

From: Nicola Swann [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 April 2022 11:07
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.

At a meeting of its Planning Committee Advisory Committee, Pagham Parish Council considered the following applications. Comments are submitted by the Clerk in accordance with a scheme of delegation dated 4th May 2021.

P/19/22/PL – Church Fam Holiday Village Church Lane Pagham PO211 4NR. Erection of jump tower with climbing wall and a container bar. This application may affect the setting of a listed building and is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.

NO OBJECTION: The Council did not wish to formally object to the scheme but voiced concern over potential neighbour disturbance. The hours of operation were not given. Council would also like further detail shown on the material used for the landing zone.

P/39/22/HH – Summerfield House Summer Lane Pagham PO21 4NG. Erection of part single, part two storey front/side extension and single storey rear extension, alterations to side conservatory and installation of front bay window and balustrade to front balcony.
NO OBJECTION

P/22/22/PL – Land West of Hook Lane Pagham. Variation of Condition 1 imposed under P/132/20/RES relating to approved plans.

The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to this application. It feels that the houses proposed are not of a style which is in keeping with the village feel of Pagham. It is noted that there are 4 character areas, with area 1 from the design code specifying a country vernacular. We do not feel the houses presented meet this brief. Houses in character area 3 are required to reflect the character of houses on adjacent Hook Lane. Again, these should have more of a village feel to better fit in with existing housing. Less use of red and red/orange brick (three of the four character areas list this), more variety in finish and roof height should be included. In particular the houses shown in Street Scenes E G demonstrate a lack of variety. The houses shown in the Design and Access Statement for the application are compared to the currently-approved Bellway Homes house types. It is clear that the Vistry Homes styles are significantly different from and more urban than the Bellway styles and do not fit with surrounding housing or the requirements of the design code.

The Council is concerned that the entire development should have a cohesive design approach. The Design and Access Statement clearly shows the differences between the two developers in terms of styles and the Council does not believe they will blend together in the finished development.

The introduction of the car barn is unwelcome as this is likely to become a hangout for local youths and may encourage low level crime or antisocial behaviour. Designs similar to this have been discussed with our local police and are discouraged. Council did not feel it emulated a farmyard.

The black weatherboarding shown on the Hook Lane entrance street scene is not attractive or in keeping. The housing proposed here doesn't blend with the other proposed housing and doesn't give a farmyard feel.

Best wishes



Nicola Swann
Clerk & RFO
Pagham Parish Council

