

**Deputation Rosie Law – Independent Hayling Resident (South West Hayling)**  
**Planning Committee Meeting 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021**  
**For APP/20/01093**

This application looks the same but there are significant differences highlighting environmental importance and potentially serious risks to existing and new residents.

The groundwater bulge under this site continues to raise questions. Despite Barratt Homes' engineer's report, this continually replenished underground fresh water lies as close as 45cm below the surface (FRA Nov 2020), but rises and falls by 10cm in amplitude with the tide despite being 800 yards from the harbour. We have seen this in our rear garden's soakaway even in summer.

The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is concerned and raised new conditions:

- avoiding groundwater mixing with surface water in the attenuation pond
- preventing obstruction of drainage flow from existing gardens northwards onto the site

Only 2 of the 6 bore-holes for 2016-17 groundwater survey data have been working and the results of the replacement bore-holes, this winter, are being chased by LLFA to ascertain accurate groundwater levels.

The forecasted rise in tidal height is 1.4m in 100 year lifetime; the groundwater levels will rise proportionately.

SuDS calculations on flow rate and volume relate to surface water but the rising level of groundwater over the development's life-time should be in this modelling.

The successful Primary Support Site includes mitigation for the Oysters and covers 12.4 hectares, yet only 5.7 hectares replace it as an onsite refuge.

Natural England have stated more land is needed to mitigate for the land lost to both this and the Oysters developments which **MUST be adjacent to the onsite refuge preventing further fragmentation of the SPA.**

HBC's proposed mitigation land, 'The Hayling Island Bird Refuge' (E26), is **NOT adjacent** to but separated by the Salt Marsh and east of the Billy Trail. Currently farmland under the same ownership as the site, it undergoes crop rotation including winter wheat - favoured by Brent Geese. Whilst very similar to the existing Primary Support Site, it is **completely within flood zone 3 and suffering rapid coastal erosion** like the North West boundary of the onsite refuge.

The County Ecologist has agreed the Brent Geese will forage wherever winter wheat is grown. Mono-cropped grassland with new landscaping and nearby estate will not attract the Brent Geese compared to open fields with winter wheat. **Therefore this mitigation is unsustainable and also leads to failure for the onsite refuge.**

Barratt Homes have appeared to undermine the course of this application:

- Continued lack of adherence to The Oysters S106 Condition to maintain fencing along the Billy Trail to prevent disturbance and attract Brent Geese remains an enforcement issue.

- Barratt Homes plan for waste water at 110 litres per person/day is nearly 60% less than average for this area. Southern Water explains 265 litres pp/day passes through Budds Farm including 3% sewage. This unrealistic target distorts calculations for nutrient neutrality, mains and waste water new provision and will affect infrastructure in the area.

The binding agreement for the future management of these proposed refuges is still not finalised. The RSPB is disappointed with Barratt Homes 'inconsistencies' in their Biodiversity Report:

- Sums of money to create and manage this new habitat, as advised by County Ecology, have not been correctly reported
- Barratt Homes' wrongfully included additional numbers in their biodiversity calculations over claiming net gain

In 2018 the planting regime on H34C was altered manipulating Brent Geese sightings. As a result the southern half became wasteland just when data was needed to ascertain whether the Brent Geese were grazing on the Southern half of the field where the housing is proposed. Fortunately, new crop planting this winter included part of the southern half of the field as well as the northern section and attracted hundreds of Brent Geese to forage where the housing is proposed. The RSPB and County Ecologist have officially received this new information but Barratt Homes' report remains out of date.

Natural England very recently produced a Condition Review demonstrating serious damage to local ecology in our surrounding single body of water, Langstone and Chichester Harbours. Just using money to fulfil conditions will NOT address these serious environmental problems.

**This development risks building homes on a future tidal marsh and destroying a successful Primary Support Site.**

**Its viability depends on unresolved mitigation issues for traffic and sewage infrastructure and environmental sustainability and endless obligatory conditions requiring enforcement. Agreeing Planning permission in order to fulfil a 5 year housing supply and receive money for such mitigation is unethical not demonstrating balanced consideration for irreversible damage caused by this proposal.**

Rosie Law  
8<sup>th</sup> March 2021

