



RESERVED MATTERS SUBMISSION
FOR 131 DWELLINGS

Land North Of Goldring Close
And South Of Beech Grove,
Mengham, Hayling Island



STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

12.05.14

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Context
- 2.0 Proposed Development
- 3.0 Process
- 4.0 Feedback
- 5.0 Design / Planning Response
- 6.0 Conclusion

APPENDICES

- A MFRG Meeting Notes
- B Public Exhibition Invite Letter and List of Invitees
- C Public Exhibition Attendance List and Blank Response Form
- D Summary of Responses

1.0 Context

- 1.1 The adopted Havant Borough Council Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), 2013 recommends (at paragraphs 4.23-4.25) that applications may need to be supported by a statement setting out how the applicant has complied with the requirements for pre-application consultation and demonstrating that the views of the local community have been sought and taken into account in the formulation of development proposals. The SCI is not prescriptive about the techniques to be used. The level of consultation should be proportionate to the scale and significance of the application.
- 1.2 The site has outline planning permission for the principle of 131 dwellings with vehicular access approved via Hawthorne Grove in some detail (appeal decision APP/X1735/A/13/2192777 allowed on 17.07.13). The detailed layout, appearance, landscaping and scale of the development and various conditional matters are now submitted for approval.
- 1.3 There is no statutory requirement to undertake community consultation, particularly at the Reserved Matters stage which is technically not another planning application. The scale of the proposed development, the considerable (c.550) local objections to the outline planning application and level of local representations to the appeal Inspector indicated to Bellway Homes Ltd Wessex (hereon Bellway) of the need for such consultation as the details of the proposed development were worked up. Bellway take community relations seriously and are keen to bring forward the most appropriate development for each site whether starting from scratch or, as in this case, working up the detail.
- 1.4 By engaging with local stakeholders it is hoped to:
- better understand potential problems that may arise from developing a site, and consider how these could be resolved
 - discover opportunities to improve a scheme
 - secure support for our proposals and resolve potential objections before they arise, and
 - design quality buildings that are in keeping with the character of the area.
- 1.5 This project-specific statement sets out the nature and scale of community involvement undertaken prior to finalising proposals in accordance with the advice of the Council's SCI.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 Bellway Homes are submitting the detail of the Reserved Matters for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping and surveys and information to discharge various pre-commencement conditional matters for 131 dwellings. Separate submissions including plans and drawings, a Design and Access Statement and Planning Statement clarify the detail of the RM proposals.

3.0 Process

- 3.1 A multiple-stage consultation and engagement process has been followed for this project, parallel to a formal preapplication submission and regular meetings with Havant Borough Council (including input from the Chichester Harbour Conservancy), as follows:

- An **introductory meeting** took place with representatives of the local community, the Mengham Fields Residents' Group (hereon MFRG), 04.03.14 (Notes attached at Appendix A) where the status of the OL planning permission, project timescales and engagement process were discussed. Bellway confirmed their purchase of the site subject to completion, commitment to regular constructive dialogue at planning and construction stages and intention to engage with the wider public to inform, where commercially practicable, the layout and detail of the development. MFRG representatives (majority view) recognised that the principle of development was now established and that a constructive dialogue was the right way to highlight key local concerns, inform the emerging details and ensure properly planned implementation.

The process and timing of the public engagement event was agreed and MFRG agreed to circulate the subsequent invite/details more widely via a local community web site. Key planning issues were identified by the MFRG; transportation projects and local priorities, archaeology, TPO'd trees, flood risk and localised drainage problems, visual impact (AONB) and particularly the retention and reinforcement of the east boundary hedge, scope to improve the alternative routes to the public footpath 88/102 east of the site, construction access and impacts (noise and disturbance to wintering birds), number and mix of dwellings. The following interim matters were addressed:

- The drainage ditch under the footpath to the east side of the southern field was manually cleared to help alleviate localised flooding / ponding,
- A meeting with the owner of 3 Hawthorne Grove was requested by MFRG to discuss Party Wall matters etc. and
- Prior notice was given to MFRG about the felling of the 2 Oaks RO 1 Hawthorne Grove permitted to be removed for the site access. The works were undertaken.
- **Written notification** was then sent to local people living in close proximity to the site and key stakeholders advising them of Bellway's intention to submit Reserved Matters and giving advance notice of a public exhibition (see list of invitees and invitation letter dated 11.03.14 at Appendix B).
- **A public exhibition** was held on 20.03.14 between 15:00 and 19:30 at the Main Hall, South Hayling United Reformed Church, Hollow Lane, Hayling Island with 'work in progress' layout plans (v4), streetscene drawings, house plans and elevations presented for discussion. At the exhibition a feedback form was provided for attendees to complete at the event or later, within 7 days, via a pre-paid envelope (see attendance list and blank response form with 5 key questions at Appendix C).
- A **second MFRG meeting** took place 02.04.14 (Notes attached at Appendix A). Bellway advised of constructive discussions with the Borough Council and Chichester Harbour Conservancy who agreed there were limited public views into the site from the AONB and recommended; the use of recessive materials and colours (buff brick to be avoided for the houses closest to the east boundary), reinforcement of eastern

hedge by shrub planting to the west side and that a bund, preferred by MFRG, was not needed as it could put the established 3-5m high hedge at risk. Feedback on the consultation exhibition responses to that date was given by Bellway. The work in progress version of the layout presented at the public exhibition was tabled by Bellway (v4) and areas where improvements could be made were identified [i.e. the density and mix of dwellings adjoining Hawthorn Grove, adherence to local back to back and 10m back garden guidelines, deletion of the bund to the east boundary and provision of a footway /cycleway link through the site to the SE corner (Mengham Lane), change from large 'l-shaped' house types to create more space to boundaries in the SE and SW corners]. Other matters discussed and / or agreed at the meeting included:

- MFRG sought clarification of the archaeological brief,
 - A tripartite meeting with Hampshire CC to discuss transport project spending priorities was agreed, and
 - Bellway to request (on delivery orders for the development) for deliveries generally to take place between the hours of 09:00 and 14:30 in result of concerns by MFRG about public/school children safety.
- **A third meeting of the MFRG** took place 24.04.14 (Draft Notes attached at Appendix A) where Bellway explained the final position regarding feedback received from the consultation event and the nature of modifications and adjustments to the proposed layout to be submitted for formal Reserved Matters approval to Havant Borough Council. Issues arising from individuals and from the unexpected size of the digger used for the archaeological dig were jointly discussed. The timing and nature of archaeological investigations was explained by Bellway and MFRG requested to preview the 'finds'. (This was subsequently arranged and the consultant archaeologist met with residents 28.04.14). The multi-party meeting with Hampshire CC (Transportation) to discuss prioritisation of local projects was confirmed. Bellway also confirmed the intention to submit a separate parallel planning application for the main access to take away the pressure on the un-made section of Beech Grove, the entrance Oak and to enable demolition to take place and wheel washing facilities to be installed as soon as possible.

- 3.2 It should be noted that the RM planning stage and the process leading to this SCI is not the end of the dialogue with the MFRG. Bellway has committed to bi-monthly meetings during the (c.24 months) construction phase of this project too. The aim is to ensure local concerns and opinions continue to be taken into account, where practically possible. The Bellway Technical Manager for the project will provide the continuity and point of contact between residents and the Company during the subsequent construction phases.

4.0 Feedback

- 4.1 The table at Appendix D provides a detailed summary of the respondents' comments and questions.
- 4.2 In summary of c.97 Invitees, 82 people were counted in attendance (47 individuals logged on the attendance list including Cllrs Turner and Wilson, Members of the MFRG and Representatives of the Mengham Junior School) [85% of invitees]. 25 completed Response

Forms were received plus an additional e-mailed response following the same format [30% of attendees].

