitive to our needs and wishes and thanks to them, we have a positive memory from the wake as a memory for the future.

On 2nd October 2021, I got married again to Darren who had also been widowed in 2016. We chose Tournerbury as it felt naturally relaxed & we felt it would suit all our children, friends and family joining together for a gathering for the 1st time. And we wanted the occasion to be uplifting. Tournerbury is unpretentious, outdoorsy and natural. In addition I felt drawn to Tournerbury from my previous memories and the setting, which is beautiful & serene. And of course it is on Hayling, where we had chosen to live. We wanted to show off Tournerbury's unique beauty.

It turned out to be an extremely wet and windy day. However, it did not spoil our celebration at all because we were beautifully looked after and protected from the weather conditions with canvas covers on the deck and the stunning marquee.

Tournerbury employs helpful, friendly professional staff, welcoming to guests and suppliers. Nothing was too much trouble.

We were very impressed with the instructions given about how the day should run in relation to the weather but more importantly, access to Tournerbury and the woodland and being mindful of neighbours.

We used local suppliers for our catering, floristry & the entertainment.

We value this as a local venue and love looking at photos of our day. It is an outstanding venue and we have told so many people about it.

Our guests came from far and wide (including abroad) – many who hadn't visited the area before (Darren's family live in Kent/East Sussex) and stayed locally and used local taxi services.

The venue should be celebrated and supported in every way – there's nothing quite like it locally.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Written Deputation

---

**Application  
number:**

APP/21/01310

**Author:**

Nicola French  
MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI CEnv

---

**Subject:**

Retrospective planning application for a wedding & events venue

---

## Introduction

I am a full member of Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Services (CIEEM) and the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) and sit as part of the Nature Conservation Working Group of the UK Environmental Law Association (UKELA). I am the sole Director of Holbury Consultancy Services Ltd, and specialise in advising on the implications of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Habitats Regulations) for development schemes. My specialism also extends to the statutory protections and policy frameworks relevant to other nature conservation sites, inclusive of the statutory protections afforded to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's). I have been advising Mr and Mrs Snell on the retrospective planning application for a wedding and events venue at Tournerbury Woods Estate since March 2020. I am one of three ecological consultancies that advise Tournerbury.

Documents submitted in support of the planning application demonstrate how Tournerbury Woods Estate has worked with Natural England, the statutory nature conservation body, to properly assess the scheme under the tests of the Habitats Regulations. These have shown that the wedding & events venue will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area & Ramsar site, or Solent Maritime SAC<sup>1</sup>. An Ecological Impact Assessment prepared by Hampshire Ecological Services Ltd has also been submitted. This has confirmed that the wedding and events venue has not had an adverse effect on the ecological interest features of the site, nor the interest features for which the Chichester Harbour SSSI is designated. Natural England agrees with these assessments and has no objection to the planning application in its proposed form.

Separate to the planning process, Natural England attended site on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2022 to undertake an independent and objective assessment of the condition of

---

<sup>1</sup> Holbury Consultancy Services Ltd, November 2021. Shadow Appropriate Assessment for Tournerbury wedding & events venue. For Tournerbury Woods Estate.

the SSSI designation where it extends to include land at Tournerbury. Natural England was given access to the full extent of the Tournerbury Woods Estate and the assessment reported earlier this month<sup>2</sup>. Extracts from the conclusion are set out below (see pages 8 & 9 of the report):

- *This assessment enables Natural England to conclude that the features of special nature conservation interest in unit 3 of Chichester Harbour SSSI meet the targets set for the various attributes used to measure condition and that they therefore remain in a favourable condition.*
- *The woodland is confirmed to remain intact and, based on available evidence and observation there is no evidence of loss of extent of woodland.*
- *No evidence was observed of detrimental impacts arising from the activity associated with the business amenity area taking place within the SSSI boundary which would pose a threat to the maintenance of the special nature conservation interest of this part of Chichester Harbour SSSI.*

The final point above is of particular importance, as it confirms that the operation of the Tournerbury wedding and event venue to date, has not caused harm to the ecological interest features within the SSSI boundary. This is unusual because normally, the impacts of a proposed development scheme on a habitat, species population or nature conservation designation must be predicted. By definition, they are potential future impacts that have not occurred. Here, clear and objective evidence now exists to show that the operation of the wedding and events venue has not resulted in detrimental impact to the ecological interest feature of the Tournerbury Woods Estate, or the designated site. Furthermore, the successful operation of the wedding and events venue allows the continued conservation management of the woodlands that form this part of the Chichester Harbour SSSI and their supporting habitats.

