

I've been studying the report and documents used for the earlier DMC meeting on APP/18/00724 as well as documents submitted for APP/20/01093, which as you have said yourself, are basically the same as for the earlier application, and also catching up on some of the other concerns we residents have. I continue to object to this development and would appreciate if you could kindly respond to each of my points.

1. **"Sinah Lakes" - A new housing development from Barratt**

Homes!

Please

see the first attached photo which shows flooding on 27/12/2020 at the end of our garden which backs on the field which is the proposed site of the subject application. This type of flooding has only started appearing in recent months and is the first since we moved to Hayling Island - i.e. the situation is getting worse. I also attach a second photo taken from a neighbour's house slightly east of mine on Sinah Lane on the same day - it is even more concerning. There is also a photo taken at the northern end of the site. The most alarming photo is the fourth one which was taken in February last year by a neighbour showing extreme flooding to the southern end of the site - I was abroad at the time so missed it. I am told that there was someone even spotted canoeing on "lake". This evidence is very different to the "sunny" photos on the HBC site, not least the glossy brochure photos submitted to you by

Barratt.

From what I

hear and read, the issue is a very complex one and I would refer you to the various comments I have read by more knowledgeable residents on the subject matter to the above applications. However I see that the Flood Risk Assessment report(s) which the Council appear to be using to examine the situation has been carried out by consultants (RCP) commissioned and paid for by Barratt. (Ironically it was first published a few days after the serious flooding shown in my fourth photo!). Which independent expert consultants did HBC use or will use to critique the RCP report and assess the potential for increased risk to the homes of existing residents? Having been a consultant myself at one stage, and having employed them at many other times, I am well aware that Barratt will get whatever report they want, otherwise there would be no further business for the consultant. In fact RCP even states in its introduction that the report has "been prepared in *support* of a planning application for 195 houses". So of course it's going to be positive. Do you agree?

I see that a

SuDS is proposed and note from the site plan that the SuDS station/pool is at the north end of the site. The RCP report in Appendix F shows minutes of a joint site visit by HBC employee Steve Mountain and a representative of RCP, who wrote the minutes. The visit was made in the month of June - i.e. completely the wrong time of year to assess flooding. Do you agree? The minutes report that Mr Mountain "queried the lack of SuDS features amongst the residential units". RCP responded that "on site SuDS features cannot be utilised". So why do we have a SuDS proposed?

Further

apparent inconsistencies concern me. The RCP report on page 5 states that "Due to the depth of the groundwater (i.e. very shallow) and extent of soft silty clay, infiltration drainage is deemed inappropriate for this site". And yet on page 15 we see the comment that "SuDS techniques comprise of infiltration drainage devices to discharge surface water....". What are we residents supposed to believe? Please explain the logic here? You can understand my concern given that even without the 195 house development and its concreting over and acres of tarmac, my garden, and those of neighbours, is already experiencing flooding at unprecedented levels. This is at the southern end of the site. The SuDS pond will be at the north end of the site. How will water be pumped from the south end to the north end? Will this require noisy pumps near existing residents' houses? I note that on page 10 of its report(s) RCP states that "A review of groundwater levels indicates that the risk of

groundwater flooding to the development is low.” Was this based on their June site visit? They go on “Any potential risk to the new development will be mitigated” by “adequate falls away from the buildings to protect both building and people”. Does this mean that those new houses which are to be situated at the boundary with Sinah Lane and North Shore Road will be raised so that water will run south or west from the back gardens of the new houses into the gardens of the existing houses - exasperating the situation for the latter as per the photos

attached?

Who will manage this SUDS? I understand that Southern Water has declined? Indeed your report for the DMC on the first application states that it is “not clear that Southern Water has taken an ‘in principle’ decision”. Is Southern Water on board or not to manage the SuDS? Will Barratt be contractually obliged to ensure that it is managed properly! Will they pay for the maintenance? If not, who will? I imagine that existing residents will have the right to sue Barratt, HBC or another party if the flooding (evidenced in the photos) becomes worse after the project is completed? Your report also states “Issues with private pumping stations have arisen on recent housing developments representing a significant and addition cost to the management company.....”. What experience does HBC have with SuDS?

You (or the Planning Department) have stated in your paper Supplementary Planning Information dated 29/10/2020 that the “Environmental Agency and the Local Lead Flood Authority have raised no objection to this development, and are content with the measures in place to ensure that the development is free from the risk of flooding and that the site is sustainably drained”. The only comment I can see in the documents is a message from the EA to RCP in the latter’s report stating that “In line with Development Management Procedure Order the Environment Agency is not a statutory consultee for development in flood zone 1 and therefore we would not be consulted at the planning stage and therefore not provide any comment to the Local Planning Authority”. Please clarify and/or direct me to the communication from the EA stating that they have a non-conditional “no objection”. Re. the Local Lead Flood Authority (Hampshire County Council), the latest comment from them that I can find is in your list of consultee comments for the first application which is dated 2 October 2019 and states that “In our previous response we requested information in relation to maintenance and maintenance schedules. It is stated that the drainage will be offered to the water company however there is no evidence that this will be accepted” and goes on “the information provided to date is not considered sufficient.” Where is the statement that there is a non-conditional “no objection”? [By the way in the documents posted online for the second application there is a document listed as “Consultee comment - Environment Agency. It is actually a letter from the Langstone Harbour Board objecting to the development!]

