

109 Harbour View Road

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

18 JAN 2017

RECEIVED

Pagham

PO21 4RJ

Dear Sirs

Re: Planning Applications P/134/16/OUT and P/140/16/OUT

I am writing to register my concerns and to add my protest to those of others about the housing developments that are proposed on the sites at Sefter Road and to the south of Summer Lane.

My concerns are as follow:

That the traffic that will be generated from these developments will exacerbate an already fraught situation. I would welcome assurance that the following have been taken into account in deciding that the present routes will be able to accommodate anticipated additional volume

- a) The loss of traffic lights at the Oving intersection which currently enable the flow of traffic from the Bognor Road and from Vinnetrow Road
- b) The volume of traffic currently gridlocked on some mornings (especially during school term times) waiting to join an A27 which is often itself jammed from A29 roundabout to the Stockbridge roundabout.
- c) Will infrastructure issues be resolved before the housing development is increased.
- d) Has increased traffic volume and weight to Barfoots (may be the wrong designation) been taken into consideration bearing in mind that there will be additional bio-digesters which will need to be provided with material.

Flooding is an issue which is high in the minds of all residents at Pagham – not simply the prospect of threat from the sea but there is also heavy run-off from rainwater especially since the Pagham Rife was improved to alleviate flooding in Chichester. That together with cessation of dredging of the entrance to Pagham Harbour has resulted in a constant threat to the locality.

There are some other aspects to my protest.

The first is that, having raised the subject informally and off the record with a local council representative I have been told that the grant of these applications is a foregone conclusion. I would welcome your comment.

My second is what I see as a cynical ploy to circumvent the requirement in new housing developments to provide 'affordable' housing. This is because I see the Sefter Road development has provision for an Old Peoples' home of some sort. I was told by one of the representatives of the developers that this was required by the local authority. Is the local authority going to run it? If not, has a business already been identified to do so or, has one been privately commissioned on the site. Whilst I may have issues around the development in any case, if there is to be one despite all opposition, then I would like to be sure that it meets a real need and that the Old Peoples' Home be scrapped and more affordable housing put in its place.

There was provision for a school and a doctors' surgery. Again, these were said to be requirements of the Local Authority. Is that so or is there some other agenda as, as I suspect, in the case of the Old Peoples' home.

We have trouble enough getting teachers and head teachers in this area and we have a similar problem with doctors. Will local schools be able to accommodate more pupils? Is the good medical practitioner service we currently have going to be stretched to the kind of limits where, elsewhere we are going to have to wait weeks just to see a doctor? Have local doctors been consulted?

As I have said before, I have no problem providing additional housing for those who need it. I live in what was once a housing development. But if action is not taken to prevent problems then, not only will existing residents be affected but so too will the new occupants of these two most inappropriate sites.

I would welcome your response to my concerns and expect to hear from you at an early date.

My letter is being copied to Nick Gibb who, I am sure, is already well aware of local concern.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Miss J Hillary

*2c, Lagoon Road,
Pagham, Bognor Regis,
West Sussex, PO21 4TJ*



Director of Planning & Economic Regeneration,
Arun Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton,
BN17 5LF

16th January 2017

Dear Sir,

Re: Outline Applications P/134/16/OUT & P/140/16/OUT

I object strongly to the proposals contained in the above-mentioned applications.

It is evident from the applications currently under consideration that cumulatively they will, if approved, result in up to 650 new dwellings, 2 schools, a care home, ambulance station, replacement scouts building and associated recreational space. Whilst application P140/16/OUT is in respect of vehicular access on to the Pagham Road it is clear the result of the two developments will result in circumstances not only damaging to the area as a whole on environmental grounds but also as a result of lack of investment in supporting infrastructure for such a large development.

To put the above-mentioned comment into perspective it should be borne in mind that both plots of land have drainage channels running across them, which eventually discharges, into the Pagham Rife. These drainage channels themselves will further act as a conduit in wet weather as the level of Pagham Rife does reach a point when excess water feeds the opposite way into the drainage channels. An example of this can be found at an existing residential development i.e. Mill Farm Park Home site, which has previously been flooded and had to have a protective bund erected around its perimeter to help overcome the ever present risk of flood. What is proposed on the neighbouring site is a development which will be subject to the same risks bearing in mind that the erection of numerous development footprints will further increase flood risk as it would give rise to the displacement of surface water over a greater area.

The effect of development on the scale proposed cannot in any way be supported by the current infrastructure as the road serving as the main arterial route in and out of Pagham barely copes with existing traffic comprising of articulated commercial vehicles travelling to and from locations in the village but also regular public transport which is further compounded by seasonal tourist vehicles.

The last concern is the limited medical facilities in Pagham and Rose Green, which are already stretched by the existing community. If additional families are brought into Pagham it result in the additional strain seeming to be the straw to break the proverbial camels back.

I do hope that my concerns will be taken into account as I fell many others in the village will share the same concerns



L W Lewis