Of 45 SSSI units in the Chichester Harbour SSSI, only nine units are assessed by Natural England as in favourable condition with no identified threats to that condition. The Tournerbury Woods Estate unit is one of these nine and is testament to the role of active and funded conservation management and good stewardship in securing the long-term future of these sites for future generations. It is an important example of how local business can support the conservation of a statutorily designated site to the benefit of both, and represents best ecological and business practice and management. Thank you.

NF291122

---

<sup>2</sup> Graham Steven and Alex Foy, November 2022. A review of the condition of Tournerbury Woods, part of Chichester Harbour SSSI. For Natural England.

## **Deputation Submitted by Shelley Meredith**

Supporting deputation for APP/21/01310 for Planning Committee meeting 01/12/22

My name is Shelley Meredith, with my partner I run the award-winning Island Catering Company. We are a Hayling based catering company providing event catering services across the region. The majority of our work takes place at Tournerbury. Without Tournerbury we wouldn't be the business we have become and we wouldn't have been able to provide the covid support that we did to our local community at a time of crisis. Our business not only feeds our family but also allows us to teach our two little daughters to take pride in our local community and give them a sense of place. We provide employment for ourselves and up to 6 other local Borough residents, and we further rely on around 10 suppliers from the area – this is real economics – we keep people in work and help families to survive, and that's because of Tournerbury. We love our business and the joy it brings to our so many people that visit the Borough to create beautiful memories. Our clients love Tournerbury – we see first-hand the effect this unique venue has on people. Criticism is coming from people who haven't even visited the venue.

As a regular supplier travelling along the access route we have never had any conflict with all the other diverse businesses that operate from the farm. The claims of it being a working farm are far-fetched, there are a lot of other things going on there, and they definitely aren't agricultural. The route is always clear, and I've never experienced any conflict or blocks to the route because of other vehicles. It's no different to the access we experience to many businesses locally where you have to travel between other businesses to reach your destination. We also visit other venues in the area and the access to Tournerbury is far easier and safer than many others we experience.

Everyone in our community who loves Tournerbury and all the good it brings are appalled at the apparent hatred that a few residents from large properties opposite the venue appear to be whipping up.

Tournerbury is a tiny family run business. They are simply trying to create something that is good for Hayling and the wider Borough, something that we should all be really proud of. The business ensures the beautiful environment there is maintained. The wildlife is incredible, and we have only witnessed it get better and better and more diverse in the years we have been supplying Tournerbury. It is one of the only areas in Chichester Harbour that is environmentally thriving. That's because of the wedding business. The owners work incredibly hard, they are passionate about the Woods and the business and without the venue Hayling will be a worse place and so will the Woods, and we won't be the business we are and won't provide the employment and contribution to the local economy that we do, including in times of difficulty.

Your decision on this application will impact lives and young families trying to survive the cost-of-living crisis.

Thank you for thinking about our perspective.

Shelley Meredith – Island Catering Company

## Deputation Submitted by Applicants Agent



29<sup>th</sup> November 2022

### **Application APP/21/01310**

#### **Deputation to HPC 01/12/22**

It is important to determine this application objectively.

A true planning balance must be applied, comprising the lack of planning harm and significant environmental and economic benefits on one side, against the limited adverse impact on the private amenity of two properties on the other.

The proposal is an appropriate, sustainable land use, delivering significant social, environmental and economic benefits. Substantial enhancement of the SSSI, provision of vital employment, supporting many local businesses and providing social benefits locally, cannot significantly and demonstrably be outweighed by a single adverse impact on residential amenity, particularly where such harm can be mitigated through appropriate planning conditions and agreements.

Determination must be on fact not conjecture, and be supported by accurate and fair evidence. Unfortunately, in this case the recommendation is based on subjective considerations leading to undue weight being applied.

Material considerations relating to:

- policy,
- environment,
- heritage,
- land-use,
- noise and
- highways,

have been assessed and no harm arises.

All public objection is addressed positively, excepting the subjective and unproven amenity loss claimed at Tournerbury Farm.

The potential loss of amenity is acknowledged but not the importance applied in the officer report. It is a subjective matter which should be discussed and mitigated appropriately through planning conditions and agreement; it is not reason alone for refusal or determination at public inquiry.

No demonstrable evidence is given by officers or objectors as to:

- the scope and form of amenity to be protected
- how amenity is manifest and experienced
- weight afforded to amenity versus the combined weight applied to all other material considerations
- why the mitigation proposed is insufficient
- what changes to proposed mitigation would make the proposal acceptable, and
- how amenity is affected by fall-back scenarios

The potential for disturbance from passing traffic is not disputed. Offered in response to mitigate adverse impact, is a reduction in the number of events to a level significantly below and less frequent than lawful use limits, and tough management measures.