4.3 The key points arising from the Respondents' comments can be summarised as follows:

- The majority 18 (72%) of Respondents agreed that the exhibition and discussion had been **informative**. A minority did not think it was informative. Some were still concerned with the principle of development (loss of green fields and/or quantum of dwellings and/or transportation / infrastructure impacts) considered and allowed by the appeal Inspector.
- The **overall impression** of the proposed development was considered '*bad, typical new build, totally unacceptable or too many*' by 11 (44%) of the 25 respondents, '*reasonable or good*' by 8 (32%) of the 25 respondents. The other most frequently occurring response to Question 2 was that there were transportation issues (use of Tournerbury Junction, S106 spending priorities, and the single vehicular access into the site) highlighted by 6 (24%) of 25 respondents.
- The main **detailed improvements** requested in response to Question 3 were '*improve vehicular access and transportation*' 8 references, '*distribute the affordable housing more evenly*' and '*encourage pedestrian and cycle improvements* jointly 5 references, and the third most common response was to '*provide less dense houses*' 4 references.
- The responses to Question 4 matters that had been **overlooked** were varied. In equal first place was '*the Tournerbury Road junction*' and '*flooding/drainage*' with 4 references each. '*Water Pressure*' or a '*no*' response was next equal with 3 references each and then a range of other matters were identified with 1 reference each including; requests for boundary improvements, clarification of the status of land in adverse possession the making up and adoption of a section St. Margarets Road, the appeal decision was flawed and general concerns about infrastructure.
- The **other comments** responses to Question 5 were again topped by the need for '*transport network improvements*' with 7 references, and then comments relating to '*proximity / amenity issues*', '*clarification of boundary treatments*' and '*the infrastructure will not cope*' were next with 3 references apiece. The next most frequent response sought clarification of the '*archaeological details*' with 2 references. A range of other matters were commented on including (i.e. not already mentioned above); whether covenants could be used to reinforce the Inspector's planning conditions, when the Biodiversity Mitigation plan would be submitted, how noise levels would be monitored, drawing attention to overhead wires, a request for no social housing next to the school playing field and a request to work with local residents.

5.0 Design / Planning Response

5.1 The following table clarifies Bellway's response and changes to the proposals following the community consultation:

Community Matter	Bellway Response
Amount of Development and Impact on the Islands Infrastructure	This is a submission of details pursuant to the OL planning permission not a fresh new application re-visiting first principles. The Inspector considered these matters and found the quantum (hence density), location and nature of the development and its impacts to be acceptable.
Transport – Use of the Tournerbury Junction	The wider transport impact of the development was considered by the appeal inspector. The quantum of 131 new dwellings (129 net after demolition) complies with the parameters established by the OL planning permission. S106 spending priorities are to be reviewed – see below.
Transport – Single Vehicular Entrance to the Site	Vehicular access via No.1 Hawthorne Grove was a detailed matter submitted with the OL application and a matter of Common Ground between Hampshire CC and the previous Applicant. The sole vehicular access was agreed in detail by the Appeal Inspector. Bellway are not proposing an alternative or second vehicular access. Many of the St. Margarets Road respondents commented that they were against opening up a second vehicular access from this route.
Transport – Use of St. Margaret's Road	This link facilitates pedestrian, cycle and emergency access to the site and was illustrated to the Inspector at the OL stage. The status and physical limitations of the

	southern end of St. Margaret's Grove are noted but those conditions existed when the appeal Inspector recently considered the use of that route into the site. There are alternative routes available for pedestrians and cyclists in the unlikely event that the situation at St. Margarets Road would significantly deter potential users.
Transport – S106 Spending Priorities	Provided this does not delay housing delivery, this is a matter where Bellway have some sympathy with local people as some of the list of transport network improvements in the S106 seem remote or otherwise not well-related to the impacts of the development. A multi-party meeting about this has been arranged.
Transport – Encourage Pedestrians and Cyclists	Proposed pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided within the site to link with existing routes, footpaths and bridleways (see Design and Access Statement). A new gate will be facilitated for the Mengham Junior School. These measures and proposed transport contributions secured through the S106 Agreement (subject to the review above) will support alternative non-car modes of transport.
Housing – Affordable Housing Distribution	The concentration of AH units on the Hawthorne Grove edge of the site has been reduced and revised as a result of the community engagement. Small clusters of such dwellings are manageable and preferable for the Registered Providers. The design of the AH units will be indistinguishable from the adjoining proposed market houses. A minority concern about such dwellings adjoining the school edge of the site is irrational. No objections were raised by the

	representatives of the school. The distribution and mix of the affordable housing has now been agreed in detail after pre-submission meetings with Havant BC officers.
Housing – Numbers and Density	The Inspector considered the quantum of 131 new houses to be acceptable. These submissions provide the detail pursuant to the OL permission. The site layout is very similar to that illustrated to the Inspector. The net density is unchanged and within the range of existing densities in the locality. There would be 3 less houses adjoining the rear of St. Margarets Road properties, 4 less adjoining the rear of Goldring Close properties and numerically the same, but less terraced properties, adjoining the Hawthorne Grove properties compared to the illustrative appeal layout. Bellway have used the centre of the site and the western boundary with the School a little more intensively than previously illustrated to make these improvements for perimeter neighbours.
Technical – Archaeology	This is a conditional matter. A Written Scheme of Investigation has been approved by the County Archaeologist. An intrusive trench survey covering 5% of the site area was completed in April 2014. A written report confirming findings is to follow.
Technical – BMEP	This is work in progress – the condition is to be discharged separately.
Technical – Flooding / Drainage	Slab levels and adjoining ground will be raised, as per the strategy agreed at the OL stage, to a minimum agreed level (see the submitted levels drawings) to provide long term climate change protection from

	localised flooding. Surface water will be stored in permeable material under the proposed site roads and swales and then discharged to the local ditch system. Separate technical approval is currently being sought for the SUDs and foul drainage proposals before discharge of the planning conditions.
Technical – Noise Levels	A solid 1.8m boundary fence will be erected within but adjacent to the eastern boundary for the duration of the construction process to act as an acoustic barrier. Building operatives will be advised of the need to use insulated equipment.
Technical – Water Pressure	Tests undertaken for Bellway by Southern Water confirm 1.7 Bar average water pressure over the sampling period of 5 working days in April '14. This exceeds the 0.7 Bar minimum statutory requirement.
Detail – Boundary Treatments	This is clarified on a separate submission drawing. The boundaries of the site with Hawthorne Grove and St. Margarets Road will be redefined with new 1.8m high close boarded fencing. The southern edge of the site is defined by a hedge which will be retained and reinforced. The eastern boundary hedge will be reinforced on its western side to provide long term substantial screening viewed from the public footpath. Plots 127-131 in the SE corner of the site would have wire mesh rear fencing to ensure a soft landscaped edge treatment.
Detail – Housing Form	Two storey dwellings were envisaged at the OL stage and are provided now. The

	proposed dwellings would be domestic in scale and suited to the range of dwelling types, scales and forms found in the vicinity and on the Island in general.
Detail – Land in Adverse Possession	This is a civil matter between adjoining landowners not a planning matter per se. Clarification of boundary treatments is provided above.
Detail – Landscaping Treatment	The Design and Access Statement confirms the landscape strategy. A fully detailed set of landscape drawings and management proposals are submitted. These show use of native tree and shrub species, reinforcement of the existing hedge rows (particularly the eastern boundary) and layers of planting within the site to affirm the suburban nature of this housing development.
Detail – Privacy and Amenity	Two storey dwellings were envisaged at the OL stage. The detailed siting and design complies with spacing guidelines set out in the Council's Borough Design Guide SPD 2011. Further detailed comments are provided in the Design and Access Statement.
Detail – Overhead Wires	An existing overhead power supply along the northern edge of the site will be replaced below ground improving the visual amenity of that edge of the site for existing as well as new residents.
Work with Local Residents	Evidence is provided to-date through Bellway's engagement with the community, meetings with the MFRG and improvements to the detail of the scheme. Bi-monthly MFRG meetings are to continue again, after the RM decision, during the construction phase.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 The details of this Reserved Matters submission have evolved with constructive input from local residents and stakeholders. It is to be hoped that the Local Planning Authority will recognise the improvements that have been made to the submissions, to complement changes through the formal preapplication process, and that these Reserved Matters submissions can be approved.
- 6.2 Bellway Homes will continue to work constructively with local residents through subsequent phases of the development.

