





From: Ian Brooks [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 January 2022 10:34
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objections to planning applications P/153/21/RES, P/167/21/RES, P/155/21/RES, P/158/21/RES and P/154/21/DOC

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.

Dear Sir or Madam

My name is Ian Brooks. I live at Summerfield House, Summer Lane, Pagham.

I **object** to planning applications P/153/21/RES, P/167/21/RES, P/155/21/RES, P/158/21/RES and P/154/21/DOC

1 I endorse all the concerns raised by Pagham Parish Council which have been uploaded under P/153/21/RES. I note that the objection letter written by the Council has not been uploaded to the other planning applications requested in that letter.

2 I remain extremely concerned that provision for private vehicles has not been adequately addressed both within the housing development and on the roads between Pagham and Chichester. In particular, where will the residents of this new estate work? - not in Pagham and there is limited public transport to get them to Chichester or further afield.

3 Re P/154/21/DOC, particular focus should be given to the Engineer's comments provided under P/167/21/RES and the need for a better informed study of drainage issues. I raise this because:

(a) I have a vested interest as I have a part sunken garage and as far as I can see no consideration has been given to existing soakaways during the building work undertaken by Drew Smith Homes adjacent to Summer Lane; and, more importantly

(b) Drew Smith Homes have dumped land waste arising from digging foundations for 90 homes on the 'open space' land they have had to provide immediately south of Summer Lane. This waste has been compacted into the land to limit the increase in height of the land. This will presumably impact the ability of the land to drain and historic drainage patterns. A similar approach needs to be mitigated on the new development by a properly informed, and agreed, Engineer's report AND proper supervision/ monitoring of the building works by a third party.

4 The combination of planning applications now being considered does not appear to include the school and sports pitches part of the original application for which outline planning permission was granted. Given the existing constraints on schools in Pagham it is difficult to believe that the inclusion of these facilities was not fundamental to granting the outline planning permission for the south of Summer Lane, north of Summer Lane and Hook Lane sites. For this reason the above applications should only be considered in parallel with planning detail for the school and sport pitches part of the site progressing at the same pace.

Please place this objection letter on all of the applications highlighted at the head of this letter.

Yours faithfully

Ian Brooks