



CTC Bognor Regis and Chichester Part of Cycling UK



Hon Secretary: Edwin Jones, 10 Brooklands, Pagham, BOGNOR REGIS, West Sussex, PO21 4QH

4 February 2017

6 - FEB 2017

RECEIVED

Dear Sirs

Re Pagham P/140/16/OUT Land South of Summer Lane & West of Pagham Road Pagham

I write to make formal objection on behalf of my organisation to this application. Although there are many reasons for objection which have been dealt with in other comments I will confine this letter to issues relating to the safe use of bicycles in the area both by our members and other residents in the local area especially Aldwick, Rose Green, Nyetimber and Pagham.

This development of 400 homes at Summer Lane will inevitably lead to a substantial increase in traffic volume on the Pagham Road and B2166 and other local roads. In the event that any of the other pending applications for the area were approved the traffic increase would be very substantial. The current other applications are P/134/16/OUT Land North of Sefter Road, Pagham (250 homes) and P/6/17/OUT Land North of Hook Lane, Pagham (300 homes)

Increased local traffic will affect the safety of cyclists and decrease still further the inclination of people to use cycling as an alternative and sustainable means of transport. This applies to both the route to Bognor Regis town centre and the route to the A259 cycle route reached by the already very busy and fast Chalcraft Lane. This will have a considerable affect on the route to Chichester via the Pagham Road and B2166

As well as living in Pagham I have been cycling in the area for 40 years. I can therefore bring some real world experience to the issues as opposed to the theory in the Transport Statement. The route along Pagham Road to Chichester from its junction with Hook Lane where the speed limit ends and on past the Sefter Road junction and on to the Junction with the B2166 at Lagness and on to Runcton is exceptionally unsuitable for cycling even with current traffic levels. The road is very busy, very narrow and with numerous bends. It is very difficult for cars to overtake cyclists requiring them to pass too close due to constant oncoming traffic. The road is well used by HGV's which cannot overtake often for a long time due to the bends and oncoming traffic. Despite being an experienced cyclist I avoid using the road except when traffic levels are much lower such as early Sundays and evenings. I only use the road at other times if time constraints make it unavoidable. Going from Pagham to Chichester via the A259 cycle route is much further and takes much longer. This is probably the reason why some cyclists use the Pagham Road.

The Transport Assessment December 2016 includes on Page 8 at Para 1.4 that the (application) proposal is to provide

Viii The safeguarding of land to help link to the existing cycle route between Pagham Harbour and Chichester with Pagham Road via the site.

The site ownership boundary Plan and the Plan showing the proposed Cycle link indicate that the Applicants own or have control of Summer Lane and the small field crossed by the existing footpath as far as the Rife. The next field as far as Honer Lane is owned by others.

Regardless of any S106 agreement there should as a minimum be a condition imposed that the applicants, if consent is granted, should upgrade the status of Summer Lane from footpath to Cyclepath and fund the paving to cyclepath standard of the footpath from the end of Summer

Lane to the Bridge over the Rife. This to be independent of any arrangements or progress on the balance of the cycle route.

The proposed cycle route from Pagham along Summer Lane and across fields to Honer Lane is part of National Cycle Network 2 (NCN 2) designated by Sustrans and following the South Coast. That part of this National route has been blocked by at least 15 years of landowner resistance and now lack of funds. To clarify the status of the NCN 2 it should be noted that this is a long distance National cycle route which, when complete, will link Dover in Kent with St. Austell in Cornwall via the south coast of England. The entire route can be viewed on a map on the Sustrans Website and this does not now show the route from South Mundham to Pagham but shows a gap. From Exeter to Dover there are very few gaps left but one of them is from South Mundham to Pagham and Bognor Regis. See

<http://www.sustrans.org.uk/ncn/map/route/route-2>

It is notable that the 2 large gaps in this National Route are in the Arun District

The completion of the cycle route from South Mundham to Pagham would substantially alleviate the affect on local cycling of this development and if the Council decides to grant Planning consent it should only be with a s106 agreement to provide the funds for route completion all the way to South Mundham and if appropriate jointly with any of the other developments mentioned if they receive consent.

It should be noted that the funds to complete this route ought to be comparatively modest with most of it already paved. The entirety from the start at Summer Lane, Pagham to the southern side of South Mundham is private but subject to a footpath. If no agreement can be reached with landowners for upgrade to a cycle route it would be necessary for funds to be provided for a Public Path Creation Order under the Highways Act 1980 to upgrade the footpath to a bridleway which would allow cycling. The requirements of the Act would certainly be met.

Work would be required to create a paved cycle path across the 2 fields. It should be noted that paving is essential and if the landowner will not agree there should be developer funding for compulsory purchase. Although technically not permitted I and some other cyclists have used this route for the last 40 years but only from April to October. It is unusable in the winter because the soil creates a sticky thick mud. This forms a thick coating on tyres and blocks mudguards and if you get off the bike covers the shoes. Deep ruts are formed from tractors. The problems have been exacerbated in recent years since the creation of the reservoir with water draining from it and flooding the lower part of the field in recent wet winters to a depth of about 2 inches. The path here would have to be raised about a foot for part of the route. Although the often used procedure is to construct across fields with a gravel path this would restrict the use of it by cyclists when the rest of the route is paved and especially with the water problems. A good local example is the tarmac paved path round the field from North Mundham to Hunston part of Sustrans Route 88.

I would give a description of the field part of the route. From near the end of summer Lane the footpath crosses a very narrow field to a bridge over the Pagham Rife. Distance is only about 100 metres. The route across the next field to Honer Lane is approximately 500 metres. In this second field the path follows the field boundary. The land currently given over to the footpath and tractor movements is between about 5 metres at the narrowest and 15 metres at the widest where the reservoir adjoins. The length of the part of the path in the middle to the SE of the reservoir where there has been previous flooding is about 100 metres. This will need to be raised for all year use. This middle part of the field has not been cultivated in recent year due to flooding.

To give an idea of the substantial benefit to the local community of the completion of this path for cycling I would give my estimate of vehicle use on the route.

1. Summer Lane - less than one car per hour
2. Honer Lane to South Mundham - 1 car per hour
3. South Mundham to North Mundham- 10 cars per hour

There is currently another gap in the route of about 400 metres at North Mundham where the B2166 has to be used but after that it is a paved off road cycle path to Hunston and then the canal side cycle path to near to the centre of Chichester. The completion of this route would lead to increased cycle use for leisure and commuting and go a long way towards meeting the sustainability requirements of the developers and the Council.

It should be noted that the final version of the West Sussex Walking and Cycling Strategy 2016-2026 can be found at <https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-plans-and-policies/roads-and-travel-plans-and-policies/west-sussex-walking-and-cycling-strategy-2016-2026/>

This includes a list of 318 top priority cycling schemes or routes for West Sussex. The route mentioned in this letter is included in the list. Page 40 in the final document. Page 38 in earlier drafts.

The route joins Cycle Route 88 (the Pagham Harbour Cycle Route) between South Mundham and North Mundham at the junction with the road to Fisher. For the avoidance of doubt it should be noted that there is no possibility of Pagham being joined with Cycle Route 88 via Church Lane and the Pagham Harbour Wall footpath. The Pagham Harbour Authority are strongly opposed to any Cycle use and there are good wildlife concerns in that area.

If a s106 Agreement is considered you should be able to get more details about the requirements and probable costs from Sustrans. I believe that WSCC would also be involved.

I have or will be writing similar letters with regard to the other pending planning applications with some variations depending on their own Transport Statements.

Regards



Edwin Jones

Hon Secretary

CTC Bognor Regis and Chichester

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