

Lt Col (Ret'd) PA Pocock ARRC BEd (hons)

11 Church Lane

Pagham

PO21 4NS



Development Control
Arun District Council
The Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

22nd January 2017

Dear Sir,

Re. Planning application P/140/16/OUT (Pagham Road South)

I object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

Loss of prime arable land: - No mention is made on the impact of the loss of crop growing land and the reduction in food production. Mention was made at a recent meeting in Pagham about how pleased the Chinese are with all the surplus food we send them. If the housing developments continue apace, we'll soon be depriving the Chinese of food and having to import it instead.

I have read the planning application extensively and all looks good on paper, but I worry about the reality. Like the proposed management of the site drainage ditches by a private company. I am sure (whoever they are) will do as little as possible for as much as possible until we are all up to our knees in flood water. Recently surveyors were sighting up Church Lane for, "proposed ditches for a private company". There was no mention of this in the planning application, although I do note that the bases of the proposed properties at the southern edge of the development site will be raised 300mm, "in case of flooding". Is the ditch along the northern side of Church Lane to protect these properties, or the existing ones?

Once the water is in the ditch, where does it go then?

Much store is made of the benefits to the community, but we must not succumb to the pseudo altruistic overtones of these housing developers. I did not see any reference to pedestrian crossings on Pagham Road. If the school gets the go ahead, there will be numerous school children having to cross. The two new proposed access roads will significantly alter the flow patterns of traffic between Sea Lane and Nyetimber Lane increasing the possibility of a child being injured or killed.

If the school does not get the go ahead, how many extra houses will be built instead?

There is no employment in Pagham for the number of projected population. This will increase the existing bottlenecks with the A27 during the rush hours. Has the sewage disposal taken in to consideration the extra 150-plus population of the school?

Has Ford and Tangmere airfields been considered as alternative sites for housing development?

I note that within a National Park, "It can restrict certain types of development from being built in certain locations. (For example a planning policy could prevent new houses being built in an area with protected species, or an area liable to flooding)"

Whilst Pagham is outside the National Park, I would have thought that we would come into those particular "no-build" criteria.

Who is to fund the care home, school, scout hut and allotments?

Cycle routes get a lot of mention, but no consideration for a path for cyclists travelling to and from work along the Pagham Road. There are two issues here: Firstly the safety of the individual cyclist, as a result in the increased traffic volume if the development goes ahead, is at potentially greater risk of injury. Secondly of cyclists holding up the traffic and drivers taking increased risks to overtake them and more accidents occur, as a result.

Yours sincerely,

Peter A. Pocock ARRC BEd (hons)
Lt Col (Ret'd)