

4 Church lane

Pagham

PO21 4NS

08/01/2022

OBJECTION Re:

P/158/21/RES

P/167/21/RES

P/155/21/RES

P/153/21/RES

I am writing my objection to the above developments in the sad knowledge that Arun District Council and its 'Planning Committee' will take no heed whatsoever.

We are told, 'we have heard this all before'. You might want to ask yourselves why this should be – if local informed people keep raising the same issues it is because they are of vital importance and should be appropriately listened to, not dismissed.

We are told 'local people's views lack evidence'! You prefer to look at 'evidence' funded by and provided by so called experts bought in for a day or two by developers with a huge financial vested interest. You ignore the views, knowledge and experience of people who really know this community based upon decades of experience. I wonder how many of the 'Planning Committee' have visited Pagham, seen its rich natural environment and the problems it already faces with flooding, sewerage proposal and poor transport access.

So at the risk of 'we have heard all this before', I object for the following reasons to the above developments:

1. These developments are subject to High Flood Risk Assessments.. Projections on rising sea levels due to climate change actually show this land could be under water by 2050. It is surely foolhardy in the extreme to even consider such a large development when this is predicted. A quick internet search shows this information quite clearly.
2. The antiquated sewerage system cannot cope with current demand. At times of heavy rainfall, which are much more frequent, again due to climate change, raw sewerage is regularly poured into Pagham Harbour, a Ramsar Site and specific protection area. This discharge of raw sewerage has been well publicised and Southern Water are responsible.
3. Loss of habitat accounts for an appalling drop in bird life, we have lost over %80 of our songbirds in the last 50 years and this proposal strips out hedges and trees so desperately needed in such an important habitat. Mitigation should be offered in a large community copse at the very least.

4. These fields are the traditional habitat of endangered brent geese and again they have used these fields for generations observed by local people but dismissed as lacking evidence by Arun. Mitigation offered is derisory and inappropriate.
5. Close proximity of a large scale development to a vital habitat for birds and wildlife will help to cause further loss in our already fragile ecosystem. Arun really should want to protect and nurture such places not destroy them. I look with envy at what other much more forward thinking Councils have done in England by working in partnership with organisations to improve biodiversity and protect fragile environments , whereas Arun and their developers simply want to destroy them for financial gain. What a tragedy!!!

Jane Weston

I would like this objection posted on your website.