

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to confirm and update my objections to the above proposed developments for Pagham.

There are now additional issues to take into account as well as to reiterate some long standing ones why the proposed housing should be massively scaled down and apportioned fairly throughout the Arun district, why are we expected to accept 35% of Arun's new build housing quota?

1. The revised application for Sefter now has added another 30 houses and will no doubt add more when the proposed 1FE school (WSCC need a 2FE school but it is not allowed for in this planning application) is not built adding another maybe 30-50 properties so now it would be over 300 properties, just not sustainable especially regarding flooding and even more vehicles on the disintegrating and congested Pagham Road.

2. Pagham Road, it is important to again to reiterate the condition of this road, it cannot not take large volumes of **extra traffic**. Barfoots have numerous large lorries up and down, which if travelling the opposite way to a lorry leaves one fearful regarding being run off the road as their width takes up their own side of the road and at times straying onto the opposite carriageway, there are tyre marks in many places along the verge where vehicles have needed more road width than there is allowed. New properties currently being built behind the Inglenook Hotel mean **extra traffic** (90 plus 45 new builds). Church Barton holiday resort have lengthened their holiday season into the Autumn so more **extra traffic**, Proposed development on Pagham Road South will mean **extra traffic** from 400 plus new builds. Traffic from proposed Hook Lane development will mean **extra traffic** from 350 plus new builds. As stated above Sefter will now have even more **extra traffic** with the proposed 280 plus new builds. It does not take much working out to see that with all this **extra traffic** (generally each household has at least 2 cars) added to the already congested Pagham Road; plus congestion in the surrounding areas as people try to find short cuts onto the Pagham Road, will add to the already dangerous driving conditions and will be totally unsustainable. Let's not forget the proposal in Bersted for 2,000 plus new builds which will have knock on effect to the surrounding areas and of course funnel into Pagham Road. WSCC appear to be complacent in their attitude and support of the people of Pagham regarding Pagham Road and don't take our concerns seriously enough, this is a disintegrating and dangerous road, there have been many accidents, I myself have seen some with cars in the ditch, it cannot take the increased volume of traffic from all the proposed housebuilding. Pagham Road currently needs attention and urgent upgrading let alone with the future proposals in mind.

Chichester free school will add to the traffic in the area with up to 1260 pupils when open, adding to an already busy link between Pagham and the Whyke roundabout A27 junction. No doubt cars will be used for transport; certainly the young children starting in the 4 years old + age group will need transporting. There will be a cumulative effect of more traffic on the surrounding roads exacerbating an already congested area especially at peak times.

3. It seems amazing that for small developments of less than 100 new builds the developers do not have to contribute to Police funding to help manage their extra workload. With several small proposed projects the cumulative effect is that there is a loss of money for which current householders are paying for with increased council tax. Why is this policy allowed, should it not be updated to included new developments of less than 100 builds?

4. Agriculture; I feel very strongly about this, why are you even allowing proposals through that are for Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land, they should be immediately dismissed with a firm NO! We have the best light levels in the country for agricultural land with many companies wanting to secure rights to farm in our area. Why are you not directing housebuilders towards brownfield land as is Government policy? The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 112 states "**Local Planning Authorities should take into**

account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is deemed to be necessary, Local Planning Authorities should seek to use areas of poor quality land in preference to that of a higher quality" May I remind you that Ford fits the bill and is much more suitable for new house builds than Pagham. As I have said before with BREXIT we will need all the good agricultural land that we have especially with our rising population. We currently import far too much of our produce and our farmers need to be supported.

5. Pagham Harbour, the jewel in the crown of Pagham is at risk, with more development comes more cats and dogs, predators to ground nesting birds, putting them more at risk, with fewer hedgerows and less protection that they are used to being removed. We will see a decline in our wildlife which will suffer from creeping urbanisation.

To conclude Chichester Hospital, the GP surgeries, local NHS dentists – mine is currently not taking on patients, they all at capacity, where are you going to get people to staff these facilities? The hospital is not taking on staff, I was told by a doctor ‘there is no money’, small procedures like cataracts, skin tags and others are not routinely available as ‘there is no money’.

Please take note of these very real concerns and treat us Pagham folk fairly, apportion these proposed building developments throughout the district, don’t just dump developments in this outer corner of Arun. Long term there may be regrets when flooding occurs, sewerage problems occur as capacity has nearly been reached. Food shortages occur – remember the broccoli shortage last year when imports were needed but not available.

Yours faithfully

Shirley Bass

1 Downlands Close

Nyetimber

Pagham

PO21 3QA

27/4/2018