Unfortunately, despite our repeated requests and lengthy negotiations about some parts of the application, there has been no active discussion about:

- the appropriateness of mitigation proposed,
- what alternatives might be more effective,
- what is the true fall-back position from which to calculate reasonable living conditions, and
- what effective planning conditions or agreements can be reasonably imposed.

A true 'on the ground' assessment suggests the levels of residential amenity and farm disruptions claimed are not substantiated and there is no quantification. How can harm, and the potential for effective mitigation, be objectively assessed without further detailed negotiation between all parties?

Mitigation must be assessed on the difference between the proposed usage and that which is lawful; not an assessment of the proposal against a situation of no traffic, as suggested by objectors and reflected in the officer report.

Harm to residential amenity must be applied in relation to 'on the ground' factors that the houses are:

- surrounded by uncontrolled, unlawful 3<sup>rd</sup> party commercial enterprises;
- within 4m and 69m respectively of a busy and successful food and alcohol licensed venue with large open-air space for patrons immediately adjacent;
- on land where farming activity is incidental, increasingly replaced with commercial activities and where farmland is promoted for housing development;
- surrounded by unauthorised development and environmentally harmful activity, and
- lawful use of the existing access has been accepted for many years with no record of harm arising before this application, only hearsay.

The Officer's planning balance is opaque on this point and appears skewed through undue weight attached to limited and localised amenity concern. There is no substantive policy or planning objection raised. Why therefore, is so much weight attached to these two properties when residents of Tournerbury Lane, subject to the same traffic movements, raise no concerns? How has the amenity loss been measured and why is it weighed above the significant planning benefits? These are matters which should be discussed before any determination is made.

Applicant and officers agree that an alternative access is desirable. A route is potentially available but its delivery is thwarted by the unreasonable, self-centred interests and actions of Tournerbury Farm; moreover, its construction is non-compliant with its planning permission. Why?

Members must consider very carefully all merits of this proposal, and work with the applicant to secure a sustainable development. Further discussion can deliver such an outcome, whereas refusal will necessitate justifying at inquiry how limited amenity concerns significantly and demonstrably outweigh substantial economic and environmental benefits and why appropriate conditions and mitigation were not discussed and applied.

Haydn Morris  
For HMPC Ltd

This page is intentionally left blank



**Deputation Summary for Planning Committee – Tournerbury Estates. 1<sup>st</sup> Dec 2022  
Lance Quantrill – County Councillor for Hayling Island  
(330 words)**

**Interest:**

Hampshire County Council has 4 Strategic Aims.

The first is: "maintain strong and resilient economic growth and prosperity."

Cllrs on the committee have advice from experts on specialist subjects, so I focus on the benefits of Tourism contributing to the County Council's Aim.

**General:**

Since Victorian times Hayling Island has been an attractive destination for Visitors.

A boom in UK seaside holidays occurred after the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War.

By the '70's Hayling Island had 5 seasonal holiday camps.

4 of which had direct harbour access.

Having evolved their mixes of stay duration and entertainment, 3 camps are even more popular today - with over 95% occupancy and open throughout the year.

Other holiday attractions thrive: such as Parkdean Park (static caravans) with Fishery Lane and The Oven campsites, for touring caravans and tents, along with hotels, bed & breakfasts and holiday let venues.

Unlike competitive resorts, most of Hayling Island venues have direct access to the shoreline. Particularly desirable for special events.

Just as the railway was a key factor 150 years ago, the Hindhead Tunnel, 15 years ago, widened access for 2.5 million residents of Southwest London within a 90-minute drive time.

**Specific:**

In a very competitive market for events, Tournerbury Estate offers a highly attractive and unique venue because it is both rural as well as shoreline.

With only 150 guests it is also intimate.

Apart from local employment and local purchases, there is a multiplier factor, typically 7x, whereby such spend is subsequently re-spent in the local economy – in Havant Borough.

Similarly, those coming to events may stay locally or arrive early and make purchases in local shops, visit attractions and buy refreshments.

Such events also prompt return visits to the locality for short breaks and longer holidays.

Havant Borough Council's Strategy for Beachlands recognises the need for Hayling Island to provide unique, attractive attractions - this is one.

**Submission:**

Granting permission to Tournerbury Estates for events would "maintain strong and resilient economic growth and prosperity".

End.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Deputation Submitted by Councillor Payter**

My deputation will cover the following areas –

- 1) HBC Regeneration Strategy
- 2) Responsibilities and duties of Councillors to the Public Interest
- 3) Environment and Economy
- 4) Weighing planning balance in the Public Interest
- 5) Definition of 'amenity' in planning law
- 6) Context of 'amenity' in this application
- 7) Access to the application site
- 8) Hayling Island as a tourist destination

This page is intentionally left blank