Appendix A

MEETING NOTES AND ACTION POINTS

Date 4th March 2014 Time Start: 10:00 Time Finish 12:15

Present Mengham Fields Resident Group (MFRG)

Stephen Southgate (SS) – Beech Grove; Neil Munro (NM) – Goldring Close and My Lords Lane; Liz Tester (LT) and Gary Tester (GT) – Beech Grove; Nick Jones (NJ) – St. Margarets ; Rod Elliot (RE) – Hawthorne Grove; John Broomhead (JB) – Goldring Close and My Lords Lane

Bellway Homes Wessex (BHW)

Rob Westhead (RW) – Land Manager; Peter Whiting (PW) – Technical Manager; David Nash (DN) – Planning Manager

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION POINTS	ACTION
	Mengham Fields Development	Meeting between Bellway Homes Wessex and the Mengham Fields Residents Group.	
	Objective of meeting	Residents: To initiate a working relationship with the new owners of Mengham Fields. Bellway Homes: To initiate a working relationship with local people to convert the outline planning permission into 131 Homes.	
1	Reasons for early meeting with Bellway	Stephen Southgate outlined the reasons for an early meeting with Bellway Homes – Residents had been vehemently opposed to the development but recognised, following the appeal decision, that they would need to work with the developer to ensure the detailed approach is appropriate for the locality. DN responded that BHW would also wish to work constructively with local people within the development parameters established by the outline planning permission (OL PP), commercial reality and local authority detailed planning requirements. RW confirmed that BHW had exchanged contracts with the current landowners with completion anticipated by the end of March 2014.	
2	Flooding	Using photographic illustrations, Stephen explained in detail the history of the fields and what causes the surface flooding. (<i>London clay substructure</i>) He also explained about the owner of Tournebury Farm who to this day maintains a flood barrier to protect land from the sea and maintains the drainage between the site and My Lords Pond. BHW were not aware of the farmer's flood barrier and made notes to contact the farmer (<i>Philips</i>) concerned about that and the drainage regime.. Bellway explained that their consultant engineers were looking at drainage and flooding issues to ensure compliance with the conditions of the OL PP and necessary drainage consents.	Bellway
3	Number of properties	1. Neil suggested that instead of building 129 houses Bellway would have the full support of the Residents if they built 4 or 5 high end market value homes in a 'gated community'. The response from Bellway was to say that in an area as large as Mengham Fields, this would simply not be financially viable. 2. It was made clear that in developments of more than 5 dwellings it is mandatory to have a mix of homes including 'affordable' homes. This mix of homes is mandatory and could not be altered. 3. However, there will probably be some larger 5 bedroom homes in the mix.	

4	Current Plans	1. The original owner's proposed layout plans from the 'outline planning' stage were only indicative. Bellway have their own architectural draftsmen working on a detailed layout and house designs following an initial meeting with Havant BC planning (Steve Weaver and Heather Lealan 24.02.14). 2. MFRG expressed their desire for BHW to consider the development of larger homes that will be more in keeping with the surrounding dwellings. 1. BHW agreed to hold a public exhibition by the end of the month exact date dependent upon venue availability. 2. It was suggested the exhibition be held either in the URC hall or in the Community centre. In addition to informing HBC and Hayling Forum asking them to advertise details, they will send details to us "The Mengham Fields Resident Group" and we will circulate via the database and post notices in prominent shop windows. 3. We will also circulate details to H.I.R.A & The Community Board. [Post meeting up-date – BHW have booked the URC Hall for 20.03.14 15:00-19:30 hrs – invite and terms of reference for the event to follow w/b 10.03.14]	Bellway
5	Public exhibition		Bellway
6	Time scale	1. Having purchased the land, BHW stated they need to realise their investment and start the development as early as possible hence the target is to submit the Reserved Matters (RM) for approval by the end of April. Bellway anticipate starting the development in "late summer" subject to RM approval from HBC. 2. Once building commences, the normal rate of progress in other developments, is c.50 houses per annum (1 per week). 3. MFRG pointed out the fact that this site is unique in as much as it only had a singular point of access on and off the site. Bellway felt this did not present a major problem. 4. MFRG requested that once BHW owned the site, they would secure/close the unofficial entrance by way of the un-adopted road at the end of Beech Grove. Refer to item 13 Archaeology. Bellway said that they would engage with local residents prior to the RM submission and then set up bi-monthly monthly meetings with the resident's at the construction stage to keep everyone up to date with developments and listen to any concerns arising.	Bellway
7	Bi-Monthly meetings/updates		Bellway
8	Inspectors report	1. Liz pointed out that the inspectors report is full of contradictions. In particular, the issue over screening and protecting the privacy of current residents was discussed. It was suggested that Bellway look very closely at the report and pay particular attention to the conditions imposed before building should commence. 2. It was pointed out that the current hedgerow height will potentially be below the sight line of new dwellings which is a contravention to conditions. 3. In addition to the height issue, there is insufficient density which as part of the conditions is required to be improved. However, the mainline sewer and rising main prohibit planting within 3 metres thereby creating another contradiction within the conditions. 4. DN explained that planning decisions were often a matter of weighing up or balancing sometimes contradictory matters and that the conditions of the appeal decision were the starting point with the commentary within the appeal decision providing guidance for the weight to be applied when decisions were made. 5. Bellway said they would not be stopping up the current old footpath surrounding the site. Instead they are committed to providing one within the site boundary. However, lighting the footpath within the conditions would create another contradiction.	Bellway
9	T.P.O's	1. Bellway are aware that the T.P.O. document covering Mengham Fields has not been updated since 2008. This needs checking before any tree cutting or felling takes place in conjunction with the document provided. 2. A copy of a document prepared for MFRG detailing all trees surrounding the site was given to Bellway. 3. BHW to forward to their Arboricultural Consultant for information.	Bellway

10	Wildlife	1. Stephen presented the issues over waders and wild life concerns. It was suggested that Bellway urgently open up a dialogue with Chichester Conservancy and land owner Mr Phillips. 2. In addition, Stephen asked that an 'adequate barrier' between the development and the fields below it be initiated, to stop rubbish ending up in the area used by the waders and birds etc. during and after completion of the development. 3. BHW ecological and landscape consultants to be briefed and contact with Chichester Conservancy to be made.	Bellway
11	Highways	1. Bellway are aware of the un-adopted road at the end of Beech Grove including the small triangular piece of land next to No1 Hawthorne. 2. Residents advised that Highways had not even visited the site and it had been simply a "desk top" exercise. 3. It was suggested BHW contact Highways regarding the entrance and traffic calming implementation through Beech Grove. 4. DN explained that the approved access was a non-standard design which relied on sub 20 mph vehicle speeds and traffic calming. BHW would look at the access design and present an alternative for public comment at the exhibition. 5. Residents considered there was a need for off-site highway improvements and traffic calming. DN commented that the S106 Agreement included a c. £460,000 contribution to off-site transport network improvements as required by Hampshire County Council (HCC). Residents queried where this would be spent and on what measures. DN advised that HCC would determine the projects but that there should be a clear link between the impacts of the proposed development and the highway mitigation works. BHW to request clarification from HCC. 6. Residents would like to see the highway contribution prioritised to meet local needs – a matter for Havant BC and HCC to consider. 7. Nick Jones highlighted the un-adopted entrance to St Margarets Road.	Bellway Havant BC / Hants CC
12	Contact	1. At this early stage, the main channel of communication should be between Rob Westhead and John Broomhead. 2. BHW took note of Gary Tester's details so that he can be contacted over issue concerning the entrance from Beech Grove. 3. Nick Jones will be the contact for St Margarets residents..	All
13	Archaeology	1. MFRG concerned about rutting occurring due to the tractors and plant machinery used to remove the stable blocks. At this time there is little or no policing of this issue. 2. MFRG feel this is in contradiction of the original advice issued by Dr. Hannah Fluck and will advise Dr Fluck of this situation and contact the planning enforcement officer. [BHW post meeting note – the site is still within the landowners control not BHW and activity to provide vacant possession has been taking place exacerbated by recent weather conditions. BHW have instructed CgMs Archaeological consultants to agree a Written Scheme of Investigation with Dr Fluck of the County Archaeological Dept. and will carry out the on-site investigations at the earliest opportunity]	MFRG BHW

