

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Neil Crowther
Sent: 13 November 2018 16:36
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Planning meeting on November 13, 2018; Applications P/140/16/OUT; P/6/17/OUT ; P/134/16/OUT ; and other associated matters
Importance: High

From: June Hamilton [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 November 2018 20:07

[REDACTED]

Importance: High

To all Arun District Counsellors, David Innes, Neil Crowther, Liz Fitcher, Jackie Follis, Karl Roberts and Nigel Lynn,

From Mrs June Hamilton, Flint Barn, Lagness, (Parish of Pagham), West Sussex PO201AZ email

[REDACTED]

PLEASE NOTE THIS LETTER/EMAIL IS BEING COPIED TO DAVID EASTON AND NEIL CROWTHER (and others) AS REQUIRED FOR OFFICIAL PLANNING COMPLAINTS, (AMONGST OTHER MATTERS).

PLEASE ALSO NOTE THAT THIS LETTER CONTAINS THE PREVIOUS REASONS (AND QUOTES FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE FILE WITH ARUN, (WHICH ARUN HAS RECENTLY REMOVED FROM ITS WEBSITE PORTAL), AS TO WHY THE DEEPLY CONTENTIOUS DEVELOPMENTS AT HOOK LANE AND SURROUNDING AREA WERE PREVIOUSLY REFUSED, PLUS A FEW OTHER IMPORTANT MATTERS.

Dear Counsellor,

If you were one of the committee members **who declined** to accept the Hook Lane planning application at the extraordinary October 24TH planning meeting, **I would like to thank you personally, and also on behalf of all local residents, most sincerely, for taking the time and trouble to try to understand the problems with the applications currently (at least supposedly) under scrutiny,** especially when you will be/will have been under serious pressure to comply with your various leaders' insistence that their wishes be rubber stamped with your approval, failing which there would be "dire consequences" and so on, as per the threats made to you at the last meeting by Councillor Ricky Bower and Councillor Neil Crowther at the meeting. The people of Pagham, Bersted, Aldwick and Rose Green are most grateful to you, **and will no doubt reflect their gratitude in the forthcoming elections next May.**
Thank you for standing up for democracy in tricky circumstances.

By driving through this inappropriately named "Local" Plan with a coach and horses when so many genuinely local residents were so seriously opposed to it and also (probably deliberately) confused by it, (not surprising as the document itself was dreadfully flawed), Arun District Council has created a huge mess of its own making which **must absolutely not be resolved by any further duplicity or secrecy.**

This letter contains much needed information to assist you in the run up to Tuesday's planning meeting, as I am sure the senior counsellor's pressure on you to change your minds will be immense. That said, the vote over Hook Lane **was** taken at the meeting and noted – Arun's planning senior apparatchiks lost - although there now appears to be a vague attempt to rerun the decision at a later date, such Arun manipulation must absolutely not be tolerated. They pay lip service to democracy, but they seem only to like it up to the point where it becomes inconvenient to their predetermined aims. (Predetermination of such planning applications and Local Plans in local government is not legitimate, by the way).

If you are one of the councillors who voted **in favour** of the Hook Lane and Pagham South planning applications, then I would ask you to kindly look at the information below and disregard any improper and inappropriate threats from senior councillors and take your public service duties as a committee member to assess every planning application **only** on its genuine merits most **seriously**. Arun District's Council's first duty of care is to the people who **already** live in the District, not the enrichment of the nation's developers and their agents, or indeed, the future coffers of the Arun District Council. I would also ask the committee members to consider whether in fact they have ever visited the proposed sites at Pagham and Bersted, and if so, whether they have visited during peak hours, in gridlocked traffic, with dreadful pollution levels and the often widespread flooding? If not, you should do so now, before confirming your vote. And what about the nature reserve, the well-documented and endangered wildlife and what about the Roman archaeological remains? What about the complete lack of infrastructure? The conditions are far worse now than they were when this application was turned down previously during the winter of 1999-2000, because so many other developments have NOW been imposed on the area. It is not legitimate to pass outline planning applications with infrastructure such as Councillor Bower described as "aspirational" at the last planning meeting referred to above - either improvements and conditions are a **requirement** - or they are not. "Aspirational" has no legal standing and therefore creates no obligations and thus offers no protection. Requirements and conditions must be properly incorporated into all current and future planning permissions. Outline planning permission is indicative that the site is basically appropriate but it must not be pushed through without appropriate back ups and condition. If in doubt say no, If you are unsure but say yes, it is much harder (if not impossible) to say no later. Some Counsellors defend inappropriate development applications with claims that "it is not our job to cure existing problems" – however, this is usually an excuse for their own interests, (no one was ever asking them to do that) – but it **is** their job to **do nothing that makes existing problems**

any worse. The public, especially the local population has the right to expect them not to approve inappropriate schemes that do make current problems worse, but which benefit the local council, particularly since most of those problems are the result of recent inappropriate overdevelopment, of which there has been much in the last nine years.

