

The Assistant Director of Planning
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

104 Pagham Road
Pagham
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO21 4NN



22nd January 2017

Sear Sirs,

Objection to Planning Application Reference: P/140/16/OUT

I would like to register my objection to the planning proposals contained P/140/16/OUT in respect of the construction of 400 dwellings, a 70 bed care home, a local centre, 1FE Primary School and a scout hut on land south of Summer Lane and West of Pagham Road.

I am shocked and dismayed that such a proposal should be contemplated for construction on prime agricultural land for the following reasons:-

1. Pagham is a village already comprising of some 3000+ dwellings which is accessed via Pagham Road, being the key route to the A27 to Chichester and beyond. Pagham Road is a narrow road, little more than lane, prone to flooding and already suffering from traffic congestion and hindered by large and slow moving farm vehicles, HGV's and articulated trucks, often leaving lengthy stretches of mud on the road. It is a major hazard for cycles which inevitably slow the traffic almost to a standstill and are practically impassable due to the absence of a cycle track along such a narrow and bending route. Furthermore, compounded by the significant increase in the building of developments in surrounding areas such as Bersted, Flansham, Felpham and beyond, people are now using Pagham Road as a means to avoid the congestion on the A27 and reach the A259, causing extra pressure on the Pagham network. This has resulted in increasing congestion, accidents and vehicles ending up in the roadside ditch alongside Pagham Road.
2. The Pagham area sits within the land between the South Downs and the sea which is a natural flood plain and due to the run-off of water from the surrounding fields, Pagham already has a history of flooding. Therefore proposing to build more houses where there are already floods would not seem to be a normal or viable practice. This proposal will significantly increase the risk of additional flooding in Pagham with the loss of the fields and vegetation which currently assist natural drainage to the area. Furthermore the proposed solution of pumping floodwater into the Pagham rife carries a risk of pumping contaminants into Pagham Harbour and the sea, which contravenes international law and raises ecological concerns and impacts upon the natural habitat and wildlife. In addition to the risk of flooding, I understand that the Summer Lane sewerage facility lacks capacity for future developments and this will also need to be addressed.
3. The loss of valuable farmland in an area which contains high grade soil and has maximum sunlight hours which is much needed for food production in England, it seems to be a somewhat perverse course of action when farmers are desperate to obtain more acreage for food production and is simply squandering our countryside for short term gain.
4. The proposal to build a 1FE Primary School is for entry level only and the need if any, would be for a junior school at all grades. In any event, currently senior school pupils in the area currently have the protracted task of travelling to Chichester, Felpham and the Regis

schools, which will become even more difficult in terms of access and time within the existing already strained infrastructure, exacerbated by the effects of a further increase in local dwellings. The proposal to build a 70 bed care home also would appear to be somewhat unnecessary with numerous such facilities already existing throughout the area, many of which are understaffed and underfunded. Similarly, there is a medical centre at Rose Green which is already under significant pressure due a lack of doctors and a number of surgeries within it remain empty, thus presenting the already sizeable village community with a major challenge to secure prompt appointments and when having done so, often face a significant wait for referrals of many months for treatment. St. Richards Hospital in Chichester is already creaking under the pressure to service the community due the cumulative effect of an increase in local population and in addition to the recent significant number of housing developments attracting more people into the area! I would also question the need for an additional centre, there is already a community centre in Pagham on the existing site which is further supported by the facilities available at St. Ninians, Pagham United Reformed Church on Pagham Road.

5. Whilst on the issue of infrastructure, in respect of the proposal to build 400 homes on the Summer Lane/Pagham Road site, compounded by the additional proposal to build a further 250 homes on the Sefter Road/Rose Green site (planning application P/134/16/OUT), where are all these additional people going to work and how on earth are they going to get there? Based upon the already stressed road network, there are only a limited number of jobs available in the area of which in any event are mostly low paid positions and would not necessarily be suitable for a number of the new residents.

So to summarise, this proposal, read in conjunction with the additional housing proposal P/134/16/OUT, would seem to be completely inappropriate in size and practicality as the local infrastructure simply could not support it. It is unsustainable both economically and environmentally and is strategically unnecessary and undesirable in that it involves the use and destruction of economically valuable agricultural land, places an untenable burden of additional traffic congestion, significantly increases the risk of flooding and has the undeniable potential to disturb the ecology and lose some of the natural wildlife which is dearly valued by both the existing community, holiday makers staying at the Church Farm facility and many other visitors currently attracted to the area.

Whilst I can understand that there may well be a future requirement to build a sensible number of additional homes to meet a local requirement, I would strongly argue that this should be realistic and sustainable and essentially within the number of 125-130 homes previously identified within the neighbourhood plan, which hopefully then could be more practically absorbed into the existing but severely overstretched infrastructure.

Yours faithfully,



May E. Marshall