

Dear sirs

I attach for completeness our particular concern as to the bike path.

You will note, that their ONE application has MANY items, one of which concerns “flooding on the WESTERN side of Langstone, as justification for ramps hump’s bumps etc” as per their application.

We object to this SECTION of their planning application, for the following reasons:

1. Flooding. We were told at the pandemic, “it was driven by the science”. This application is not.

The sea does not flood this side. The tidal flood is via Chichester harbour. Evidenced April 2024. No flooding in WEST beach at all. The force came from the EAST. Langstone west beach is in the lee. It accrues stones, they are not eroded FACT.

Please go and take photographs, of the substantial shore we have been given, and shingle Bank, etc, over 20 years. Please photograph the beach shore wooden stakes put in by Havant, 1.5 m long, on the shore. They are now covered right up, save 30 cm. FACT. Coastal partners have been shown this, they deliberately ignore it for their own “self justification” aims.

Please photograph the vegetation in the beach behind [REDACTED] Langstone road., and Bartholomew house, mill lane This is getting more and more. FACT. It is not eroding. The only erosion is at the point to the south, out at the far end. Indeed with the dredgers work off Spithead, they unsettle the solent stones, and these get washed up, on storms, particularly, at rear of [REDACTED] on the beach. 20 years ago it was a “building site rubble shore,” at the. Langstone harbour beach. Now with the storms we get lovely fine sand and gravel.. indeed the sand has come, and it is no longer muddy squelch to walk out on the sand. It is hard. It has changed. One only needs to inspect enormous shell mound created by the sea, at “the ferry”.

The Victorian railway men, knew what they were doing. At no stage has the sea ever got to the height, of the billy bridge railway line, nor for that matter, any of the lines. We watch them. The sea does not get to within 0.9 m of that datum. We have measured it. It is an entire smoke screen by coastal partners. Indeed last time coastal partners, were there, they DELIBERATELY destroyed this border of the beach so THAT it SHOULD flood in, and I had to ask them, go back with their digger and replace the mound where it was. Afterwards I then went and [REDACTED] on grass seed, so it is, as it is today. They leave a “dirty” site. (similar to their work ethic at the path recently completed at north hayling island It was a deceitful and subversive tactic, to break down the shore. I do not trust their motives...they clearly are NOT to enhance the environment. Quite the opposite.

It was at that time Coastal partners said “ oh we want it to flood it here like south moor, indeed we are going to cut it so it does (by the bus stop) “ so we can increase our target of 10% floodable land, for the wildlife “. So do they want to “ defend against the sea” as per the application, “ or destroy it, to achieve their goals. “ Please read that item again. It contradicts.

Never once have we seen coastal partners with a “ dumpy level”, a surveyors instrument to draw a map of the exact gravel heights. They do not want the evidence on their file. They do not want to know how high above datum, the natural environment is.

Accordingly, no hump, ramp, raised footpath or anything of this type is needed whatsoever, in the face of a 50 year high mini tsunami storm, which proved beyond any doubt, and the residents between 40 and 50 Langstone Road, came out and inspected the beach at that time, and there was no flooding THIS SIDE.

Coastal partners are not driven by the science, but are driven by justification of their salaries. Even if they are NOT professionally qualified, and they are not, there ARE residents who are Chartered Surveyors and Chartered Engineers, who have a lifetime of experience and fully understand what is going on, geographically, and politically.

I can state that ANY washed over wave water , which gets onto the rail track, (the old billy bridge line) either washes straight into the Chichester harbour creek, or trickles down to another hump, (installed by the residents), ensuring that it does drain into the creek. And that is from WAVES. (once every 3 years maximum) We have watched them. Not, at high tide levels.

At these times, the tide in Chichester harbour creek, [REDACTED] is always is 1.5 metres below the top, with the railway. The big log, at the northern end, justifies this highest tide mark,. This is proof, that since historic photos from 1920 and 1930, showed dinghies moored, and in Victorian times, the ladies would wash their washing in it, and local residents, 60 years ago, “ would swim in the creek “ . Today it is dry. Read the facts. Read the science. The waters are not as deep. Fact.

At no stage has any sea water, crossed the bike crossing over the creek near the bus stop, and the ship pub, and RUN DOWN , the current bike path. It does not achieve those heights. (this is the “ cut across” track through the mud) .

