

Deputations Submitted by Mr Parham

The HI Transport Assessment (TA) was commissioned in recognition of the unique infrastructure limits fixed by the capacity of the A3023/Bridge single access route, and recognised the need to evaluate the road network as a single strategic requirement. The A3023/Bridge is accepted by HBC as having no economic options to increase its capacity, therefore why has the most logical and essential criteria been ignored: the loading vs capacity of the only access route?

The only independent review of the TA (undertaken by an internationally recognised expert on Roads, Professor Nick Hounsell) recommended the route be assessed with a flow/capacity analysis as the correct way to evaluate the impact of the Borough's housing development on the Island's roads. The data to undertake this analysis is readily available: why has this professional advice been unacknowledged and disregarded?

The peak hour loading at the bridge is approximately 85%, with many periods when the road becomes overloaded and gridlocked, leaving little spare capacity to absorb the increase from HBC's ambitious housing and tourism growth plans. A clear picture of the flow/capacity over time to ensure a sustainable infrastructure is essential in any development evaluations.

The TA includes a number of mitigation projects to improve the round-the-Island traffic flows as essential network enhancements supporting the Plan. The costs are estimated at £10,500,000 – these can only increase.

There is only a £600,000 contribution in this application and incidentally, nothing from the numerous windfall developments in progress to provide finances the essential strategic improvements which are supposed to be implemented ahead of the need.

Your Committee should require a detailed funding analysis as part of the evaluation process for all housing developments, including this one.

Our second area of concern is coastal protection and the condition of the surrounding waters.

Coastal Partners' Hayling Island Coastal Strategy is scheduled for completion in 2022, so no one knows what the future looks like, but options will include contraction of the coastline. It is significant to note that the shoreline adjacent to the Sinah Lane site is classified as 'no intervention,' and threatened by the 1.4mtr tide rise prediction. Coastal Partners declined to comment on this application, and deferred to the Statutory Bodies.

The water quality surrounding the Island is rapidly becoming a national scandal. Serious complaints requiring Southern Water (SW) to re-evaluate its processes and utilities to stop polluting our beaches and harbours have been raised by Alan Mak MP, Chichester Council, Natural England, Harbour Authorities, Chichester Harbour

Trust, Harbour Sailing Clubs, Hayling Sewage Watch, and local support groups. HBC is notably absent from the list.

The pollution is primarily generated by discharges of excess screened but untreated waste water from the SW sewage network. These occur when the network capacity is reached through rainfall and system failures. Some of these discharges are licensed, some not. In the 11 months February to December 2020, just for Langstone Harbour, there were 160 discharge events over 75 days lasting a total of 1,215 hours. We can assume a similar situation exists in Chichester Harbour.

This means that on at least 75 days last year, the blue flag bathing beaches of Wittering, Hayling and Southsea were likely to be contaminated.

The SW 5year service improvement plan is not designed to stop waste water discharges.

Alan Mak is supporting a Bill which would require SW to stop polluting our two inland waterways. SW have stated that to stop the pollution would require a change in the Law and a massive investment, which is not going to happen overnight.

Therefore, as it stands, housing development and climate change will inevitably exacerbate the situation and increase pollution, resulting in an unsustainable eco-structure.

SW have stated that the discharges of waste water are contained within the harbours. This is untrue and must be retracted. Our two harbours fill and empty twice a day, and the outflows impact the designated bathing waters.

The minimum requirement should be for SW to provide this Committee with a detailed improvement project schedule, together with the pollution impact at each stage so that it can accurately inform the development's infrastructure needs.

The nitrate reduction claims for this site and Warblington Farm are purely aspirational. Where is the process to ensure compliance?

It is the cumulative development which should be driving the infrastructure design and expansion. Continuing with the housing plan (including this application) without a proven pollution control process, an accurate TA, and coastal strategy in place we stand the risk of blindly establishing an unsustainable environment and making irreversible mistakes.

Dave Parham, Save Our Island Group
8 March 2021