

Please upload inc attachments to P/140/16/OUT, P/134/16/OUT and P/6/17/OUT as rep objection

Regards
Tracey

From: David Innes
Sent: 23 March 2017 11:14
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Planning Objections -P/140/16/OUT, P/134/16/OUT and P/6/17/OUT

For upload to each of the Pagham applications.

thanks

David Innes | Planning Consultant , Strategic Development, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF DX 57406 Littlehampton
Internal: 37776 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737776 | E-mail: David.Innes@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 March 2017 14:37
To: David Innes
Cc: GIBB, Nicolas; Ray Radmell
Subject: Planning Objections -P/140/16/OUT, P/134/16/OUT and P/6/17/OUT

Dear Mr Innes,

Please find attached a pdf letter with my objection to planning applications:

Land South of Summer Lane & West of Pagham Road Pagham

P/140/16/OUT

Land North of Sefter Road & 80 Rose Green Road Pagham

P/134/16/OUT

Land North of Hook Lane Pagham

P/6/17/OUT

I trust that the genuine level of concern expressed by the Pagham community and its neighbours will be fully taken into account when determining these applications.

Kind regards

Robin Henderson

HALSYS LTD. is a company registered in England & Wales. Registered Number: 9566061. Registered office: Unit B5 Dovers Courtyard, Lonesome Lane, REIGATE, Surrey, RH2 7QT. Please notify us if you have received this email in error so that we can update our records.

45a West Front Road, Pagham West Sussex PO21 4SZ

Mr D. Innes,
Case Officer, Planning Department
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

**Land South of Summer Lane & West of Pagham Road Pagham
P/140/16/OUT**

**Land North of Sefter Road & 80 Rose Green Road Pagham
P/134/16/OUT**

**Land North of Hook Lane Pagham
P/6/17/OUT**

14-3-17

Dear Mr Innes,

I wish to object to the above planning applications. These developments are in addition to P/124/14/PL Orchard and P/58/15/OUT Hanbury North of Summer Lane and the proposed major extension of the Barfoot's commercial operations at the edge of Pagham Village.

The in combination effect of all these developments will have a dramatic and detrimental effect on the community of Pagham and its neighbours and is unsustainable with regards to local infrastructure, employment and environment. Specifically:

- Access - one of the main access routes into Pagham is Pagham Road which has already been designated as one of the most dangerous roads in West Sussex. With limited public transport available people have no other choice than to drive. This busy road already has to deal with commuter and holiday traffic, cyclists, delivery vehicles, buses and agricultural and heavy goods vehicles connected with the local farms and pack house/distribution centre, that is currently planning further significant extension. There is a high instance of serious and fatal accidents over the past 10 years on this road leading to delays and closures. The addition of over 1200 homes and the lack of local businesses will significantly increase these problems. This road therefore would not be fit for purpose.
- Increased flood risk – any additional development will further increase the flood risk to the area, that is already challenged with heavy sustained rainfalls due to surface water from the soil/subsoil already saturated from the rife and drainage ditches. Pagham is already at significant threat from coastal flooding due to coastal erosion which, ironically, is of little concern to the authorities.
- Current drainage and sewerage systems are under strain before any additional developments. Southern Water has confirmed that the 50 year old local pumping station is not adequate and has to be helped by pumping lorries. In extreme cases macerated sewerage has been dumped into the rife and raw sewerage into the lagoon.

- Health Service - doctors and dental surgeries in Pagham are currently under pressure within their catchment area. With the crisis in recruiting new GP's, additional housing will only further increase this pressure.
- Education- the local schools are already oversubscribed and cannot take on more pupils. With each development promising a new 1 or 2 form entry primary school indicates there appears no rationalisation across these proposed developments for an effective solution only an opportunity to build more homes on 2 of the 3 sites. What provision has been factored in for the secondary schools that will be needed over the coming years? Where will the additional teachers needed be recruited from?
- Environment – the loss of grade 1 farmland in one of the most productive and sunniest agricultural areas in the UK. Also the loss of ancient hedgerows and mature ivy covered trees that provide excellent habitat particularly for invertebrates, nesting birds and roosting bats.
- The impact of the in combination effect of these developments on the neighbouring nature reserve. As one of the main drivers for living in Pagham will be the coastal and natural aspects, has the total impact been assessed with a rigorous Appropriate Assessment considering the sensitivity of Pagham Harbour Nature Reserve? This would include disturbance (by people and pets), pollution and level of mitigation.
- What is Pagham's need for additional 1200 homes with the prospect of a further 2500 in coming years when there is no local business or industry? There is little diversity in the range of homes being proposed especially with the lack of starter homes, for young people already living in the area.
- Pagham Parish Council had put a lot of time, money and effort into developing a Local Neighbourhood Plan why has this been over-ruled and all this extra new housing being imposed upon us? Why did ADC not produce their own area plan with the result that they are now facing demands from developers to build anywhere?

In summary these combined developments are unsustainable within this area that is surrounded by prime agricultural land and a highly protected nature reserve. They are disproportionate with the rest of the village and serviced by a road that is currently not fit for purpose. The additional strain put upon the current infrastructure will be to the detriment of the current community of Pagham and only assuages government dictates and imposed quotas, with no consideration of the genuine needs of Pagham and its neighbours.

Current infrastructure is barely coping with the current size of Pagham. When considering proposals that will increase the size (and demand) by at least 35%, this will have a negative impact on all concerned. If allowed to proceed, who will take responsibility for this action and its long term effects?

Yours concernedly

Robin Henderson