MEETING NOTES AND ACTION POINTS

Date 2nd April 2014 Time Start: 13:00 Time Finish 16:00

Present

Mengham Fields Resident Group (MFRG)

Stephen Southgate (SS) - Beech Grove; Mrs Southgate (MS) - Beech Grove; Neil Munro (NM) - Goldring Close; Liz Tester (LT) and Gary Tester (GT) - Beech Grove; Nick Jones (NJ) - St. Margarets; Rod Elliot (RE) - Hawthorne Grove and John Broomhead (JB) - Goldring Close; John Perry (JP) – St Catherine's Road

Bellway Homes Wessex (BHW)

Rob Westhead (RW) – Land Manager; Peter Whiting (PW) – Technical Manager; David Nash (DN) – Planning Manager

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION POINTS	ACTION
Mengham Fields Development		2 nd Meeting between Bellway Homes Wessex and the Mengham Fields Residents Group.	
Objectives of meeting		Continuing Dialogue Prior to RM Submission	
1	Minutes of Last Meeting	DN summarised the main items from the minutes of the 1st MFRG/Bellway meeting 04.03.14 and they were agreed as a true record of the meeting. Key points acted on since the last meeting included: • Approved tree felling undertaken to rear of 1 Hawthorne Grove • Timber provided to residents as requested • Community engagement event held 20.03.14 • Drain under footpath to east side of the southern field cleared to help alleviate localised flooding • Meeting with owner of 3 Hawthorne Grove undertaken to discuss Party Wall matters etc. • Resident's wish to influence the S106 Transportation spending priorities conveyed to Havant BC • CgMs appointed as archaeologists have agreed a Written Scheme of Investigation with the County Archaeologist	

2	Update regarding meetings with Havant BC and Chichester Harbour	Bellway reported that they had met with Havant BC and the Chichester Harbour Conservancy that morning to discuss the best way forward to achieve the desired visual and landscape strategy to protect the AONB. The extension of the long term climate change flood protection bund (an option in the FRA along with raised ground/slab levels) was discussed as a method of reinforcing the landscaped edge at the east side of the site. The bund was not preferred by the Council's landscape officer. A second line of native planting was recommended. It was agreed to only raise the level of the lower slab levels, plant whips the west side of the existing hedge and use recessive chain link to fence off the gardens of Plots 127-131. Bellway Landscape Architect to liaise with the Havant Officer to agree the specification and scope of landscape enhancement works.	Bellway
3	Summary of Responses from Community Event	Bellway reported that they were still receiving some written responses to the event held on the 20th March and would include these in the written response to the Borough Council. A schedule of the responses received so far was circulated and discussed. The main points raised were as follows: • General agreement from most attending that the event was informative • Some residents still opposing the development in principle (impact on the Island's infrastructure) or would want the quantum of dwellings reduced • Several residents consider Bellway's proposals are reasonable or better than expected • Hawthorne Grove residents are encouraging a second vehicular access from St. Margaret's Road • St. Margaret's Road residents are against an additional vehicular access and concerned about the lack of footways and condition of the private section of that road • Concern from Hawthorne Grove residents about the density of houses and concentration of AH units on the north boundary • The importance of the east boundary hedge retention and request for a bund to reinforce it • Mengham School had no objections to the development but would welcome a further access gate at the SE corner of their site for children of the new development to use, would like the proximity of the school identified on the marketing details and would hope some construction / health and safety presentations could be made to the school. • Concern about how S106 monies being spent (transport priorities) • Concern about drainage and flood risk and details such as boundary treatments	Bellway
4	MFRG Feedback from Community event	LT asked if her e-mailed response was included within the response summary. DN confirmed that he had the response but it was not yet on the summary. Post Meeting Note: Two more response sheets have been received so DN will circulate a final summary in due course.	Bellway

1. Transportation: Bellway stated that Havant BC were due to have a meeting with HCC about the S106 contributions/works. A long discussion involving all attendees took place regarding the appropriateness of the works proposed by HCC as part of the S106 and a plan was tabled (attached) with the MFRG request for the works and it was agreed that PW would forward this onto Havant BC the next day for inclusion in there discussion with HCC.

[Post Meeting Note:

Hants CC e-mail from Holly Drury 10.04.14 indicates some potential for S106 projects to be reviewed. Tri-partite meeting to be arranged.}

2. Drainage: The existing ditch system will be cleared of blockages by hand to allow better water flow Both the surface water and foul water systems are in the early stages of design. The SW design will capture run-off from the new development and direct it towards My Lords Pond.

3. Landscape/Ecology: Bellway agreed to commence discussions with Portsmouth Diocese regarding the benefit to the development of their open space.

4. Layout and Design: It was stated that various materials had been left with Havant BC that morning and that they were basically all natural colours that would not be obtrusive to the eye and would help the development recede from view seen from My Lord's pond rather than stand out.

A request was made for consideration that the cycleway link from the North of the site to the Southern boundary could be contained within the development and then linked back to footpath 88/102 in the SE corner of the site - to minimise disturbance to the wildlife beyond.

[Post Meeting Note:

Bellway have briefed their architect to review the position of the link between the site and the public footpath route].

5. Access - DN noted concern expressed by residents about the use of the Hawthorne Grove field gate for site access. Bellway propose to make a separate planning application to demolish No. 1 Hawthorne Grove and construct sufficient estate road to enable safe access to the development land and early closure and reinstatement of the existing gate.

LT noted that refuse lorry access needed to be checked. Swept-path analysis will be carried out on the site access road/junction as part of the audit of the works prior to submission of the access details.

6. Archaeology: A discussion was held regarding the specification of the proposed works and it was agreed that PW would forward to CgMs the questions as to why they were not carrying out ground penetration surveys and if they were prepared to carry out an increased amount of excavation works to the Southern boundary. It was stated that CgMs would be starting the on-site phase of the investigation on Monday 28th April.

[Post meeting Notes: this has subsequently been revised to the 22nd April. Also it has been agreed that there will be an opportunity on Monday 28th April for the Project leader to meet and discuss the work to date with interested members of the public. Time and venue to be decided later].

It was stated that members of the public would not be able to enter onto the development area due to H & S reasons and insurances.

6	HGV's Over Hayling Bridge	Bellway will look into and incorporate within the deliveries any weight/time restrictions for crossing onto the island. It was agreed that Bellway would request deliveries only between the hours of 09:00 and 14:30 to respond to concerns of public/school children safety	Bellway
7	Project Programme and Next Stages	It is anticipated that the RM application will be submitted to Havant BC at the end of April The next meeting will be just prior to our Planning application being made – date to be confirmed	All
8	AOB	No. 23 St.Margarets Road to be let short-term by Bellway. Bellway have no intention of purchasing additional St. Margaret's Road properties. Wheel wash to be provided during construction phase – details to be submitted with the RMs in a Construction Management Plan and Construction Method Statement (Inspector's condition 10) There are 3 separate TPOs relating to the site and Bellway have a copy of these.	

NB. Last three items re-numbered post approval of the notes.

