

**From:** Hannah Riddle on behalf of Planning.Responses  
**Sent:** 16 February 2022 11:59  
**To:** Planning Scanning  
**Subject:** FW: P/178/21/OUT

**Hannah Riddle**  
Planning Apprentice  
Planning Services



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

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

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



**From:** Daun Johnson  
**Sent:** 16 February 2022 11:28  
**To:** Planning.Responses  
**Subject:** FW: P/178/21/OUT

**Daun Johnson**  
Technical Support Unit Assistant,  
Planning Services



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

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

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



**From:** Shirley Bass  
**Sent:** 16 February 2022 11:03  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: P/178/21/OUT

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.

I have now added my name and address to this objection, I forgot to do this on the email sent a few minutes ago.

Shirley Bass

---

**From:** Shirley Bass [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 February 2022 11:00  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** P/178/21/OUT

Objection P/178/21/OUT

I strongly question the need for more housing in our area which would add to the large scale developments already in the pipeline for Pagham. There are three large sites already approved by yourselves, with approximately 1200 dwellings to be built, how many more are you proposing to send our way? We are going to be double the size of the village soon and akin to a small town!

In addition, the proposals for another 106 dwellings would add approximately another 200 + vehicles plus at least 2000 from other developments all funnelling out onto Pagham Road. There needs to be a good infrastructure to support these vehicles – and there isn't, we are a no-through road. Here in Pagham we only have limited country road access in and out and that goes onto the already overcrowded, problematic and dangerous A27 near Chichester. Pagham Road is already overburdened with traffic: agricultural vehicles, lorries, tourists, as well as locals. It is the most dangerous C class road in the county of West Sussex; an old road that has never been upgraded and it cannot cope now with the amount of daily traffic. It is unclassified south of the B2166 Lower Bognor Road. Both roads were essentially narrow winding country lanes. With roadside ditches and often adverse camber and poor drainage with several accidents; there is a real safety issue with the ever increasing traffic. There are currently no plans or funding to improve the Pagham Road. Currently there are traffic cones at several places along the side of Pagham Road where you can see that vehicles have gone over the verge, if a vehicle goes into the ditch – which is very close to the verge on this narrow road, there will be an accident and there have been quite a few.

There are virtually no new jobs available: the main employment coming from agriculture, tourism and retail. And on proposing to build on prime agricultural land this is reducing one of those job areas. Not only that, as a country, we are importing more and more food at a time when we should be producing it ourselves. This is just not sustainable. If nothing else the Covid Virus Pandemic should have taught us that we need to be more self-sufficient and not reliant on other countries for our essentials including food.

Prime farming land is being depleted with house building, in this particular area, with a micro climate especially suited to agriculture, I believe about 10% of the country's vegetables are produced. As 40% of our total food is imported and rising we feel there is a good case for using suitable brown field sites for housing without the pressure on the environment that these proposed sites will bring?

There are known historical flooding issues for this area with surface flooding on the fields and at times over Pagham Road itself. The 106 houses will add to the concreting over of the surrounding fields at this end of Pagham, in fact this proposed development will be opposite another development on the Hook Lane and Pagham Road junction, the flooding can only get worse. Further, the local sewers can just about cope now. There is a major concern amongst those of us in the Hook Lane vicinity that this house building will exacerbate the flooding risk by removing more local farmland which takes some of the run off of water. This ultimately would be pumped into the Rife which will have to accommodate the Chichester Relief Channel, the relatively new site of 40 properties behind the Bear Public House, the proposed 90 homes in Summer Lane, the 300 + homes at Hook Lane, then 450 + homes at Pagham Rd South and the 2700 + homes proposed at Chalcraft Lane, all destined to dump their grey water (non-sewage) but NITRATE loaded with no chance of this being filtered out. In 2020 Southern Water's latest report stated that the Pagham Rife would remain at a chemical FAIL status for at least the next 10 years.

Then there is the further damage to the environment that such a development would cause. The area is bounded by ancient hedgerows and with the range of mature ivy covered trees this provides an excellent wildlife habitat particularly for invertebrates, nesting birds and roosting bats. The surrounding ditches and seasonal streams are full of wildlife including water voles.

A development in this location would also spoil the view from the village, of the historic Chichester Cathedral which needs to be a consideration, especially as developers do market a view to sell to prospective buyers.

You appear to be permitting the building of the majority of your housing shortfall in the Pagham area which just isn't capable of supporting the planned developments or this current proposed development. Morally it is wrong to build on farmland which is one of the most 'flexible usage' pieces of agricultural land in the area not forgetting the micro climate we have which benefits agricultural growing. At this time we need to be more self-supporting in our food production.

For all the above reasons I strongly object to your proposals for housing to the West of Pagham Road.

Shirley Bass