Coastal partners representations, on this side of Langstone, are a smoke screen to deceive, and imply that all the money Havant spent, 10 or 15 years ago, on putting down the hard shared footpath, was

a complete waste of government money. Really ! And none of their proposal is urgent, important, or necessary, compared with other life threatening issues, addressed below.

Indeed their repeated proposals, are not driven by the SCIENCE . Also, for those I have met, none are even professionally qualified to comment, and certainly do not understand the basics of A level, GCSE geography, on coastal erosion, and counter balancing deposits.

However, where there is a need, and only when this has been completed, should any money, or attention be given to this bike path section, which is simple aesthetics.

1. A deliberate erosion policy, has questioned “ the Kings Coastal Footpath”. At the northern point. The sea here, is unbearably close to the Langstone technology park office buildings. This is of primary importance. Indeed, all that matter, TOO , could have been prevented. But we now know, on Coastal partners verbal representation, that this was all allowed to “ achieve their destructive goals “. Even today, as evidenced by Havant Councils work, in pump lane, this flooding could be stopped, reversed, and returned to as it was, low lying marshland, by stacking the concrete mixture sand bags. Cost ? Less than £10,000. Why cannot simple solutions, and simple savings be made ? I thought 11 Downing Street wanted to SAVE money . Are they aware of this nonsense ?

2 Langstone high street, as Bosham, has flooded for 100 years. It is what happens. If that is of priority, then all money, available, should be centred on this residential area, with the highest possible qualities used, and the most aesthetic and appealing solution found, to enhance, rather than erase, the uk known, appeal, of the Langstone shore landscape.

I fully support works on THAT side...this is not nimbism, but is proven by the April 2024 flood...the water comes and goes through Chichester harbour, at Sandy point. I leave it to architects to design, or instruct the DUTCH to design, a suitable acceptable proposal. Let the SCIENCE lead.

On the east side, focus should be made to prevent the main road flooding, then the kings coastal path to protect the shore.

And then, look after humans and not bikes.

This bike path is a dangerous proposal, [REDACTED] because Havant cannot be bothered to slow down the racing A 3023 traffic , off the hayling Bridge, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Oh yes, dear cyclists have a nice central segregation in mill lane, and of course, (we have watched and counted them) they go straight over Hayling bridge to hayling for their ride.

Do the pedestrians ? No, the majority come down billy line north, cross at the central reservation above, or park at the pull in car park, and walk the Langstone cycle track to the bus stop, and then put their life in their hands, trying to cross the road, at the ship. Only when a bus pulls in, are they given some protection to cross. ,

In fact,

There is enough room by the bus stop, for pull in, and a chicane at slow speed in the road, to enable an "island " for safe pedestrian crossing , to the East Chichester harbour, and the ship pub.

We need joined up thinking.

Langstone bridge or village does not need 40 mph, or 50. Mph, or 60 mph.

It needs enforced 20 to 30 mph through the village.....unless of course you take away the traffic lights at the a27 roundabout and give hayling residents immediate priority. !! Everyone stops. Everyone waits. And the " so called speeding gains" are totally wiped out.

Go back to the science. Do the exercise yourselves. Drive it, at speed, and at 30 mph. And watch yourself being made to stop at the A27, and then only switch off your stop clock, when the lights go GREEN.

Be driven by the science. Abide by the facts, and make Langstone a safer place.

We do not need racing track bike paths, with electric bikes at 40 mph, motorbikes at 40 mph...yes you read that right, [REDACTED] hurtling down with ONE ping of the bell, expecting any human, to get RIGHT out of their way. ...or else !!

Some joined up thinking and solutions are needed. Get a pecking order 1 humans, 2. Disabled. 3. Children's bikes and road crossing. 4. Keep the tide out, or do it cheaply and fill some concrete sandbags. 5. Speeding bikes maximising their personal best from hayling sea front. (exactly, WHAT is the speed limit on a bike path any way .? 11 km p h I believe. ?). And , speeding cars...(oh no, you cannot hold back the Hayling Islanders rushing towards a red stop, at traffic light.)

It is all a nonsense.

Please refuse their application, until Priority is given to priority issues.

Yours faithfully