

**Subject:** RE: For the attention of Charlie Vallis and the Planning Manager: – Further representation during 21-day period / new material matters and procedural concerns

---

**Sent:** 10 July 2026 23:58

Dear Charlie,  
Please treat this email as a further representation during the current 21-day period for application **F/26/100829**.

I also ask that this email is forwarded to the Planning Manager, the Chairman of the Committee and the Monitoring Officer, as it raises material planning matters as well as procedural and governance concerns.

I understand the Committee resolution was not an unconditional approval. It was to delegate the matter back to the Planning Manager in consultation with the Chairman, subject to expiry of 21 days following correct formal notice being served and consideration of any new material planning matters raised during that period. I therefore raise the following points.

### **1. The documents sent on 19 June do not appear to include a valid Notice 1**

On 19 June 2026, Denfords sent an email stating that “the attached notices have to be sent to you”. The covering letter states that a “Notice 1 – Completed” is enclosed. However, having reviewed the email and attachments, I cannot identify any actual completed Notice 1.

The documents appear to comprise Denfords’ covering letter, a Certificate B header page, and Certificate B owner-list pages which still record the historic alleged service date of **06/02/2026**. Re-sending Certificate B pages which record the old date does not appear to constitute fresh service of a correct formal Notice 1 on 19 June 2026.

The Denfords covering letter also does not, on its face, appear equivalent to a formal Notice 1. It does not clearly identify **Leyson Building Consultancy Ltd / Toby Connis** as the applicant, does not provide the Council’s address for representations, does not state a clear representation deadline, and does not contain the formal owner-rights wording.

Please confirm which exact document the Council considers to be the completed Notice 1, whether it was served by a valid method other than email, whether a corrected Certificate B has been submitted, and whether the 21-day period is being calculated only from valid service of the correct formal notice. Pending this clarification, I ask that no delegated decision is issued.

### **2. Conflict-of-interest / independence of the planting plan**

The Committee report records that an owner of one of the flats assisted with the application and works closely with Eastleigh Borough Council’s planning department as a contractor.

I understand that the late-submitted planting plan was prepared by **TGD Landscape Ltd / Tim Griffin**. I further understand that Tim Griffin may be an owner or leaseholder at Boston Court and may be the contractor referred to in the report.

I do not make any allegation of impropriety. However, the planting plan is central to the officer report’s conclusion that the proposed bin enclosure can be visually softened and integrated into the landscaped setting. It is therefore directly relevant to material planning considerations, including character and appearance, landscape quality, trees and biodiversity.

Please confirm:

1. whether Tim Griffin / TGD Landscape Ltd prepared the planting plan;
2. whether Tim Griffin is an owner or leaseholder at Boston Court;

3. whether he assisted with the application;
4. who instructed and/or paid TGD Landscape Ltd to prepare the planting plan;
5. whether TGD Landscape Ltd or Tim Griffin is expected to carry out, supervise or otherwise benefit financially from the planting or associated works if permission is granted;
6. whether these matters were declared to the Planning Manager, Chairman and Vice-Chairman before any delegated decision; and
7. what steps have been taken to manage any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest arising from his professional relationship with the Council's planning department.

Given the report's own reference to this connection, I ask that this matter is reviewed by the Monitoring Officer before any decision notice is issued.

### **3. Alleged involvement in escalating the bin issue**

I also understand that the same interested owner was involved in encouraging or asking residents to move 1100L bins a very significant (up to 100m) distance away from the existing designated bin store:

***"Is anyone around tomorrow evening to push the bins round to the front... Just need to make sure they are left not to block traffic.."***

This is relevant because it has contributed to the impression that the existing bin store was unworkable. This should also be read in the context of the explanation provided to me by Denfords, namely that the bins should not be "out" and should be collected from the designated bin store for the property:

***"Apologies for the delay in response, I am just picking this up on Alan's behalf due to absence. I have spoken to Eastleigh Borough Council this morning about this issue and they let me know the following: Only issue logged by the waste management team was back in March as "recycling bin not collected as bin not out" – which even they mentioned was strange as there is a note for Boston Court that the bins should not be "out" and should be collected from the designated bin store for the property."***

This is not a personal allegation. My concern is that the factual basis for the application may have been shaped by a situation that was unnecessarily escalated, creating confusion and concern among residents, particularly elderly residents. Some owners and residents are in their 80s and 90s and may not have been able to navigate the planning, leaseholder and consultation issues easily.