Then there is the archaeology. The site has been designated as part of the coastal plain which is rich in archaeological remains, particularly those of later prehistoric and Roman date. Notably, when this case went to appeal last time, (as it will again, if not to a judicial review), it was a stipulation that the site must be examined and thoroughly assessed by suitably qualified archaeologists with trial trenches recording and sampling of all ancient features thereby exposed, before any construction whatsoever may take place. I wonder whether the potential buyer has been informed of this?

You see, the planning apparatchiks of ADC have been rumbled! If you were looking for suitable heavy-density development sites for the new local plan, then Pagham area is just about the last place in the world you would (or should) even consider - whether you were properly qualified or just completely sane, and with no vested interests. The flooding is dire and real, despite ADC's claims that floods are only a once in 100 year risk. The reality is quite different. The Parish of Pagham suffers from all types of flooding: coastal and tidal flooding, fluvial (river) flooding, flash flooding, groundwater flooding, and drain and sewer flooding. My home (built in 1700) has been ruined by it and we cannot rebuild it until the problems of the current risks are dealt with, this requires complete tanking, subsidence corrections and the deviation of various water flows. I can't afford it and now have a home which is uninhabitable, unsaleable, uninsurable. I have sent many photographs of the flooding over the last nine years to ADC, but they persist in their claim that it isn't happening.

You cannot build thousands of homes on an overpopulated flood plain, with no rail network, no safe cycle routes, no infrastructure, gridlocked roads locked in by the coast on one side, the river on the other and the dreaded M27 at the top, and with pollution levels approaching the legal limit, and expect nothing bad to happen as a result. Concreting of areas this size will greatly increase the local flooding.

The pre-determined sites selected for the local plan – and we know they were pre-determined because some Counsellors “quietly” invited developers and land agents to view the sites long before the areas for the local plan were officially chosen – unfortunately all sites are situated on some of the finest agricultural land in the county and very close (in some cases illegally close) to a much treasured nature reserve that provides protection and reproduction grounds for many endangered species.

The micro-climate sheltered by the South Downs and the Isle of Wight produces at least three outdoor crops per summer and provides one third of all the fresh fruit and vegetables sold in the UK. The very high water table which has gone up by five feet over the last ten years is still rising, which is a worry. However, the high water table is very helpful to growers during periods of drought and local agriculture is never damaged by drought. Combined with the long sunshine hours, these factors all result in one of the finest growing areas in the country. Why would you wish to decimate this wonderful asset when the government says you must not?

The government promised that future housing developments would take place on brownfield sites wherever possible. We have plenty of brownfield land available in the district but no effort has been made by ADC to make use of any of it. Indeed, there is room for 5,000 houses at the now disused airfield at Ford. This was once a recommended site with no problems at all, and sewerage plans nearby and also, its own railway hub – but perhaps that was a little too close to Arundel, Littlehampton and East Preston for the liking of the perceived electorate closest to ADC, as it was eventually turned down by ADC! There are also many smaller brownfield sites elsewhere, not quite so large, but infinitely more suitable than those currently (allegedly) under scrutiny.

Traffic is dire, it was occasionally bad when I first moved here 25 years ago, but it has got steadily worse and is now utterly dreadful. Pagham has no railway hub, and a hopelessly inadequate bus service, so all journeys are by car and there are four hours every day during which it is almost impossible to exit from my own driveway onto the Lower Bognor road. This has already reached a level that is unacceptable. It is usual practise for a planning committee to demand a proper traffic survey, especially in areas where there are already problems, but then ADC don't really seem to want to know about them and keep dismissing the idea that there is any problem - and presumably therefore did not insist on a proper traffic survey one on this occasion. A “sensibility study” is a ridiculous

substitute and on no value at all. In promoting these developments, ADC might as well be saying that more high density housing estates are needed in downtown Croydon – except that Croydon has a railway station, and we do not.

Reasons for Arun's enthusiasm for these developments

OK, so what possible reason could there be for ADC to encourage high density planning permissions on previously refused development sites, sites that actually already flood every year, and that will increase flooding to neighbouring properties, on sites of archaeological importance, and which are legally too close to a highly regarded nature reserve protecting many endangered species in the area??? To do this in an area with no transport hub, terrible roads, terrible pollution, and no social infrastructure, particularly medical and educational, and where hospitals are already at breaking point seems like madness to me. But ADC remains rigidly in denial.

