

Re your letter 17/11/2025 update. For Coastal Flood Defence. LANGSTONE

Dear sirs

The above headed words are the content and purpose of your letter, i presume.

I note Coastal Partners are still awaiting the decision for your planning application to Havant Council, to which substantial public representation was made, together with Marine Management Organisation. (to quote)

I note you welcome home owners continued involvement and feedback for your future engagement. This sentence follows the previous concerning " coastal scheme"... This necessarily concerns COASTAL matters. Those words are important. Collins thesaurus describes " coast " as " the line or zone where the land meets the sea. "

Following the tsunami flood, 2 years ago, we are all now, with this 70 year extra-ordinary, not ordinary, tide extent and reach. We are all now very clear, where that tide comes FROM, how long it lasts before retreat, and properties affected, and reasons for that impact.

Findings and result : as residents have ALWAYS maintained, the flooding tide in the local area, comes solely from CHICHESTER Harbour, particularly as the volume, entrance mouth, square kilometers of tide at surface, Vastly surpasses, anything into LANGSTONE harbour.

These are facts. Any diversion from these facts, necessarily diminishes the money, funding, and QUALITY of works, for water containment, from that eastern side.

Neighbours at that night, went out, and inspected the direction and flow of the sea water reach.

Their findings were, ...the water came westwards from chichester harbour, straight along the high street, as there was no barrier to keep it out, between the Royal Oak Cottages,, for want of better words, and the house, winkle cottage, on the extreme south east corner of langstone high street.

This point, necessarily, needs to be, first line of defence.

The water did NOT come from THE SHIP car park, onto Langstone Road, although i do agree this is a weak point, and consequently northwards along the A3023, but rather, the OPPOSITE. , southwards from the high street towards the bridge.

No houses in Mill Lane, or Harbourside were affected at all.

No houses on Langstone Road, whose ground floor datum is 200mm above ground level, were affected at all, in their habitable accommodation.

Each and every house from [redacted], were affected if one of the 2 apply :

1 their historic ground levels are less than 150mm (building regs)
2 they are illegally habiting, without paying habitable council tax, and in breach of planning permission, using basement, (built for flood risk) for habitable accommodation.

I agree, our garden shed was flooded, but our house, in accord with buidling regualtions, is over 150mm above datum ground levels. It did not flood.

All houses in [redacted] estate, all appear not to have substantial above griund levels. Ditto the coastguard cottages. Indeed we were told, the water came into the Coastguard cottages, by, in the first instance, getting through the airbricks.

As you are well aware, [redacted] with extensive knowledge of building matters [redacted]

I agree, as your carefully worded letter states, works are needed to address, in the first instance, water flooding, where it floods from, and to, and where it DOES NOT flood from and to.

And you are well aware, i am referring to the final western chichester harbour creek, and Langstone Harbour. In respect of both these items, neighbours, at 2 am in the night, came and inspected both.

A 70 year high tide came no where near these extremes. FACT.

Therefore, no works, are necessary, or important for bunds, or any other cosmetic or " desirable" improvements to infrastructure, al beit, roads, paths, bike paths, etc. On that side. To do so, is a diversion if puvlic funds, by deceit.

.....

I note you refer to funding " to complete the project ". Lets make that quite clear....your letter refers to flooding, and relates to flooding and tides.

If by default, or devious inclusion, your aims are to " get funding for a bike path improvement" this is a deliberate smoke screen, to slip in, extra curricular works, which your letter hides under the words " complete the scheme ".

Accordingly i fail to see why you write " access requirements with multiple properties [redacted ," when no works for flooding are required. Certainly not from the rear. But at the rear, you well know, there is the bike path.

However, if it is, that you are trying to slip this in by stealth, please unequivocally confirm that is your intent, and re issue your letter, with clarity, honesty and forthrightness.

My comments concerning land ownership still apply, and i refer my previous correspondence to you, to refresh your memory..

I trust this is an oversight, and i await written clarification.

I would finally, draw your attention to the fact, that IN FACT you do NOT care if ANY path floods, as your recently constructed board walk King Charles 3 coastal path, would inevitably be seriously under 2 feet of water, and or, that you do not IN FACT believe langstone harbour, will flood in any event ! And your VERY RECENT construction works prove that point. !!!!!

You cannot have it both ways. !!

Yours faithfully