

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](#) 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.