

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notifications of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



From: Nicola Swann [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 November 2022 12:22
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Pagham responses

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Pagham Parish Council considered the following applications at a meeting of its Planning Committee held on 22nd November 2022:

P/153/22/RES Approval of reserved matters (appearance, layout, landscaping and scale) following outline planning permission P/140/16/OUT for the erection of 375no dwellings, together with public open space, play space, drainage, parking and associated infrastructure, landscape, ancillary and site preparation works, with access off Pagham Road. This site may affect a Public Right of Way. Amendments to layout. RESOLVED: To OBJECT to the application. A copy of the reasons for objection are attached.

P/164/222/HH – 10 Mayfield Close Pagham PO21 3NU. Removal of existing and front porch and erection of single storey front and side extension (resubmission following P/97/22/HH) RESOLVED: NO OBJECTION

Best wishes



Nicola Swann
Clerk & RFO
Pagham Parish Council



P/153/22/RES – Approval of reserved matters (appearance, layout, landscaping and scale) following outline planning permission P/140/16/OUT for the erection of 375 no dwellings, together with public open space, play space, drainage, parking and associated infrastructure, landscape, ancillary and site preparation works, with access off Pagham Road. This site may affect a Public Right of Way.

Amendments to layout.

In addition to previous comments submitted in connection with this application, Pagham Parish Council continues to OBJECT to the proposals for the following reasons:

The Council is concerned that the drainage arrangements have not been comprehensively planned with neighbouring developments. The drainage arrangements to the north of LO1 run in parallel to drains on Summer Lane. The capacity of these ditches to take the amount of water displaced by impermeable surfaces is highly unlikely to be sufficient. The entire system will rely on other riparian owners ensuring drains are kept clear, for which there is no enforcement when maintenance isn't undertaken. The ponds will take a considerable time to drain and the Council is concerned there will be deep standing water in the area. Is this area a true attenuation pond?

A footpath is shown which crosses the SUDS area. Is this to be a bridge across the SUDS area? If not, the path may at times be submerged. It is difficult to see from the plan if the fencing proposed around the SUDS area accommodates the path so as to prevent access into the SUDS area when it is full.

The footpath as shown accesses onto Summer Lane. There is no footpath or lighting on this side of Summer Lane at this point and this is dangerous. Compounding the safety issues, there is a ditch being installed by the developers of Summer Fields at this point.

These layouts do not consider the wider context in which the development is proposed. There is no connectivity to the public open space to be delivered as part of the Summer Fields development. This would surely be preferable.

There is insufficient visitor parking for the site and we foresee dangerous parking on the internal roads in the estate. As can be seen from the situation at Summer Lane during the recent half term break, there are a considerable number of visitors attracted to Pagham and particularly to this area to access the footpath network. The officer for the Summer Fields development was provided with photographic evidence showing the situation on a sunny October day – this is relevant as it shows what is to be expected on this neighbouring estate.

We are concerned the layout does not sufficiently accommodate refuse trucks, particularly at the blocks of flats.

The landscaping could be improved; there are large areas of tarmac which could be softened with more trees/shrubs.

Why are the accesses into the adjoining development proposed at Church Barton House shown? The reserved matters application for this site, which includes access, now indicate the proposed access for that development is via Summer Lane (please note, the Council is not in favour of Summer Lane as an access, but also did not feel access via the spine road past the proposed school site was an acceptable alternative either). If the access is indeed via Horns Lane, then the proposed northern footpath exit on the northern parcel is very close to the point at which Horns Lane meets Summer Lane. This could be dangerous if it is an access to a 65 dwelling development.

Again, the application should reference neighbouring proposed developments to ensure a comprehensive approach. There is a requirement for a masterplanned approach for this strategic site, which is not being followed in this application.

The play equipment provided at the various LEAP and ELAP sites lacks imagination. It would be helpful to know what the proposed heights of the various mounds proposed would be – recent experience with the mound at Summer Fields shows it is important to agree the details up front, to ensure there are no “blind spots” which might encourage antisocial behaviour.