

2) Effect on daylight, privacy and outlook: All the properties adjoining the proposed site are bungalows, therefore to build two/three storey buildings would impact on the privacy, daylight and outlook of the existing residents and therefore reducing their quality of life.

3) Noise, smells and fumes: We can hear the traffic along the A27 which would be east of the proposed site, when they built the A27 in the 70's residents were given compensation for noise pollution, since then although the road surface has been renewed the traffic has increased 10 fold and the noise is constant, therefore to build dwelling closer to the A27 would impact on the dwellers quality of life as they would suffer even louder noise pollution and higher fumes produced by the heavy used A27 than we already do and also the addition of more cars the development would bring, will increase noise & fumes to the area, therefore increasing pollution.

4) Conservation of trees and hedgerows and protection of natural habitats for our wildlife: The whole site and all along the sites borders are trees and hedgerows which are home to our wildlife, it homes protected species living and feeding at the site such as bats, slowworms, Adders, dormice and hedgehogs together with shrews, field mice and many other much needed wildlife. This year I have seen an increase in butterflies and bumblebees in my garden. I'm sure if the site was surveyed by wildlife experts they would find even more important and rare species of wildlife, as what I have mentioned is just what we have seen. So we need to keep these open spaces in order to protect or precious wildlife.

5) Impact on Public services and infrastructure: We already have to wait for over two weeks to get an appointment to see our GP, to add another potential 600 people to an already stretched service, could cause unnecessary suffering to existing people already struggling to get a doctor's appointment when needed. Emsworth Primary School does not have the capacity to take any more children, so how far would more children need to travel to and therefore adding further impact on transport and traffic in the area. How does Havant council propose to cope and finance all these additional requirements 192 dwellings would bring. We have had flooding in the past at Havant Road end of Selangor Avenue and the Victoria Road end of Selangor Avenue but not in-between which is where the majority of the proposed new dwelling would be built, who would be responsible for any future flooding problems, if due to the amount of concreted area the new buildings would cover should impact on the existing drainage the site provides.

6) Building rules and regulations: We are reliably informed that one of the rules states that, no digging is allowed within 4 metres of an established tree, this rule is referred to as "A 4 metre no dig zone" Therefore, as the proposed site is completely surrounded by established trees and there are many established trees on the said site, we will expect this rule and any other building rules or regulations to apply.

N.B. DUMPING THE 2014 PLAN MAY BE
UNLAWFUL.
HBC = RATIFIED & CONFIRMED BY PLANNING
INSPECTOR AFTER NPPF HAD BEEN
PTO →

CONTINUED... FROM Pgs 2.
IN EXISTENCE FOR NEARLY 2 YEARS (?)

7) Development plans to our countryside: When planning future housing, the government and local authorities should take in to account the impact it will have on the future look of our country and countryside. We need cities, towns and villages to be defined, although we need new homes, we also need to be able to see when we are leaving or entering a city, town or village, so although strategic gaps are no longer protected from being built on, they should be the last place to be considered for development and after all other non-impact areas have already been considered first and exhausted, therefore, protecting the look of our future countryside. Just allowing developers to build homes anywhere there's a gap to do so, would be irresponsible and detrimental to this site and the surrounding area.

I also have questions that HBC and Barrett's need to answer should the proposed site be given planning permission. Who would be responsible for moving and relocation the existing gas pipe? Who would be responsible in protecting existing properties from future flooding? Who would be responsible for the rat infestation the existing properties will be subjected to once the site is disturbed when digging the foundations. I'm sure there are many more questions that need to be answered by HBC and Barrett's in regards to this site, one other being, why do we have to use this site to build houses in the first place, when there are so many other sites that should be considered first. It is HBC responsibility to not only provide new homes for local people but also protect existing homes and residents and the look of the whole borough so it doesn't become just one big extending housing estate, as HBC already has Leigh Park one of the largest housing estates in Europe, shouldn't we then say "enough is enough" and protect these small green belt areas of land that have very little impact on the whole country's housing problem, but a huge impact on our local environment and look of an area and its identity.

We need to act now, we need to protect Emsworth and other areas like Emsworth, not just for us right now but for our future generations, once it's destroyed and gone, it's gone forever.

Please can you register and acknowledge our comments and reasons as to why we are opposed to this type of development on the proposed site.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

23/8/16