

[REDACTED]

FAO Enforcement Manager,
New Forest National Park Authority

10/13/2020

Ref: Article 4 Direction – Cadnam – Class A Part 2 of Schedule 2 GPDO

Dear Sir,

We are writing to you as joint owners of part of the land which is proposed to be the subject of an Article 4 direction restricting the erection of means of enclosure (fencing essentially).

The entire Article 4 area is a large agricultural field which has also been used in the past as a showground and to host equestrian competitions. In the summer of 2020, the field was notionally divided into a total of 16 plots (A to O plus a Barn Plot) for the purpose of sale (by auction) either as individual plots, combined plots or as a single entity.



In the event we purchased 3 plots (A, B and C above); the sale having been completed on 25/11/2020.

We also understand that plots D, F, I, J, L, N, P (the large block on the diagram with no reference) and E have been sold to a single buyer and therefore 6 plots (Barn Plot, G, H, K, M, O) remain unsold and are still on the market. The thick black lines are common access routes and are there to prevent any plot becoming effectively landlocked.

We are most concerned that the proposed Article 4 direction will prevent us from enclosing the land we now own. This would appear to be a basic requirement of land ownership and therefore not one that should be withdrawn. We note that the supporting information suggests that the Article 4 is not intended to prevent owners enclosing their land, although it is clear that the Article 4 requires planning applications for all fencing which of course can be approved or refused. It therefore must have the potential to prevent all owners enclosing their land and therefore we object to it on those grounds.

Given that the land ownership pattern of the Article 4 area has already started to emerge, it is clear that there are only two owners of the bulk of the land and therefore any concern over the mass subdivision of the land into each of the 16 constituent lots is unfounded.

We therefore do not think that the Article 4 direction is justified. Furthermore, if the suggestion that all owners will be able to enclose their land is correct, that provides implicit confirmation that planning applications will not be refused. That being so there is no reason to have the Article 4 direction in the first place. It would therefore appear to be adding control for control's sake.

We are currently unable to prevent people from driving/walking across the middle of our land and this is causing a lot of damage and rutting.

Whilst we want to work with the council to ensure that we work within your guidelines, we are sure you appreciate applying for planning permission is both time consuming and costly and aside from the planning application fee, will normally require appointment of specialists to prepare plans, etc. We contend that the concern which first prompted the Article 4 direction is unfounded and therefore the cost and inconvenience it will impose on others is not justified.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]