




From: Nicola Swann [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 December 2021 11:11
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.


Further to a meeting of its Planning Committee Advisory Group held on 14th December 2021 and pursuant to a scheme of delegation dated 4th May 2021, the Clerk submits the attached comments on behalf of the Parish Council in respect of the following applications:

P/153/21/RES
P/167/21/RES
P/155/21/RES
P/158/21/RES

Best wishes



Nicola Swann
Clerk & RFO
Pagham Parish Council



P/153/21/RES. Land south of Summer Lane and West of Pagham Road Pagham. 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.

P/167/21/RES. Land south of Summer Lane and West of Pagham Road Pagham. 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 (alternative to P/159/21/RES). This site may affect a Public Right of Way.

The Council wishes to OBJECT to these applications for the following reasons:

The views of the historic St Thomas A Becket church in Pagham are not respected by the proposed development. There is no evidence presented as to how the views will be preserved for properties within the development. In addition to the views of the church, the view from the footpath in the opposite direction includes the Chichester Cathedral. This will be obliterated by the development.

The standard of design of the properties is poor – Councillors felt the properties were boxy, unimaginative and the addition of tile hanging, cladding and other design features did not alleviate the impression that the units were too similar. In a village setting such as Pagham, design should be less urban. There was insufficient character detail, particularly on the rural edge. Too much red brick was proposed. The roof heights were too high.

There appeared to be very little frontage between properties and the road in some areas, particularly on the northern plan. Many of the areas appeared cramped and was considered overdevelopment of the site.

There was a lack of respect for the Village Design Statement applicable to Pagham.

We note that in some instances, there are proposals to raise land by 1.5m, further impacting the landscape.

The Council is aware that there is a design code for the site, however much is made at ADC's Planning Committee meetings of the opportunity to "sort out" the detail of a development at reserved matters stage. There are a number of issues with this site, and the Council feels reserved matters are where these are most suitably addressed. ADC Planning Committee members specifically asked at the time the outline application was approved for reserved matters to be returned to them for consideration and they have not yet been given an opportunity to comment on the design elements of the scheme. The Parish Council does not therefore accept the comments given at the Advisory Group that it is too late to change details such as roof height, layout etc at this stage. Officers stated at the Advisory Group meeting held on 9th December 2021 that the design had been informed by an indicative "storey parameter plan". However, the Officer's Report for P/140/16/OUT clearly states that "the scale of development is a matter for consideration at reserved matters stage"

During discussions with developers, the Council had been advised that there would be bungalows fronting onto Pagham Road. There did not appear to be any bungalows in the development.

There is insufficient detail about how the allotments will be laid out – where is the provision for parking? Will there be power/water?

There is a consultation response from Historic England dated 18th November. The Council would like to understand what information Historic England were provided with in order to come to the conclusion that there were no comments to make at the time? Are the District Council planning to seek views of specialist conservation and archaeological advisers as suggested?

The ecological survey (30/11/21) states at 4.10 that WBS surveys are being undertaken at the site and the Pagham SPA enhancement zone. The Council has evidence that the crops on which the geese would ordinarily feed have been burnt off, and survey results could therefore become unreliable. In addition, we have seen no response to the report submitted to Arun District Council's Karl Roberts on 6 July 2021 prepared by the Sussex Ornithological Society Conservation Officer which calls into question the efficacy of the Brent Geese Mitigation Plan. If the land made available does not provide one for one alternative feeding grounds for the overwintering birds, further provision in the layout must be made.

The Council would like to support the comments of the Local Highways Authority in respect of the need for far more detail and consideration to be given to the proposed school site. Whilst it is accepted that it is not within the gift of the applicant to deliver the school, all the strategic sites in Pagham are reliant upon its delivery and it must be assumed to be going ahead. It is vital that adequate account is taken of the traffic generated by the school – it does not just serve this site, and parents will inevitably drive to the school from the Pagham North developments. We support the calls for a road safety audit, but believe a wider spine road is preferable as parents will, despite measures to encourage otherwise, park on the road to drop off and pick up children.

The Council would also like to see the points raised by WSCC in relation to the cycle route resolved. The delivery of the cycle route for Pagham is a key project in the Council's view, to provide a safe alternative to Pagham Road for access to Chichester.

In relation to drainage of the site, we note the holding objection of ADC's drainage engineers and the considerable amount of work required to satisfy them that the drainage proposed is deliverable. The report from the drainage officer has identified the very poor presentation of the drainage situation on the land known as Church Barton Farm.

There is definitely a need for a proper survey of how the ditches drain the area. The current analysis of how it works is simply wrong. Our Chairman has lived in this area and farmed this land over the last 20 years. He has walked the footpaths and borders with his dogs every day for 21 years. He is therefore aware of how the land works and which way the drains run in relation to the lie of the land. He comments that the current plans of the developers are not going to work as they contain erroneous flow plans. They do not cover the whole year in their surveys. No attempt has been made to prove the ditch system is in good working order and in fact it is not, due to poor maintenance and culvert blockages. The extent of the integrated ditch system for the whole area must be assessed to avoid flooding. Finally, the seasonal flow of surface water and soil drainage water interacts with the rise and fall of the ground water levels. This causes the ditches to be dry part of the year and in full flow at others, especially in the January to May period. The increase in the covering of free draining land with impervious concrete and tarmac will obviously create serious run off increase.

Unfortunately, 2 of the main drains run into a too small culvert at the south end of Pagham road. The intention to raise ground level for some areas, as much as 1.5 metres will cause a problem to the natural drainage of the areas covered and require extra planning avoid neighborhood ponding and extra run off.

In conclusion the drainage of low lying flat areas is far reaching and therefore down the line investigation is essential to avoid causing flooding beyond what is deemed to be the extent of the drainage effects.