DRAFT MEETING NOTES AND ACTION POINTS

Date 24th April 2014 Time Start: 15:15 Time Finish 17:00

Present Mengham Fields Resident Group (MFRG)

Stephen Southgate (SS) - Beech Grove; Mrs Southgate (MS) - Beech Grove; Liz Tester (LT) and Gary Tester (GT) - Beech Grove; Nick Jones (NJ) - St. Margarets; Rod Elliot (RE) - Hawthorne Grove and John Broomhead (JB) - Goldring Close

Bellway Homes Wessex (BHW)

Peter Whiting (PW) – Technical Manager; David Nash (DN) – Planning Manager

Apologies:

John Broomhead and Rod Elliot

No longer attending:

Neil Munro (NM)
John Perry (JP)

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION POINTS	ACTION
Mengham Fields Development		Meeting between Bellway Homes Wessex and the Mengham Fields Residents Group. 3 rd Meeting between Bellway Homes Wessex and the Mengham Fields Residents Group.	
Objective of meeting		Continuing Dialogue Prior to RM Submission	

1	Minutes of Last Meeting	DN summarised the main items from the minutes of the 2nd MFRG/Bellway meeting 02.04.14 and they were agreed as a true record of the meeting. LT sought a correction of Section 3 Bullet 4 - second vehicular access via St. Margarets being requested by Tournerbury Lane residents, school children, police and fire brigade too. [Post Meeting Note: as a summary of the residents' consultation the reference to school children and emergency services is a reflection of local opinion not the outcome of the Bellway consultation exercise]. Clarification by PW Section 5 Item 2 Drainage - The remains of the northerly (E-W aligned) ditch RO Hawthorne Grove will go but the surface water will pass via land drains to rear of Plots 4-13 the stone storm water storage capacity to be created under the roads. AOB highlighted by MFRG 1. 75 dBA eastern edge 2. Existing slabs north field - request for salvage by Mr and Mrs Dawes of 15 Hawthorne Grove 3. Existing slabs south field - request for salvage by Mr and Mrs Southgate Key points acted on since the last meeting included: • Archaeological Investigation underway and preview of finds to be discussed with MFRG • Meeting with Hants CC to discuss S106 priorities arranged 11.06.14 • Request for cycle/pedestrian link from site to be moved to SE corner to provide an alternative N-S route to footpath 88/102 incorporated in to the layout • Community responses considered and incorporated into the submission detail (summary at section 5 below). 1.	
2	Update regarding meeting with Havant BC	A positive meeting took place that morning with Bellway presenting layout v6 to the Council (Heather Lealan and Steve Weaver). The conclusion was that Bellway could proceed to a formal RM submission in the next 1-2 weeks. Potentially a Planning Committee decision could be made in July-August 2014 (PW). 1.	Bellway

3	Summary of Responses from Community Event	Bellway reported that they had stopped receiving written responses to the event held on the 20th March but still needed to include LTs e-mail comments in the final summary. DN highlighted the 'top 3' issues (i.e. most frequently occurring) responses to the 5 questions asked on the Response sheet. The main points raised were as follows: • General agreement from most attending that the event was informative (Q1) • The overall impression (Q2) of the proposed development was mixed with 11 (44%) respondents to the v4 scheme negative and 8 (32%) considering it reasonable or good. The other most frequently occurring response to Question 2 was that there were transportation issues (use of Tournerbury Junction, S106 spending priorities, and the single vehicular access into the site) highlighted by 6 (24%) of 25 respondents • The main detailed improvements requested (Q3) were 'improve vehicular access and transportation' 8 references, 'distribute the affordable housing more evenly' and 'encourage pedestrian and cycle improvements jointly 5 references, and the third most common response was to 'provide less dense houses' 4 references. • The responses on matters that had been overlooked (Q4) were varied. In equal first place was 'the Tournerbury Road junction' and 'flooding/drainage' with 4 references each. 'Water Pressure' or a 'no' response was next equal, with 3 references each. • The other comments responses to Q5 were again topped by the need for 'transport network improvements' with 7 references, and then comments relating to 'proximity / amenity issues', 'clarification of boundary treatments' and 'the infrastructure will not cope' were next with 3 references apiece. The next most frequent response sought clarification of the 'archaeological details' with 2 references. All of the above to be included in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) to accompany the RM submissions.	Bellway
---	---	--	---------

4	Site Issues and MFRG Membership	Apologies from Bellway following the unexpected size of the digger used for the archaeological surveys, its near miss with the access Oak tree (thanks to GT for seeing it through) and unfortunate unanticipated removal of a small section of the hedge between the north and south fields. Bellway also confirmed that the BT works to create the new connection from the east side of the un-made section of Beech Grove to a chamber in the footway to the front of No.3 Hawthorne Grove was undertaken ahead of anticipated schedules. Bellway surprised by this too and had not been able to forewarn MFRG. The combination of the two events was coincidental and not the commencement of development but preparatory survey work and work within the powers of a Statutory Undertaker. The digger will be on site until w/e 01.05.14. Bellway to ensure that the sub-contractor provides metal plates to spread the load of the digger within the RPA zone of the existing entrance Oak tree plus full supervision to ensure it can exit without harm to the tree. Discussion took place about subsequent comments from Mr Munro (about the above matters and disparaging remarks about Bellway generally). Action by SS on behalf of MFRG has excluded Mr Munro from future attendance or involvement as he is not representative of the MFRG. He can make his own case to Havant BC in due course. Bellway thanked SS and LT for their resolution of this matter. Bellway / MFRG
---	--	---

Bellway layout drawing v6 was not to hand so PW and DN described the latest changes in comparison to the previous v4 layout [Note v5 was an intermediate drawing for internal discussions between Bellway and their architects. After minor adjustments it resulted in v6 for public consumption] – v6 to be circulated by e-mail and PW to take hard copies to MFRG archaeological briefing Monday 28.04.14.

Working from the entrance along the E, S, W and N edges the following was discussed:

New Access – DN confirmed a full planning application for the new access and demolition of No. 1 Hawthorne Grove is to be submitted (to run in tandem with the main RM submissions). [Note: The detail will supersede conditions 10 and 19 and other pre-commencement matters of the appeal decision but only specifically for the land at No. 1 Hawthorne Grove and extending part into the north field].

All recognised the benefits of a simplified main access with existing traffic prioritised over the new and the benefits of early installation of the access to take away the pressure on the un-made section of Beech Grove, the entrance Oak and to enable wheel washing facilities to be installed as soon as possible.

Existing access – PW confirmed new tree and shrub planting to take place (part of the landscape brief which can follow as the layout is now in its submission form) once it is stopped up.

East Boundary – HBC support reinforcement planting of native hedgerow species and trees rather than a bund. The main gap in the existing hedge where there are dead trees etc. (where the boundary switches E-W at the public footpath intersection) will form part of the landscape architect's brief for the RM submission. The relocation of the new footpath link from the site to the SE corner of the site was welcomed by SS as it would provide a N-S alternative route through the site and reduce reliance on the public footpath east of the boundary. The existing E-W public right of way would still connect through.

South Boundary – adjustments made to comply with garden length and spatial guidelines. Landscape scheme to include new boundary tree planting.

West boundary with St. Margarets Road – adjustments have been made to comply with the LPAs spacing guidelines and back to back distances but Bellway are proposing houses not bungalows.

Access link to St. Margarets Road – for emergency, pedestrian and cycle use only as approved.

West boundary with school – opportunity for new school gate to be explored to reduce car use and help the school to link with this new part of its catchment area.

North boundary with Hawthorne Grove – concentration of affordable and terraced dwellings reduced. Landscape scheme to include new boundary tree planting.

