

Bronte Welham

From: Nicola Spencer on behalf of Planning
Sent: 03 February 2017 16:23
To: Planning.Responses; Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: P/6/17/OUT Outline application etc for construction of to 300 new homes, care home of up to 80 beds and other development at land north of Hook Lane, Pagham
Attachments: 2017.02.02 Representation re planning application Hook Lane Pagham.docx

Nicola Spencer | Technical Support Manager, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk P Save the environment - think before you print.

-----Original Message-----

Sent: 02 February 2017 17:24
To: Planning
Subject: P/6/17/OUT Outline application etc for construction of to 300 new homes, care home of up to 80 beds and other development at land north of Hook Lane, Pagham

Dear Sir

I attach a letter of representation about the planning application referred to above.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Thank you

Philip Heath-Coleman

**1 Ledra Drive
Pagham
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO21 4PF**

2 February 2016

To

Karl Roberts

Director Planning & Economic Regeneration

Arun District Council

Arun Civic Centre

Maltravers Road

Littlehampton

BN17 5LF

Dear Sir

P/6/17/OUT Outline application etc for construction of to 300 new homes, care home of up to 80 beds and other development at land north of Hook Lane, Pagham

I refer to the above planning application recently received.

This letter supplements my letter of 13 January in respect of applications no: **P/134/16/OUT** and **P/140/16/OUT**.

It is of supreme importance that, in considering these applications individually, their cumulative impact is taken into account. If all three applications this would represent an increase in parish population of about a third and is unsustainable.

Whilst a limited increase in housing provision is undoubtedly needed, and has been provided for in the Pagham Neighbourhood Plan, an increase in population on the scale contemplated cumulatively in these applications would overwhelm local facilities, bring even more serious congestion on local roads,

and could so change the nature of the village as to make social integration difficult.

My main concern is about road congestion. The only route from these sites in Pagham to Chichester and the wider highway network without a detour through adjoining urban areas is the Pagham Road (designated B3166 north of its junction with Lower Bognor Road at the Royal Oak at Lagness).

This road is narrow and winding. In addition to commuter traffic it carries increasing numbers of farm machinery and heavy goods vehicles associated with local agriculture and horticulture, and bicycles. This is not a good mix, and the road has a poor safety record, with vehicles frequently being seen in roadside ditches and fields. Any interruption to peak time traffic flow due to road works or an accident results in serious congestion such that it has taken me nearly an hour to make the six mile journey between Pagham and Chichester.

There is no prospect of improvement to this road. The provision of an alternative for cyclists would help, and the reservation for a cycle link along Summer Lane in application P/140/16/OUT is welcome, but by no means certain, as it would require permissive or compulsory upgrade to cycle use of Honer Lane in North Mundham to complete the route, and the applicants (and the Council) have no control over this.

The main bottleneck is access from Vinnetrow Road to the Chichester Bypass at the Bognor Road roundabout. This is dangerous, and there is already serious congestion here - and not only at the weekday morning and evening commuter peaks. There is, for example, a regular buildup of traffic on Sunday mornings.

Highways England has recently consulted on a Chichester Bypass Improvement Scheme, which will affect this junction. The outcome of that consultation is not yet known. However, it should be noted that none of the options will significantly improve conditions for traffic from Pagham. Indeed Option 2, which is the only option to properly separate traffic crossing the bypass from traffic along the bypass, actually will considerably worsen Pagham's problems. This is because eastbound traffic from Hunston and Selsey, and from Birdham and The Witterings, will no longer be able to access the bypass at the Stockbridge and Whyke roundabouts, but will be channelled via North Mundham and Vinnetrow Road to the Bognor Road junction. The proposed new roundabout junction between Vinnetrow Road and the A259 will not help, because traffic from Pagham will be subordinate to increasing flows of traffic along the A259 from the expanded developments on the north side of Bognor Regis and from retail and employment uses on the former fuel depot opposite.

The traffic consultants report and addendum submitted with Hanbury's application estimates an additional 800 vehicles per peak hour arising from these three development areas in Pagham, 50% of which will use the B2166. To state (as the consultants report does) that development traffic "will not create a highway safety issue and can be accommodated on the local and wider highway network without detriment" is frankly unbelievable to anyone who has experience of current traffic conditions.

There are other infrastructure problems in the area. These are, notably, land drainage and flooding, foul sewerage capacity, primary school provision, access to primary health care (doctors surgery). There is also the issue of increasing pressure on Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve. It may be that some of these problems can be alleviated by inducements offered by the developers, secured through planning agreements (I understand that the Community Infrastructure Levy is not yet available in Arun). But there are serious questions about this. For example, is the CCG willing and able to staff a new doctors surgery? The provision of a new one or two form entry school does not seem the most efficient and educationally satisfactory way of meeting primary school needs. Do the developers have sufficient control over the land drainage network to solve the flooding problems?

In conclusion, I urge the Council not just to consider whether these applications are individually acceptable but to conclude that together their cumulative effect is unsustainable and for that reason planning permission should be refused.

Yours faithfully

Philip A Heath-Coleman