(1). You may have noticed that all the sites are on the very edge of Arun District, but fairly close to Chichester District, with all that city's facilities and infrastructure – except of course that you first have to get there, and that is difficult. We have a big new school now, which is already causing great traffic difficulties and it is barely open yet.

School-age children in Pagham will never go to school in Arundel or Littlehampton for example, because it is much too far away and the journey could easily take one and a half hours on terrible roads in rush hour traffic. They will all go to hospital at St Richards or Queen Alexandra's when necessary, not to Worthing hospitals. And so on, so Arun will collect all the Council tax from all these new residents but will provide nothing for the new residents or the existing ones, in the way of facilities or infrastructure, the expense of nearly all that infrastructure will fall on Chichester District Council.

(2). On the other hand, Council tax aside, ADC will benefit from four/five times the amount of council tax assessed for each house built under the New Homes Bonus Incentive Scheme. To check the details for yourself, google New Homes Bonus Incentive Scheme, in the House of Commons library, work it out approximately and you can see that even if the average Council tax is only £1,500 a year, and it will almost certainly be more, the new homes bonuses will come to £30,000,000 (ie 30 millions) if they build the 20,000 houses that they are intending to build in this area. Even if they only build half that number, they will still be eligible £15,000,000. The idea of that size of bonus without having to contribute to any infrastructure seems criminal to me. What was that government thinking of? (Looking good politically as a provider of new homes, I would suggest. Well, this government has shot itself in the foot and the Conservative party will not look good again probably for decades, sadly, I say this as a lifelong conservative voter now looking for a new party).

This is not a comprehensive list of objections, because then this letter would need to continue for many more pages and it is already longer than I would wish. However, here are some helpful verbatim quotes from the planning files of 1999-2000 and onwards (now removed from the website), detailing reasons given for the previous rejection of this site for development and comments that apply equally to the other sites (not listed in any particular order of importance). **Please consider how completely they contradict the current stance of ADC** who accuses the public who disagree with of being Nimbies. Having now seen where these councillors all live, I do feel the boot is on the other foot. I hope these following quotes from ADC's own papers will help you with whatever you wish to say at the next meeting about reasons for your earlier decision (please do not abstain). I will be arriving early and bringing the files with me in case you doubt any of the truth of what I say in these matters Arun has taken down the files from the earlier decision, from the ADC portal and you may freely inspect the papers as you wish:

Effect of Traffic

No traffic survey has been conducted. Why not? The situation is already dire – and ADC wants to build another 20,000 homes on land which is effectively a cul-de-sac. Why?

Inadequate infrastructure

Who will pay? Where will they go to the doctor and the dentist?

Effect on wildlife

Well documented, but ADC rejects it and also rejects the recommendations of the Campaign for Rural England. Bats, water voles, hedgehogs, brown hares, Brent geese and many other bird species will be adversely affected and diminished as a result.

Loss of View

There will be considerable loss of view and also of daylight for many existing residents, and hence a diminution of property value also.

Strategic Gap

Councillor Philippa Dart, Senior Landscape Officer wrote: “ I have a number of concerns about this proposal.”

1. The site is within the Pagham and Selsey Strategic Gap. **The local plan states: “only in compelling circumstances will development be permitted within the strategic gap”.** No such compelling circumstances were found.
2. This site is visible from a range of locations on the South Downs.
3. The proposed structure planting may ameliorate the impact of the development when viewed from the North but will not prevent its impacts on the open countryside.
4. The Public Open Space is being used as a screen to the north. Play areas would have to be provided throughout the development in accordance with the Local Plan and NPFA guidelines.
5. Hedgerows should be retained on the site and managed appropriately.

Contrary to government policies

Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land is shocking negligent and contravenes Government policy

Effect on homes/roads during construction

Because of the way that developers build (according to order instead of treating the project as a whole), they will only build at the rate at which they sell, i.e. in arrears, and therefore it could easily take 10 or 15 years to finish the whole project. Is it really fair to impose 10 or 15 years of serious disruption on a peaceful, rural community of many retired people (that will be longer than some of them live), for an unknown and unspecified need?

The loss of Prime agricultural land

Reduction in property values

Overcrowding caused by the proposed developments will certainly cause a drop in established property values

Many previous developments allowed

Yes, too many and they are not selling

Fields flood

The actual fields on which developments are proposed already flood every year, and Arun has been sent many photos of them, which continue to be ignored.

Is more development actually needed?