6	Project Programme and Next Stages	The RM application will be submitted to Havant BC at the end of April beginning of May. No subsequent meeting dates set or discussed. [Post meeting note: no meetings while the RM submissions being considered by the Borough Council but to recommence at the construction phase]	All
7	AOB	None	Bellway

Appendix B

Date: 11 March 2014

Ref: DN/clw/Mengham/Community Engagement

To See Attached List
(by E-mail or hand delivered):

Bellway Homes Limited
Wessex
Bellway House
Embankment Way
Castleman Business Centre
Ringwood
Hampshire
BH24 1EU

Telephone 01425 477 666
Fax 01425 476 774
DX 45710 Ringwood
www.bellway.co.uk

Dear Neighbour/Stakeholder

Re: Detailed Housing Proposals for 131 New Homes on Land with Outline Planning Permission Land North of Goldring Close and South of Beech Grove, Mengham, Hayling Island - Invitation to Bellway Homes Ltd (Wessex) Community Consultation Event

3:00 pm – 7:30 pm Thursday 20th March 2014 at the Main Hall, South Hayling United Reformed Church, Hollow Lane, Hayling Island, Hampshire PO11 9EY.

Bellway Homes are a Plc national housebuilder with a local division based in Ringwood. Bellway Homes Wessex has undertaken a number of local developments in recent years in or adjoining the main cities, towns and villages in Dorset, Hampshire and West Sussex. The division builds 400-500 homes a year and we are actively building new homes for people on a number of sites near you.

We take community relations seriously and are keen to bring forward the most appropriate development for the sites that we have purchased whether that is starting from scratch or working up the detail after the principle of development has been approved, as in this case.

This event provides an opportunity for you to inform our proposal as it evolves. Views and responses will be recorded and summarised in a 'Statement of Community Involvement' to be included with our detailed submissions to the Borough Council. This is not a statutory requirement but we consider it best practice.

Our representatives will explain to you what the timetable and process will be from hereon because that is unique to each project. By doing this we hope to:-

- Inform you of our intention to submit Reserved Matters very soon
- Understand potential problems that may arise from developing the site and consider how these could be resolved

Continuation

- Discover opportunities to improve our scheme
- Secure support for our proposals and resolve potential objections before they arise
- Design quality buildings that are in keeping with the character of the area

We would ask you to note that this site has Outline Planning Permission, allowed on Appeal, for the principle of 131 dwellings with access via Hawthorne Grove/Beech Grove, approved in detail (permission APP/X1735/A/13/2192777 dated 13th July 2013). That decision was made before our involvement. Bellway Homes wish to turn that paper decision into new homes, with associated open space and parking in a way that will fit with the character and amenity of Mengham. The discussion will be about the detailed layout, appearance, landscaping and scale of the development.

We look forward to meeting you and hearing your views.

Kind regards.

Yours faithfully



Planning Manager
For and on behalf of
Bellway Homes Ltd (Wessex)



Technical Manager
For and on behalf of
Bellway Homes Ltd (Wessex)

Continuation

Ward Cllrs: Mr D Collins, Mr J Smith, Mrs L. Turner, Mr A Lenaghan, Mr V. Pierce-Jones and Mr M Wilson

The Mengham Fields Residents' Group

Ms W Bolton (Head) and Ms Sue Lewis (Chair of Governors) – Mengham Junior School

Beech Grove – 1-27 (odd) and 2-24 (even)

Goldring Close – 23-27 (odd) and 1-16 (consecutive) Mengham Court

Hawthorne Grove – 1,3,3A,5, 5A,7,9A,9,11-17 (odd) and 2-10 (even)

Mengham Lane – Hope Not House

My Lords Lane – 12-16 (odd)

Poplar Grove – 17 and 18

St. Margarets Road – 18-28 (consecutive)

Mr Phillips – Tournerbury Farm, Tournerbury Lane

Mr S. Weaver (Senior Planning Officer, Havant Borough Council)

Ms H Lealan (Senior Planning Officer, Havant Borough Council)

Appendix C

LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, MENGHAM, HAYLING ISLAND

RESERVED MATTERS DISCUSSION – ATTENDANCE LIST

Please complete your details below so we have a record of who attended this event and who to contact in the future. Thank you.

Date: 20.03.14 15:00-19:30.

Venue: South Hayling URC Hall, Hollow Lane, Hayling Island.

Name	Address	Email
LIZ TESTER	19 BEECH CROVE HI PO11 9BP	
GARY TESTER	— — —	
Steve Sargate	6 Beech Grove	
Jan Sargate	6 Beech Grove	
mim Nema	38 ST MARGARETS	
John Brownell	14 Goldring Close PO11 9PN	
HEIL MURDO	11 GOLDRING CL.	MURDOV@AOL.CO.UK

Name	Address	Email
J. MARTIN.	27 CHURCH CLOSE PO11 9PN.	N/A
N BARNBROOK S BARNBROOK	16 MY LORDS LANE PO11 9PW.	— —
W. Crane P. Crane	10. My Lords Lane PO11 9PW	Wendy-crane@tiscali.co.uk.
June Cole Angela Kerry	26, St Margaret Rd. PO11 9BP	
Cherry Elliott	9, HAWTHORNE HI GROVE PO11 9DW.	
Rod Elliott.	9 Hawthorne Grove H.I. PO11 9DW	cherry and rod@hotmail.com
Anne and Brian Vinson	32 Mengham Lane PO11 9NW	please send layout. vinsonsevirginmedia.com
Joan Gullings	3A Hawthorne Grove	—
Heather Leelan	Maent Borough Council	
Brian Rowe	9 Tournesbury Lane.	—

Name	Address	Email
Mrs & Mrs P.D.M GREGOR	25 BEECH GROVE HAYLING	front 2747@btinternet.com
MR. H. KEEN	23 Beech Grove	
Jo P Middell	27 Birwood Grove	
Dorothy Powee	11 Beech Grove	
M.R.G Power	11 Beech Grove.	
MRS M. REEVE	18 Heath CLOSE	
MRS P Rose	8 Sandy Point Rd	
Mrs C.A. Evans	63 Hollow Lane POHLEY	cardle.evans@ countrywide.co.uk
MRS A LAYTON	27. BEECH GROVE POHLEY	
MR J GREENLAND & MRS B GREENLAND	24 MANOR WAY.	

Name	Address	Email
M Lovell	14 ST MARGARETS RD PO11 9BF	
Leah Jones	Council HBC.	
TOM DEANS MINNIE DEANS	22 BEECH GROVE	
W. Bolton Head teacher	Mengham Junior School	Please discuss the access to the school! → send proposal for community from children
Jan Randall Headteacher	Mengham Junior School	Mengham inf to Jun Very keen to work with developes to provide easy access to families
John Perry	Redoak 42b St Catherine's RD HI PO11 0HF	johnperry@ redoak.co.uk
ANDREAS NESS	12 MY CROFTS LANE	
Peter Poulton	8 MY LINDS LANE	
Alan Hurren	6 MY LINDS LANE	
HOJ DAVIS	1 Hawthorn GROVE	

Name	Address	Email
TERRY WORRALL Chair Hi Community NW	13 BEECH GR	terryworral@gmail.com
Mandy Worrall	13 Beech Grove	Mandy.worrall1@ntlworld.com.
BARRY COURT PILTON POSCOTT.	22 ST MARYS CLOSE " "	-
Mauraen & Frank Sharrington	13 Hawthorn Grove	
Sharon Altendorff	7, Beech Grove	
Tony & Lynn Georse	7, Hawthorne Grove	tony pg @ live.co.uk
ANDREW ALTENDORFF (POSTMASTER)	7 BEECH GROVE POLL 9 DP	
Russell + Susan Woolnough	1 My Lords Lane Poll 9PW	
Mike + Barbara Bale	24 North Shore Rd.	
MICHAEL WILSON	77 ST. MARYS ROAD HATLING ISLAND POLL 9DD	MichaelweWilson- wakefield.G.WW

LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, MENGHAM, HAYLING ISLAND

RESERVED MATTERS DISCUSSION - FEEDBACK FORM

We would appreciate your feedback on what you have seen and discussed this afternoon / evening. Please complete this form and ideally return it to us now, while your thoughts are fresh, or by post by the **27th March 2014**. Only with your comments will we understand what you like about the scheme or whether we need to address particular concerns. This will enable us to consider what can be done to improve the detailed proposals before they are submitted formally to the Borough Council. (Please use the reverse of this page if we have not left enough space for your comments).

