

Good afternoon Chairman, committee. I am making this representation to ask that this planning application be refused and re-submitted in a corrected and revised form that properly addresses the following five subject areas:

1. Traffic
2. Car Parking
3. The Visual Impact
4. Health Care and Safety
5. Incorrect statements

Let me say, I fully support redevelopment of the site, but **not** in the form proposed.

## **1. Traffic**

I have seven issues with traffic regarding access to the site and safety.

First, the use of electric gates is likely to cause congestion as confirmed by Simon McFarlane as cars, service vehicles, refuse vehicles, emergency vehicles and delivery vehicles wait to gain access. The inability for cars and service vehicles to turn on site and exit in a forward gear presents a safety issue as would the placement of bins on the pavement on bin collection days.

Second, the HBC Development Engineer (Peter Marshall) has identified that the number of road trips has not been quantified these are also required to evaluate the availability of car parking facilities at Elm Grove.

Third, the only analysis of car usage relates to sites well outside of the area in March 2014 and outside the Island with its associated unique needs. March is one of the quietest months of the year, new detailed analysis which is Hayling Island specific is needed.

Fourth, the section 2 and 5.1 photos are misleading with **no** traffic, **no** pedestrians, **no** school children, and **no** disability scooters. The photos are only taken facing south whereas traffic approaches from both north and south. At most times during the day there is a steady flow of pedestrian and vehicular traffic in both directions. Furthermore, turning right out from Pullingers was always extremely difficult.

Fifth, the applicant has acknowledged poor sight lines, yet the access to the development is poor with limited road frontage and restricted site lines requiring ingress and egress across a busy pedestrian footpath used regularly by school children and people of all ages, as well as those using mobility transport.

Sixth, there is no mention in the documentation of the large number of cars and traffic congestion that occurs at school opening and closing times, or the very close proximity of the proposed development to the schools.

Seventh, storage for mobility scooters and cycles are essential. Developments should support green initiatives and the secure storage of such vehicles.

If the applicant is unable to provide sufficient space within the development to accommodate traffic movement perhaps it demonstrates that the site is being over developed and smaller buildings would be appropriate to meet safety requirements.

## 2. Car Parking

I have five issues regarding car parking for residents, visitors and construction workers.

First, section 8 refers to 14 parking spaces being adequate due to the close proximity to public parking facilities, but this is not a good reason to provide inadequate on-site parking.

Second, the parking situation will be exacerbated by the imminent closure of the Hayling Billy public house, and their free car park with parking spaces for Bentley Walker customers and the adjacent garage.

Third, the closest public car park is located off St Mary's Road, across the main and busy Elm Grove using a dark alleyway and this raises safety issues for the elderly residents.

Fourth, the report of public car parking spaces is hardly representative when taken on part of a day on two very wet November days. The conclusion on parking evidence cannot be relied upon since it is not correct to state '**significant parking is available at all times**' as no analysis has been done '**at all times**'. The public car park is full to overflowing on a regular basis.

Fifth, there is no statement on where construction contractor cars and vans will park; this is a recognised issue with other developments.

A less dense development would allow for more on-site parking and a reduced demand for off-site parking that could be used by shoppers to support local retailers.

### **3. The Visual Impact**

I have six concerns on the visual impact regarding the sheer mass and height of the development.

First, the sheer mass and over-bearing nature of the tall 3-story building is far in excess of other buildings in the vicinity.

Second, there will be an impact on privacy and shading particularly to the North, as the building aspect is east-west and to the allotment holders to the east.

Third, the height of the building would be clearly visible from the AONB to the east.

Fourth, the applicant admits existing buildings are two story and I believe new buildings should remain at that height.

Fifth, white UPVC windows make the visual impact even harsher.

Sixth, I have seen no comments from the Chichester Harbour Conservancy Board; have they made a representation?

These concerns could be resolved by reducing the height of the development from three stories to two too.

### **4. Health Care and Safety**

I have five concerns relating to health care and safety:

First, with a three week delay in gaining health centre appointments, has the applicant been required to provide an analysis of health care needs for its potential residents and how these can be provided?

Second, has the applicant been required to provide funding to extend the existing Health Centre on Hayling to provide more doctors and nursing staff to accommodate the new residents who are likely to need more services than the average Hayling resident?

Third, home visits by doctors from a practice in Havant are unlikely to be achievable given the poor road link. Inadequate onsite car parking would restrict home visit access with care in the community being a new priority.

Fourth, Hampshire Constabulary have identified significant issues that affect resident safety and which require a redesign of the buildings. New plans need to be presented that meet their recommendations.

## **5. Incorrect statements:**

The documentation supporting the application refers to the Tesco store which **has closed**; the Hayling Ferry **that closed a year ago**; The NatWest bank **has closed**, there are now just two banks on the Island; and the Hayling Billy with its car park that is **closing at the end of this year**.

The applicant refers to the east of the land being fairly undeveloped however there is 131 house Bellway development being constructed to the south east of the site on a previous green field site.

The applicant followed obsolete out of date sustainable homes technical standards; so this application needs to be corrected and resubmitted.

Surely revised plans and true statements of the currently available and much reduced amenities must be presented before this planning application can be considered?

### **Now let me comment on the process**

I have a plea to the DMC and Council Officers that if this planning application is minded to be approved either now or at a later date after resubmission, that all attached conditions are enforced.

For example, if a condition is made that work be carried out between 8am and 6pm, then please enforce and do not ignore repeated violations.

I would ask that the DMC consider the 131 dwelling house Mengham Fields development and examine the effect of the overdevelopment in plots 127-131 overlooking the AONB as this is an analogous situation.

Where statutory consultees, specifically the Constabulary, HBC development engineers and architects as well as residents raise issues on the proposals, please recognise their concerns as they are more knowledgeable than applicants who are unfamiliar with the area and perform a non-local desk analysis.

### **Summary**

To summarise, the applicant has rushed through a planning application with significant misleading errors and has used inappropriate and obsolete documentation. Consultees and residents have raised significant concerns regarding fire engine and vehicular and pedestrian access. The sheer mass and height of the building would unreasonably affect nearby residents. I would therefore urge this committee to refuse this planning application until the applicant corrects the errors and addresses consultee and resident concerns which primarily require a compassionate building of two stories.

Thank you for your time.