

We oppose the Planning Ref. APP/21/0135

We would offer the following for consideration when viewing the above mentioned Planning Proposal:-


1). [REDACTED] we were informed that there was a “no development covenant” placed on the land when it was sold to the current owners. I assume such a covenant would appear against the title deeds for the property held by the land registry. Please can the owners be asked to provide a copy of the land registry documentation to confirm or otherwise .

Drainage and Flooding

2). The field is off Saltmarsh lane and is called SALTMARSH field - bit of a clue in the name there. It does not drain well. Indeed, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] floods very badly and the farmer is unable to harvest any crop from this area - see photo.

There is also a risk of flooding near the proposed access point from Saltmarsh lane . - see map from Onesearch



direct carried out when our property was purchased . Add to this the fact that a drainage ditch runs across the land and it becomes very clear that there are major drainage issues which will not be helped by having yet more concrete covering up what little natural drainage there is.

Lost of habitat/wildlife disturbance

3). The area provides grazing for a variety of birds and flocks of starlings are a common site , as is the presence of a pair of Buzzards which can be seen most days using the field as a hunting ground .

4). During the day a family of deer often visit the area and in the evenings at dusk pipistrelle bats swoop and hunt over the field for the various insects to be found there.

5). The Brent geese are well known over this part of the island and this development would take even more of their habitat away from them . I note that the developers propose to address this through a financial contribution ! How does that work? I am reminded of the Christmas rhyme :-

“ Christmas is coming
But the Geese aren't getting fat,
'cos someone's put some pennies
in a council office hat”!!

They need LAND not money. Items 3,4 and 5 are all threatened by this development.

Proximity to boundary of new properties

6). The outline proposal shows what we presume to be flats being sited [REDACTED] This will clearly impact on our privacy and give rise to noise issues as well as blocking sunlight from our rear garden and windows. This will also cause unacceptable construction noise whilst works are in progress.

7). What screening is proposed around the site boundary as trees marked on the plans do not currently exist and will certainly not grow overnight. They may look pretty on plans but the reality is somewhat different.

General considerations

The proposed over development of HAYLING has been well documented in the local press and clearly this particular proposal falls foul of all the arguments already on the table but they are equally relevant here .

Infrastructure not considered by the developer include :-

Medical centre already overloaded

No NHS dentist places

Extra school places

Extra shops needed

Charging points for anticipated electric car revolution will overload the electricity supply on the island .

Overloading of water supply and drop in water pressure to surrounding properties.

Gas supplies similarly affected.

Extra traffic past local care home in Saltmarsh lane
potential danger to residents out walking both by HGV s
during construction and additional vehicle movements once
completed. When drawing up proposals traffic surveys
were carried out during lockdown so woefully inaccurate.

Extra traffic on already overloaded road system and bridge
- has the bridge had a recent health check to cope with the
additional HGVs needed for the work.

More sewage to be pumped to Budds Farm so that
southern water can pump it straight back into Langstone
harbour. Southern water are unable to cope with the
present situation and tankers are often employed to empty
storage area late at night and transfer the offending waste
by road to the local treatment works.