Date:

Name and Address:

Q1. Was the event informative and do you now understand what is being proposed?

Q2. What is your overall impression of our proposal?

Q3. Remembering that the principle of development has been approved, are there any detailed improvements we could make to the scheme?

Q4. Are there any matters that you feel we have overlooked or are not aware of (again considering that the principle of development has been permitted)?

Q5. What other comments do you have?

Thank you

David Nash and Peter Whiting

For and on behalf of Bellway Homes Ltd (Wessex)

Appendix D

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

Respondent	Q1. Informative?	Q2. Overall Impression	Q3. Suggested Detailed Improvements	Q4. Matters Overlooked	Q5. Other Comments
Mrs J. Southgate 6 Beech Grove	Yes understand but not impressed as it does not offer enough to the immediate area (no east side path and cycleway up-grades).	This is a badly presented plan. The access could be addressed to alleviate vehicles using Beech Grove by providing a second access via St. Margaret's Grove. No calming measures in Beech Grove.	Improve Tournerbury Junction to allow school children safer crossing and to allow cars to access Elm Grove. Up-grade cycle paths/tracks on the east side of Hayling from all the schools.	Tournerbury Road Junction. Second access via St. Margarets. Traffic calming in Beech Grove. Problem people likely to occupy one bed houses nearest the school playing field.	How could a Reserve Housing Site be included in the LP / LDF without an access?
G McCormack 18 Beech Grove	Yes	Ok	More 'even' spread of affordable shared housing.	Water supply capacity? Sewerage Supply Capacity? Gas Supply capacity? Potential flooding? Any plans to control heavy morning and afternoon traffic flows?	
Mr G. Tester 19 Beech Grove A response form and separate e-mail 21.03.14	Yes, thank you.	With suggested amendments discussed and on this form overall largely satisfactory. Please send copy of proposed plan to MFRG as	Extend the proposed bund northwards with planting on top to screen the development from the AONB. There is a concentration of	Advise on plans to protect existing residents from flooding. We have limited water pressure and cannot use power showers has a	Can development be limited to M-F 9-5pm please? Can covenants be included to ensure all of the Inspector's

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

(combined).		promised. Cladding in natural wood preferable. Clarify how privacy of existing properties to be protected. Further comments on the design and layout only possible once datum heights disclosed.	AH dwellings (plots 4-7 and 9-11 concentrated behind Hawthorne Grove and none backing on to St. Margaret's or Goldring Close. Consider swapping with some of the owner-occupier properties (to achieve a better balance 2 backing onto to St. Margaret's, 3 Hawthorne Close and 2 Goldring Close). Some of the roof pitches seem steep review please to be less visible.	plan been devised to improve this for all residents? Detail of how the Oak tree will be protected. Reassurance needed that all the workforce will be parked in the site and not on adjoining roads.	conditions are met? When will the Biodiversity Mitigation be available? How will the 75 dB(a) be measured? The existing hedging alongside No.1 Hawthorne Grove should be retained – currently full of birds. Ensure screening at all times (provision 6). Advise residents of Tournerbury Lane as they will be affected by the extra traffic. Are traffic calming measures for Beech Grove still planned? How can we ensure
-------------	--	--	--	--	---

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
 RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

					the existing wildlife is protected in line with the requirements of the Inspector? When will the archaeological report be available please? Consider s106 expenditure to benefit residents in the immediate vicinity and not for tourist areas or the north of the Island. Making another entrance/exit via St.Margarets would have ecological benefits as well as taking pressure off the Tournbury junction. Has the use of the Legion Field been secured by the Council because if not
--	--	--	--	--	--

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

Mrs M. and Mr T. Deans 22 Beech Grove	Yes.	Too many houses and not enough parking.	Did not like the AH units concentrated behind Hawthorne Grove – it should be shared more evenly through the site.	Will the poor water pressure be improved? Will our property be protected against flooding? Please ensure construction limited to 9am-5pm Mon to Fri.	more green space will be needed in the development. This is an area of archaeological interest – has the site survey been completed?
Mitchell 27 Burwood Grove	Yes.	Over-intensive use of the site. The houses backing onto Hawthorne Close bear little relation to the spacing of the established houses.	Consider the density and closeness of the units where they meet with existing properties.	Every consideration should be given to the owners of the house in Hawthorne Grove who are to lose their tranquil retirement. They should have the best wall available built and Bellway should bear the cost of structural surveys before, during and after.	The impact on the junction at the top of Tournerbury Lane must receive attention. The extra vehicles will make it much busier. HCC should spend the money paid by Bellway their not elsewhere on the Hl.
Mrs M. Heather 107 Elm Grove	I always understood.	Attractive, though I would never want to live in an enclosed estate with only one way out.	Traffic lights: effect of traffic turning out of Tournerbury Lane into Church Road/Elm Grove and what amount of traffic build up this will create (it is already busy -	No.	Understand pp has been grant but find it hard to believe infrastructure will cope (schools, health centre full to

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

				often nose to tail at 10mph on Elm Grove).		capacity, sewerage). Real concern about traffic (hospital journey that should take 30 minutes took 2hrs due to traffic. Another 130 cars will add to the problem considerably.
Mr C. and Mrs F. Plavenieks 106 Fathoms Reach (moving to Tournerbury Lane)	Parents who attended on our behalf found it informative.	Too many houses are proposed and the proportion of 3-4 beds is too high.	Reduce the number of houses substantially. Build more 2 bed houses. Restrict access to the site in rush hour. Use the £450,000 Bellway are paying (transportation improvements) in the direct vicinity of the site (i.e. the Tournerbury Lane junction).			Repeats the transportation spending priority should be the Tournerbury Lane junction and Hayling Island not Havant.
Mr P. Lintoot 23 Goldring Close	Badly organised - too many people were trying to speak with advisers at the same time.	Only interested in what directly affects my property. The proposals should never have got to this stage.	Build bungalows to stop people objecting to loss of privacy. Bungalows are in great demand in Hayling.	We regrettably have to accept the decision to build despite firm local opposition. (Backhanders still very much a part of decision making).	[Summarised] Loss of view of fields. Proximity of a proposed large 4 bed house and loss of light. Unless you change to a c/bungalow or bungalow or move	

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

						the proposed house further away I shall object to HBC for invasion of privacy and light when details submitted. On the credit side thank you for at least giving us the opportunity to air our views. Unusual. Please take note of them.
25 Goldring Close	No.			Yes less housing.	We have only one road in - how do we get off the Island?	
Mr and Mrs A. George 7 Hawthorne Grove	Yes.		It looks ok from what we have been shown on the current plans and elevations.	Re-arrangement of the shared ownership properties as discussed.	None that we could think of.	One main concern is the increase of traffic at the Elm Grove / Tournerbury Lane junction which is already difficult at busy times.
Mr and Mrs R. Elliott 9 Hawthorne Grove	Yes.		The overall design has been significantly amended from the first proposals. We believe the changes are detrimental.	The proposed layout suggest a 'block' of housing from No.'s 4-13 which creates a 'wall' without spacing and has significantly changed the initial	Grouping of houses have 'ghettoised' an area within the development. Accepting the need for affordable housing this	Bellway have developed a significantly changed proposal without consultation.

