



Planning development
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant PO9 2AX



29th June 2021


Dear Sir/Madam

APP21/00419 and APP21/00420

I enclose my objection to both these planning applications. There is one copy which applies to both of applications. Please include them in the public comments section as objections.

If you have any problems please contact me either by email or phone.

Kind regards



Looking at this application forms there are many items which are incomplete, inaccurate and in dispute. I object to both these planning applications APP21/00419 and APP21-00420

1. Section 4 – site area

Stated to be 286sq meters. If their plan shows the site area to be that outlined in red on their map only about half of the sales office is shown as within that site area. Surely the plans should be accurate.

1. Section 5 – Description of the Proposal.

Why do both planning applications give the description as “Erection of a Temporary Sales Cabin including car parking on the land at Sinah Lane, Hayling Island” when APP/21/00420 is only for lights, flags and signs? Why does 00420 specify six parking spaces and include elevations of the sales cabin?

2. Section 9 – Vehicle Parking

The application form says the intention is to increase this from 2 spaces to 6.

This is an agricultural field which currently has no parking spaces.

There should be no parking on Core Support Area agricultural land.

Why does APP21-00420 specify parking spaces?

3. Section 11 – Assessment of flood risk

The application form says “no” to “Will the proposal increase the flood risk elsewhere?”

This field often floods during and following heavy rain including into the adjoining gardens. If a large building (over 30 sq. m) is constructed and six parking spaces (approximately 70 sq m) this would cause increased runoff into adjoining gardens. The plan clearly shows a roadway (approximately 130 sq m) between the parking spaces and Sinah Lane although permission to construct this is not requested in this planning application. If this roadway is constructed it would cause even more flooding in the adjoining gardens.

“How will surface water be disposed of?” There is no answer given to this question on the application form.

4. Section 12 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

This application form claims there are no protected species on this land or on land adjacent to or near the proposed development.

This location is defined by Havant Borough Council as a Core Support Area for Brent Geese, a protected species, since 2019 – which according to Havant Borough Council is the highest level of protection.

The protected birds are deterred by a large section of the field being left ploughed up over during the winter period which is unsuitable for birds with webbed feet. They have also been deterred using multiple explosive devices being let off at hourly intervals. Despite these deterrents this is still a favoured foraging field for the highly protected species of Brent Geese.

The internationally important Brent Geese need to be considered for this application as they return from mid-September.

The suggestion of large, illuminated hoardings, large intrusive flags and lighting in this area is in contravention of the preservation of a Core Support Area

5. Section12 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

I understand the bat report for this location is out of date and would need to be repeated before this application proceeds.

6. Section 13 – Foul Sewage

The application shows a sales cabin with both a toilet and two sinks all with wastes.

The application form says the method of disposal of foul sewage is ‘Unknown’. This is not acceptable.

7. Section 14 – Waste Storage and Collection.

According to the application form there are no plans to incorporate areas to store and aid the collection of waste.

There are also no arrangements made to separate storage and the collection of recyclable waste.

8. Section 17 – Non-residential Floorspace

The application form asks if there will be no loss, gains or change of use of non-residential floorspace. The answer is specified as "no"

Surely a sales office is non-residential floorspace?

9. Section 18 – Employment

"Are there any existing employees on the site or will the proposed development increase or decrease the number of employees."

This is shown as a "no". If it is a sales office surely, they intend to have some sales staff working there?

10. Covering letter.

This says that the sales office and parking spaces are temporary until the end of October 2021. It needs to be confirmed that all will be removed by the end of October 2021, or preferably before mid-September when the Brent Geese start to return.

11. This application and the almost identical one seems to assume that they have planning

permission for APP/20/01093 for the whole development but I understand that is not the case. I also understand that it has been specified that no development can commence until about 25 conditions have been met. I understand that has not happened.

12. There should be no residential development on this field as it has recently been revealed.

that this field has been a Core Support Area since 2019 for the protection of the rare species Brent Geese. The whole development should be re-valuated now that significant fact has at last been revealed.

I am adding this series of objections to both planning applications because although one states it is for a cabin and parking spaces and the other for flagpoles, lights and hoardings etc for some reason the details for both applications are included in both applications.

If one is for a sales cabin and parking spaces so the advertising information specifications should be removed from that application.

If the other application is for lights, flagpoles and advertising hoardings etc. the details of the cabin dimensions and parking spaces should not be included.

I assume it is a developer tactic that if one application is approved, they assume they have approval for everything. I am appalled by their tactics so far of encouraging the farmer to use various tactics to try to deter the Brent Geese from foraging on their favoured field.

The south of Hayling has excellent agricultural land which should not be used for cheap housing for the benefit of the developer while upsetting the protected wildlife and increasing the congestion of the roads on this island cul-de-sac. Yesterday the main road just south of the bridge was deeply flooded due to rain as was the only alternative route through Northney. I understand that there are no plans to resolve this by HCC. The queues extended from the A27 roundabout to Daw Lane.

Should any of this development be allowed when Climate Central predicts the whole of Hayling will be in danger of flooding by 2030 which is in only nine years' time?

Please see the attached map provided by them.

I tried to contact HBC planning concerning APP/20/01093 and the diggers and erection of fencing on this protected field and was told to email Lewis Oliver. I received a response of "We will respond to your email as soon as possible: please note we are experiencing a higher than usual demand for our service; please allow up to 5 working days for us to reply to standard requests".

It is now 16 working days and still no response. What is the current accurate response time?

Councillor Thomas is specified as a contact, but she stood down on the 4th May 21. Has she been replaced for these planning applications?

Under "Further information" it says no to "Environmental Assessment Requested". As this location is a Core Protected Area for the internationally important Brent Geese then surely this needs to be corrected.