

Matter 3 Hayling Island

Para 3.1 Transport Assessment

No! On two counts

The micro-simulation tool used is inappropriate for “strategic” road networks; the A3023 is clearly a strategic network.

No consideration has been given to the capacity of the A3023. The council has failed to justify both counts.

The output data from the micro-simulation tool used was subject to micro-tweaks in order to make it fit in a strategic way

Para 3.2 Transport Assessment

Absolutely not! Hayling Island is a tourist town that the council is heavily promoting as a tourist destination. Travel times on and off the island are intolerable for most of the summer season in both directions. More often than not emergency vehicles need to come onto (and off of) the island in a hurry and nose to tail traffic meaning a journey of 90 mins or more is unacceptable and could threaten the lives of those requiring emergency assistance. There is no permanent emergency ambulance or police provision on the island and the islands fire service is not always available so in emergencies the A3023 is our lifeline.

Para 3.3 Transport Assessment

No! The idea of sustainable development as defined by the NPPF that any development in the local plan does not leave the community in a worse position as a result of that development. Most people work on the mainland and so extending journey times in this way is unacceptable - this is especially true when windfall is unaccounted for (para 2.29) and also where the capacity of the road is ignored.

Para 3.6 Flood Risk

It is inappropriate when the council's strategic coastal defence plan will not report for at least another 12 months. How does the planning team know where homes can reasonably be built if the positioning of sea defences is unknown?

The bridge according to the latest Environment Agency sea level rise estimate will see out bridge under water twice per day with the tide. The council's strategic coastal defence plan will not report for at least another 12 months. How does the planning team know if the positioning of sea defences is unknown will support extra development?

It is worth noting that the NPPF sets out that every development should be free from flooding in their lifetime. The council has failed to indicate how they will do that because it does not have a contemporary strategic coastal policy not due for at least 12 months.

Para 3.10 Flood Risk

Yes! On both counts

Para 3.11 KP3

This development is already in progress without any assurances by the Council's strategic coastal strategy not due for at least 12 months. It is possible the cost/benefit analysis of the coastal strategy may not support coastal defence to protect for the lifetime (100 years) of the development given the strict spending protection ratios of 8:1.

Para 3.15 KP3

No! The council's strategic coastal defence plan will not report for at least another 12 months. Without urgent and targeted interventions Coastal Partners have told me the Inn on the Beach will be undermined and the official plan is to remove this crucial "groyne" structure then much more aggressive erosion will take place leaving the land required for seafront development unavailable because the development site(s) will have been eroded or at threat of erosion during its 100 year life time - an NPPF requirement. The coastal strategy not reporting for 12 months, and probably not implemented for years is unlikely to even protect this area because the 8:1 spend ratio could not be met at these places

Para 3.18 KP3

Yes! The billy trail is under serious threat from no spend on grounds of the 8:1 spend ratio. The transport assessment relies on this vital link for sustainable travel.

Para 3.20 West Beach

Yes! West beach has already suffered massive erosion impact since the sea defences were moved. The council decided to withdraw maintenance from sea defences decades ago. That should have triggered the commission of a strategic coastal defence effort which eventually occurred in the last 12 months. A lack of foresight here? Eroded land clearly means no development site.

Para 3.28 Southwood Road

No! Removal of public parking for a public beach will cause serious parking problems for existing residents.

Mike Owens