There is no proof that all this housing is actually needed – they are not “affordable” homes although in these huge developments there is always a token of affordable homes, they are houses worth something approaching £500,000 on average, as witnessed on other surrounding new development sites, still under construction despite planning permission being given many years back.

Portsmouth Water wrote to Arun in March 1999

“I would advise you that the Company’s distribution network within this area is fully committed. Therefore, any development within this area the Company will require an offsite main to be laid from (1) the Company’s 600mm main at Lagness along the Pagham Road to the site, or (2) from the Company’s 600mm main at Lagness along the Pagham Road to the site of (2) from the Company’s 600mm main in Chalcroft Lane alone Hewarts Lane and Rose Green Road to the proposed development.

Of course the cost of laying the offsite watermain will be at the developer’s cost.

Southern Water wrote to Arun in March 1999 to head of planning services at Arun District Council:

Wastewater Treatment and Foul Sewerage

The public foul sewers in Hook Lane connect to Nyetimber Crescent wastewater pumping station that pumps flows to treatment at Pagham Works. The pumping station operates at the limit of its capacity in wet weather. Southern Water has a Drainage Area Plan for the Pagham area and would need to assess where the development could connect additional wastewater, and whether it is necessary and possible to up-rate the existing pumping station.

The developer would need to provide the infrastructure to serve the development, including up-rating any existing sewerage to provide capacity for the new development.

It is essential that any outline planning permission granted is made subject to a planning condition requiring that the means of foul sewerage disposal is to the satisfaction of the local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water Services.

The development would drain to the relatively small Pagham Wastewater Treatment works and Southern Water needs to check that flows can be accommodate here. The phasing of the development would need to be co-ordinated if necessary with the provision of treatment infrastructure by Southern Water.

Surface Water Disposal

There are no public surface water sewers in the vicinity of this site. (This still applies today).

Surface water will need to discharge to the local land drainage ditches. The environment Agency and/or Council's own technical staff should comment on land drainage, the adequacy of the local watercourses and the need for storm water storage.

Where necessary surface water storage should be provided in open storage ponds as part of open space areas on development sites. In these cases it is anticipated that the District Council would take over responsibility for maintenance of the pond – the developer is advised to discuss this with your Council before planning permission is granted.

It is essential that any planning permission granted is made subject to a planning permission condition requiring that development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of surface water disposal have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water Services."

The Planning Inspectorate wrote in November 1999:

(Under the Town and Country Planning Act)

Wastewater Treatment Foul Sewerage and Surface Water Drainage

Southern Water made comments on the planning application saying "I enclose a copy of our letter dated March 5, 1999. Since then, further investigation of the local sewerage infrastructure has been made.

Wastewater treatment capacity is not available at the small Pagham wastewater treatment works (situated west of Pagham) to accommodate additional flow from this development.

In addition capacity is not available in the local wastewater pumping station at Nyetimber Crescent on the public sewerage system.

Southern Water has made an assessment of the sewer capacity using an up-to-date Drainage Area Plan of the sewer network. The results show that capacity would be available in the Carlton Avenue wastewater pumping station that transfers flows to the Bognor Regis area where Southern Water is constructing a new wastewater treatment works **at Ford**. *(At Ford there is capacity for 5,000 homes on a brownfield site at the old aerodrome - jmh).*

Health

West Sussex Health Authority wrote to Arun on April 12, 1999

"However, upon investigation, The Rose Green Surgery would be the nearest practice to the development and is already stretched beyond capacity. The premises in Pagham are inadequate to take on such a significant number of patients and the nearest alternative practices are either in the centre of Bognor or Selsey. In these areas they do not have any spare capacity for the patients concerned. If the application is approved then I am certain that Dr. Ridley would close his list of patients and require the Health Authority to allocate patients on a rota system to practices some distance from their residence."

We would therefore request that the Council refuse the planning application on this site, due to the limited provision for general medical services in the area.

(nothing has changed here)

The most important reasons for rejecting the development site are:

1. Flooding

- 2. Excessive traffic at a dangerous level, and most important, no safe access on and off the site, a reason given previously for refusing planning permission**
- 3. Pollution levels already too high and almost at illegal levels**
- 4. No railway available**
- 5. Every journey has to be by car, cycling is highly dangerous on these roads**
- 6. No medical infrastructure (*we have to drive 10 miles for a doctor's appointment.*)**
- 7. Loss of prime agricultural land, just when we are going to need it the most**
- 8. Loss of protected wildlife and valuable natural habitat and adverse effect on nature reserve**

Please see attached (previous) documents relating to this application. Since this was written, conditions have become considerably worse.

Yours sincerely,

June Hamilton