

Planning Application: P/58/15/OUT
Land at Summer Lane, Pagham. PO21 4NG

We strongly oppose the above application for a number of reasons but principally for the fact that Summer Lane is too narrow and wholly inadequate for the increased volume of traffic.

As an illustration:

At present we have a stand-off between our boundary wall and the road of 0.33 m at the west end increasing to 0.55m at the east end. The road increases from 4.87m at the west end to 5.06m at the east end and the present footpath on the south side increases from 0.98m at the west end to 1.12m at the east end. Thus a total width between our property and those on the south side increasing from 6.18m at the west end to 6.73m at the east end. All measurements are restricted to and between the west and east ends of our property.

If the footpath is relocated from the present south side to the north side and is a consistent 1.8m in width this would leave a road width, being generous, of between 4.4m and 5.0m without any stand-off on the south side. At no point could the road width be 5.2m as suggested in the proposed plan. *Incidentally, if the plan is wrong with these measurements how many other errors are there throughout?* Also, at present, the south side footpath incorporates lamp posts and a telegraph post. With no stand-off these would also need to be relocated to the north side and, amongst other concerns, this would bring the street lamps much closer to bedroom windows. Within the road there are various run-off drains and man holes, all of which would need moving if the footpath is relocated from the south to the north. Also, with no stand-off, the walls, fences and land of the south side dwellings would be open to considerable damage and access to south side properties will be restricted if not downright dangerous. If there is a stand-off on the south side of say 0.3m that would reduce the road width to between 4.1m and 4.7m. Even if there is just a curb on the south side this will reduce the width of the road. 4.1m is barely sufficient for two cars to pass, without taking into account any parked cars. The problem does, of course, become worse if car and lorry or two lorries are trying to pass.

In addition, our property and that of Moonraker next door, and perhaps others, has a noticeable gradient to the drive. If the footpath is moved to the north side it is, at the very least, unclear how our drive would tie in to this new footpath without work being carried out on our drive.

The above is just one example of one of the properties along Summer Lane. Much of the road to the west of our property decreases in width and hence concerns and dangers shown above are further exacerbated the further along Summer Lane one moves away from Pagham Road.

The proposed 90 dwellings would produce a considerable increase in traffic. Assuming an average of 2 cars per household there would be around 180 extra cars many of which would be trying to access Summer Lane during rush hour/school start & finish hours.

At present Summer Lane is accessed by large vehicles in respect of:

- Council refuse collection
- Sewage tankers
- Tractors and trailers

All of these will continue to require access and, in fact, the council refuse collection will, of course, need to access the new development – often during the most crucial times of the morning. At any time that any of these vehicles are using Summer Lane it can become impossible to pass them.

Parking often restricts the road width even further and although yellow lines are proposed in places, there are dwellings, Martins Cottage and Summer Lane Cottage in particular, that have no on-site parking and thus need to park in the road, preferably outside their respective dwellings and usually at least two cars each. Other properties often have visitors parking outside and in addition, with the proximity of local shops there can be additional parking near the east end of the road. Also, the use of yellow lines does not restrict blue-badge parking and, for that matter, illegal parking.

At present there are 17 dwellings in Summer Lane and even with this few there are times when the road can be congested – refuse collection, farm tractors, deliveries etc. An increase of more than 500% in dwellings, with a single narrow access road, will be both dangerous and disastrous. In addition, it will affect our, and many others, quality of life.

Although it is proposed to move the junction of Summer Lane and Pagham Road in order to gain less restricted sight lines, the considerable increase in traffic will increase the dangers at this junction rather than reduce them.

Walkers (with and without dogs), cyclists and horse riders are frequent users of Summer Lane, most of whom are not accessing properties in Summer Lane but making use of the public footpath past the stables and across the fields. All of these users would be put at substantial risk by the considerable increase in the volume of traffic.

It is our contention that, bearing all the above in mind, Summer Lane is far too narrow to safely accommodate access to this proposed new development.

In addition to the inadequacy of Summer Lane to accommodate the vastly increased traffic flow, it seems to us somewhat short-sighted to build a new development with no thought as to extending the local facilities, especially educational. The new dwellings are likely to house a high number of children, many of whom will be of junior school age or likely to reach that age. The distance to the nearest school will mean that, except in a very few cases, children are likely to be transported by car to their school, with all the traffic and environmental implications that produces. Also, the number of local school places may not be able to accommodate all of these children now or in the future.

In relation to the “Application” substituted on 10/7/2015:

- A number of items are marked as “..to be considered at reserved matters stage” The application must be rejected until these items are fully available for inspection and consideration by the public.
- Item 10 states that there will be no on-site parking spaces. This is clearly not what is planned.
- Item 15 states that there are no “..trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character.” Again, this is clearly not the case as trees along the boundaries adjoining neighbouring land could provide valuable screening. In addition there are several trees to the eastern boundary that are protected under a preservation order.

- Item 24 “Can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath.....” The answer given is “no.” Once again, this is clearly not the case as the site can be seen from public footpaths and probably from some of the surrounding public roads (Pagham Road, Summer Lane – around no. 7 if not elsewhere.)

As suggested above, if we can find some fairly simple errors how many more errors are there within the whole?

In conclusion, therefore, we reiterate our opposition of Planning Application P/58/15/OUT.

John and Jacqueline Kitchener
Selig
Summer lane
PO21 4NG

24th August 2015