2. **Consultants**

Regarding

consultants, which expert companies did HBC use and pay for to give you an independent assessment and critique of Barratt’s consultants’ contributions on the other aspects of the development?

3. **Mitigation Funds.**

I have heard several councillors- such as David Guest - say that councillors should support this application because Barratt will pay-in funds which can be used for roads etc. Is this how Barratt buys off councils by offering money and threatening, as they have, court action, appeals etc. that they expect councils not to contest because of the cost? This is one of the reasons we pay our rates! Why should residents have to put up with controversial housing developments so that HBC can increase its income when we pay our rates for the Council to function. If the money is needed,

increase the rates! Will legal contracts be signed for these funds before Barratt is given a go-ahead to start building? Will there be penalty clauses in these contracts if they do not pay up? Will there be provisions in the contracts that such funds are only to be used on Hayling Island, and not in other parts of the Council area and only offset detrimental aspects of the application - such as increased traffic?

4. **Station Road pinch-point.**

I noticed in one of the previous presentations to the DMC that photos were shown of Station Road and Sinah Lane. Deliberately or not, and it looks like the former, what was missing were photo angles showing the dangerous pinch-point on Station Road adjacent to Jaspers Restaurant. No mention was made of this. All the traffic from the site, vehicular and human, must pass this way to get to West Town and beyond. I have examined the resubmitted "Travel Plan" by Barratt drawn up by their consultants Paul Basham Associates. I would like to draw your attention to the blatant misrepresentation by them of the actual pedestrian situation at Station Road and access to shopping facilities etc. at West Town. On page 11 of the Report they show a photo and talk about the 1.8 meter wide footpaths on Sinah Lane, some with grass verges even. How lovely! However the problem is that the photo is taken looking west from the site entrance - in other words, in completely the opposite direction to West Town. The other photo shows the wide road and footpaths of Staunton Avenue. You would not drive, walk or cycle down Staunton Avenue to get to West Town - it goes directly south (but looks good!). On page 12 there are two more photos, one showing the West Town Centre Pedestrian Environment and the other The Station Road Pedestrian Environment looking east towards West Town. The shocking thing is, it is the area between the first and the last photos, as listed by me, that is where the road safety danger is. And Barratt is deliberately not pointing this danger out. The company is claiming that they enhanced the pedestrian route towards West Town from Station Road as part of their "Oysters" development ensuring "a continual footway and pedestrian crossing facilities towards West Town." This is a complete pack of lies. On the north side of Station Road going east from the site, which has its exit and entrance on the same side of the road, there is not a continual footpath and at spots where there is the footpath it is not even 0.5m wide in places. There are no pedestrian crossing in the vicinity. The photos I have attached from Google Earth show precisely what the situation is and if it is not clear I suggest you send someone down to take measurements and photos. The pinch-point is extremely dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. It will be used by children from the proposed development everyday to go to and from school. There is already a builders merchant on this stretch of the road and a fencing company - both use large trucks. There is not enough width on the road itself for two large trucks to pass. What would it be like if construction work on the proposed site took place? The double decker bus service also uses this pinch-point, cars have to stop to let it through whilst pedestrians are trying to navigate the narrow footpaths. Because of the existing houses on either side of the road, I cannot see how the situation can be alleviated. I have to say that the most disturbing aspect of this is that Barratt are prepared to completely misrepresent the true picture at this pinch-point. Is HBC prepared to take the chance that no one will be killed? And of course this behaviour by Barratt begs the question - what other misrepresentations has the company made? It is up to HBC to protect its residents - this will require an examination by hired experts, if you don't have the relevant capacity on your staff, on all the aspects of this application. Please comment?

5. **Privacy.**

I have seen statements from HBC that measures have been taken to ensure there is adequate distancing between new houses and existing houses to provide privacy. Sorry, that is not correct. Look at the line of new houses running east to west parallel to Sinah Lane and backing on to existing houses. They appear to be almost the most densely situation on the

site. To make matters worse, one of the bigger 2.5/3 storey blocks is one of them. It is ridiculous that one of these higher houses should be put where it is. Why can the new houses on this stretch, with the most impact on existing residents, not be build on the east or north side of the site where building next to existing residents minimised? Or is it too wet in those areas?

6. **RSPB**

I note from their letter of 28 October 2020 that they have set a number of pre-conditions regarding the proposed Wader and Brent Goose Refuge. Of significance is that the Refuge "**must** be established and operational before construction works start. This is to ensure that any adverse effects on the wintering birds.....are avoided". Further that "Monitoring of the Refuge will be essential to ensure that it is functioning effectively.....". So it is clear that they want to see the Refuge operating effectively before any works starts on the houses. Is this correct?

They also refer to Construction Phase Disturbance and call for an approved plan which "should specify that the main works are restricted to the summer months....." So I have to ask - what about the existing human residents with houses backing on to the site who will normally be found in their back gardens during the summer? Can they get the same consideration during the summer as the birds will get during the winter?