The Council should therefore be cautious about treating the absence of formal objections from some residents as evidence of informed support. I am aware that some residents expressed concern informally but did not submit formal objections. One owner described the outlook for residents facing "this carbuncle" (the proposed structure) as appalling and said it would be an eyesore on entry to Boston Court. This is directly relevant to visual amenity, outlook, character and appearance.

### **4. Waste-collection evidence undermine the claimed need: All waste and recycling bin collections are taking place without difficulty**

The officer report proceeds on the basis that the existing rear bin arrangement is "understood" to be impractical and is causing issues with waste and recycling collection. However, recent information suggests that this assumption may be unsafe.

ALL regular waste and, importantly, recycling bins continue to be collected without any issues. This supports the view that the issue was operational and communicational, rather than a genuine planning or layout problem.

That makes it difficult to justify relocating and expanding the whole bin-storage arrangement to a new front enclosure for eight 1100-litre eurobins plus smaller bins.

This is a new and important material planning matter. If the existing bin store can be serviced, then the applicant has not demonstrated a genuine planning need for a large new bin enclosure at the front of Boston Court.

This raises serious questions about who benefits from the proposed works.

### **5. Section 20, contractor selection and implementation assumptions**

No Section 20 consultation has been served on leaseholders in relation to the proposed works.

I appreciate that Section 20 is primarily a leasehold/service-charge matter and not, by itself, a planning consideration. However, it is relevant to the extent that the application appears to have been presented as a settled management solution capable of implementation.

If works of this nature are to be funded through service charges, leaseholders would normally expect to see proper consultation, clear specification and alternative quotations. I am not aware that alternative quotes have been provided, nor that leaseholders have been consulted on whether **Leyson Building Consultancy Ltd / Toby Connis, TGD Landscape Ltd / Tim Griffin**, or any other party should be commissioned to carry out or supervise the works.

Therefore, the Council should not assume that the works are authorised, settled, costed, or that any particular party is entitled to implement them. This is especially important given the potential conflict-of-interest concerns around the late planting plan and the person who may benefit from implementation.

## **6. Less harmful alternatives have not been properly considered**

If the issue genuinely aims to benefit the resident, less harmful alternatives should have been explored before recommending a large new enclosure in the landscaped frontage, which would avoid sacrificing landscaped green frontage, avoid introducing a visually intrusive enclosure at the entrance, and avoid new risks to parking, access and manoeuvring.

## **7. Cumulative pattern of procedural and evidential inconsistencies**

From the outset, this application has involved a series of issues which, cumulatively, raise concerns about whether the proposal has been assessed on a complete and accurate factual basis:

- the original owner-notice issue;
- the Council's later requirement for correct formal notice;
- the apparent failure of the 19 June documents to include an actual Notice 1;
- the late planting plan submitted after the original consultation period;
- re-consultation only after concerns were raised;
- reliance on an unscaled planting plan;
- uncertainty over the independence and financial interest behind that plan;
- uncertainty over Section 20 consultation and contractor selection;
- the absence of clear waste-service evidence supporting the claimed need;
- and new evidence suggesting that the alleged collection issue may have been overstated, mischaracterised or unnecessarily escalated.

These matters are not minor. They go to the need for the development, the reliability of the submitted evidence, the adequacy of mitigation, the fairness of the process, and whether permission can safely be issued under delegation.

I therefore respectfully ask that no decision notice is issued at this stage.

Kind regards,

Owner of Flat 11, Boston Court