

OBJECTION TO APP/24/00968
BEACHLANDS 5 SEA FRONT HAYLING ISLAND

This proposed development is in Flood Zone 2 and is surrounded by a large Flood Zone 3. This is based on historic data which the EA is currently revising due to an increased flood threat from Climate Change. The sea level rise is now projected between 1-2 mtrs during the next century (the lifetime of the development.)

This application (as part of the justification for the site) says the HBC included a number of beachfront sites for development in the Local Plan. This is true. However, the Local Plan, following inspections, was rejected as unsound, and these beachfront developments were called out as problematic. The application also says that a sequential flood assessment will not be required as one was completed in 2014. The Flood Risk Assessment by the EA has now been revised, which renders the 10-year-old test unsound, and a new test will be required.

The EA states that in the NPPF Section 14 – 170 & 184 that:

“170: Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.”

“184: Plans should reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas and not exacerbating the impacts of physical changes to the coast. They should identify as a Coastal Change Management Area any area likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast.”

There is no information or contribution in this application which addresses these recommendations or provides any arguments that that this residential development is necessary in this high flood risk location.

The height of the development is 4.7-5 mtrs AOD. The EA require the ground level of residential properties to be 5.8 mtrs AOD and the access road at 5.2 mtrs. This application does not conform to the EA requirement. The residential units are planned on the upper floors. However, the access and services are not, and of course the occupiers of the ground floor are at high flood risk. Insurance for all these units and the apartments will be problematic, as will it be for the residents' vehicles.

The flood risk to these areas is complex and requires careful study.

The beachfront along the south coast of the Island is a natural shingle shoreline 5-6 mtrs AOD (see Pic 1) and is regularly overtopped throughout its length, including the plan site (see Pics 2 & 3) and there are no hard defences in place or planned for the future. The Coastal Partners' strategy for this location is categorised as 'hold the line' but funding for that is unlikely under the existing EA funding cost/benefit algorithm.



Pic 1



Pic 2



Pic 3

There is also an unusual and dangerous wave phenomenon which impacts only two places on the south coast – Chesil Bank and Hayling Island. This bimodal swell wave-form results from storms far away in the North Atlantic. These fast-moving, high-energy waves move up the Channel, hit the Isle of Wight, and are diverted north to hit Hayling Island beach, creating serious erosion and overtopping. Coastal Partners are in the middle of an evaluation of this major risk. (See Pics 4,5&6.)



Pic 4



Pic 5



Pic 6

We have for years had accurate data on all of the sea conditions from the automatic weather station at the Chichester Harbour entrance (CHIMET.) The findings below are based on these data. Below is the worst-case analysis:

High tide in 2024	2.6 mtrs AOD
Tide surge in 2024	1.0 mtrs
Bimodal (4 mtrs)	2.3
EA tide rise projection to 2100 (1-2 mtrs)	2.0
	7.6 mtrs AOD
Beach height	5.0 mtrs AOD

This major, very localised flood risk element is in addition to the EA projected tide rise. This application's Flood Risk Analysis has no evidence of understanding or addressing this risk.

It is possible for retail and food outlets to be developed on this site, but to provide security and sustainability for owners it should be on a raised boardwalk, with attention paid to the daily sea breeze, which blows onshore most sunny days at Force 4 from the south. South-facing seating for food service would need protection from high glass screens as seen all across the Mediterranean resorts.

This kind of application is clearly designed for a 'quick buck' by a person or company who have ignored the known risks, disregarded the NPPF considerations, and wasted the valuable resources within HBC to evaluate this frankly deliberately inappropriate application.

This application must be rejected at the earliest opportunity.

Dave Parham
Save Our Island