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

			proposals.	should be more dispersed across the proposed development.	The gardens to the rear of the northernmost properties have much reduced area and are significantly closer to the boundary line. There appear to be no screening proposed unlike the rest of the site which offer hedgerow and tree screening of significant height.
Mr and Mrs Sherrington 13 Hawthorne Grove	Yes.	Generally good but one or two issues.	Swap some of the shared ownership houses with the private ro Hawthorne Grove.	Wish to discuss formalising our claim to 6ft of land at the rear of our garden to match neighbours who have registered land under 'adverse possession'.	Note – drawing attention to overhead electric wires.
Mrs M. Reeve 18 Heath Close	Yes.	The development, although large, appears well laid out.	The existing path that skirts the east side of the development should be upgraded and made into a joint path / cycleway.	The Tournerbury Lane junction is always difficult if turning north, this development will impact considerably. Should a roundabout be considered?	Overall my main concern is infrastructure. Hayling is very busy and with only one road on and off the amount of additional cars must impact on

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

					this. Social housing should not back onto the school.
Ms C. Evans 63 Hollow Lane	Yes – shame no bungalows as we have a big retirement market.	Whilst we need more homes, particularly affordable housing, I am very concerned there is only one way in and out via the Tournerville Road junction (rush hour tail backs).	Access to the site.		
Barnbrook 16 My Lords Lane		Too many properties which Hayling Infrastructure cannot cope with.			As the houses at the end of My Lords Lane are the only two storeys with living rooms (i.e. bedrooms) overlooking the site could consideration be given to our outlook and the type of property built at our back. The flats of Mengham Court only have kitchens and bathrooms overlooking the site.

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

Mrs P. Rose 8 Sandy Point Road	Yes, but the fact infrastructure is not being improved is not good enough (doctors surgery and roads need improving).	Why are they using HI as and extension of Leigh Park and putting children at risk? I know we need housing but it needs in a small community to be thought through carefully and this is not happening here.	Improve cycle ways to the bridge. We have a lot of horse riders and cycle riders and they need to be kept safe.	Half million pounds for roads etc. is not enough there is a lot that needs to be done.	
Mr J.P. Perry Redoak 42b St.Catherines Road	Partially.	Totally unacceptable. Housing density to north double that surrounding. Property to right of entrance devalued - offer compensation. Reduce no. houses near entrance. All houses to be a minimum 10m from boundary.	Listen to and implement changes suggested by MFRG. Limit site working times and exclude weekends. Pay compensation to those most directly affected.	No consideration of MFRG suggestions.	Work with local residents to ensure the development is acceptable rather than taking actions and decisions purely to maximise profit.
T and D Samways 32 St. Leonards Avenue	Yes, we understood this is a building proposal and not yet approved.	Overall the building project is impressive - a good mix of different houses, off road parking, green spaces and maintained existing footpaths.	Feel strongly that foot access into St. Margarets remains a foot path only. More green space and a play area would have benefitted young families.	Traffic congestion at the junction of Tournerbury Lane / Elm Grove. Concern about the capacity of highways infrastructure and health centre capacity – we wait 2-3 weeks for an appointment already.	Added traffic on and off the island at peak times will cause extra congestion and queues. Main concern is the Tournerbury Lane junction – does the Council have plans to address this if a problem arises?

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

Mrs M. Lovelock 1A St. Margaret's Road	Yes		Duty of care to children as there is no paths in St. Margaret's Rd. Anybody wishing to visit Mengham shops would probably park in St. Margarets we therefore would hope to have yellow lines in the road.		
Mr B. Court and Mrs D. Prescott 22 St. Margaret's Road	Know what is being proposed but lacking some information on planning decisions and flood protection for existing housing.	Typical new build – fine in theory but overcrowded with no insight / info on overall infrastructure.	The enhancement of the road surface in St. Margaret's Road.		Our concerns are the security of our property and the increase of flooding. As our property has the boundary up to the emergency and pedestrian access we feel that a secure boundary be erected ideally in brick for security and privacy, which we value, accepting that the development will proceed.
J. Cheeseman 41 St. Margaret's Road	Yes.	Good. What do you aim to do with all the cars that will come into Turnerbury Lane when you reach the Coop.	As 2.	St. Margaret's Road needs making up with a better surface.	If all the people who own cars in this road put them outside the homes it will block off

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

		Surely lights or a roundabout are needed when all the homes are finished!		Fire engines and emergency vehicles with people inside will find it very uneven.	any emergency vehicles access.
Mrs Benton St. Margaret's Road	Yes but I do not understand a development with poor access roads.	Too cramped – only one small play area.	More footpath access.	The area is liable to flooding.	No consideration of wildlife.
Mrs Knowles Hope Not House 46 Mengham Lane	Yes.	A great pity – we all preferred it being a greenfield site and undeveloped.	Your development affects many Hayling Islanders beyond your curtilage boundaries including me: Foul sewerage proposals - through my land, and Surface Water Drainage down ditch to east and creek - through my land.	Compensation and access considerations need to be addressed urgently.	W. Atkins Ltd July 2012 report on foul sewerage (to Capita Symonds) is very inadequate and flawed and should not be relied on as the sole expert source of what to do until very much more technical information relating to flows, gradients, pumping stations is available. Their current suggestion to simply rip up the land between manholes 6201 and 8001 is very impractical and disruptive. There

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

Mr M. Wooding 33 Tournerbury Lane	Yes.	The Tournerbury Land / Church Road junction and the impact of construction traffic and extra cars has not been considered and will become a nightmare for residents.	Tournerbury Lane / Eastwood Close bottleneck. The Coop is very busy and the car park is insufficient resulting in parked cars along Tournerbury Lane. Construction traffic and extra cars will make this a nightmare.	could be much less destructive solutions available.
			Why not extend the gravel path behind the school to the main Havant Road for construction traffic use? After construction finishes the Tournerbury Lane / Church Road junction could become right turn only and the new road used for traffic who would normally have turned right. There is space by the Mill Rythe School and Holiday Camp that could be used as a car park for parents collecting children from school rather than parking on the main Havant Road.	

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

						This could be a far more practical solution versus a round about or traffic lights on the Tournerbury Lane/Church Road junction.
Un-marked	Not really this is not different to the previous owner's proposals.	Completely inappropriate for the area. Too many dwellings for this single entrance.	Absolutely. Comply with the conditions and submit plans with dwellings 'in keeping' with the surrounding properties (i.e. bungalows). Two storey houses and blocks of flats are most assuredly NOT in keeping.	The permission given at the hearing by the Inspector Asquith was flawed from the outset. He totally ignored the 'localism' act and dismissed out of hand the feeling of the locals. In addition, he further ignored the fact that there was already sufficient other sites to meet targets!	This is an ill-conceived and unnecessary development to go ahead on 'AN ISLAND'. The only road on and off has been described as an over long cul-de-sac. The only way to get the local populous 'on side' is to come back with 'your own' set of drawings and proposals for considerably fewer dwellings and all 'in keeping' with the area.	
Mengham Junior School	We were pleased to attend the public	We would like to work with Bellway at each stage of the building and have some thoughts:	Look forward to meeting with you			

BELLWAY HOMES LTD (WESSEX) COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES
RM PRE-SUBMISSION - LAND NORTH OF GOLDRING CLOSE, HAYLING ISLAND

	meeting.	Safety - perhaps the site team can come and talk to the school about what is happening at our back field and how children can keep safe while the work is underway. Access – Currently we have 2 gates but we would be willing to discuss a third gate in order that people living at the end of the estate have less distance to walk. Publicity – we would like to ensure Mengham School detail are available in your show homes and brochures and would be happy to work with you to do this. The project is an opportunity for the children to design tourist leaflets, covers for the building site.	again soon to discuss future plans.
--	----------	--	-------------------------------------

Event Date / Time: 20.03.2014 / 15:00-19:30

Location: South Hayling URC Hall, Hollow Lane, Hayling Island, PO11 9EY

Invitees: c.97

Attendees: 82 people counted (47 individuals logged on the attendance list including Cllrs Turner and Wilson, Members of the MFRG and Representatives of the Mengham Junior School) [85% of invitees]

Response Forms Received: 25 + 1 e-mail [30% of attendees]